



A Journal of Culture, English Language, Teaching & Literature

ISSN 1412-3320 (Print), ISSN 2502-4914(Online)

Vol. 16 No. 1; July 2016

Copyright © Soegijapranata Catholic University, Indonesia

**MAKASSARESE AND BUGINESE LOCAL WISDOMS IN
SCL-BASED WRITING CLASS (A CASE STUDY)**

**Ria Jubhari, Ety Bazergan (decs), Karmila Mokoginta,
Simon Sitoto, Besse Puspita Syarif, and Ery Iswari**

English Department and Department of Local Languages, Faculty of Cultural
Sciences, Hassanudin University, Indonesia

Tel +62 81342647559

Email: ac.riajubhari@gmail.com

Received: 15-01-2016

Accepted: 14-07-2016

Published: 31-07-2016

MAKASSARESE AND BUGINESE LOCAL WISDOMS IN SCL-BASED WRITING CLASS (A CASE STUDY)

Ria Jubhari¹, Ety Bazergan¹, Karmila Mokoginta¹,
Simon Sitoto¹, Besse Puspita Syarif¹, and Ery Iswari²

ac.riajubhari@gmail.com

English Department¹ and Department of Local Languages,
Faculty of Cultural Sciences², Hassanudin University, Indonesia

Abstract: This descriptive-qualitative case study aims to (1) identify the values of Buginese/Makassarese local wisdoms that shape the learning process of Hasanuddin University students attending the *Writing2 (MBI2)* subject in the even semester, 2014; (2) find out which of the local wisdoms that strongly shape the student-centered learning (SCL) process in the Writing II class. The study focused on students' classroom interaction. Data were collected from classroom observations, questionnaires, interviews and teachers' note on the learning process in classroom. This study found that what is thought as Buginese or Makassarese local wisdoms especially respect to older people and mutual help can both support and inhibit the SCL process in MBI2.

Key words: local wisdom, student's interaction, respect to the elderly, mutual help

Abstrak: Penelitian deskriptif kualitatif ini bertujuan untuk (1) mengidentifikasi nilai kearifan lokal Buginese/Makassarese yang membentuk proses belajar mahasiswa Universitas Hasanuddin yang mengikuti kuliah Menulis Bahasa Inggris 2 (MBI2) di semester genap 2014; dan (2) mengetahui kearifan lokal mana yang kuat membentuk proses SCL di kelas MBI2. Fokus penelitian ini adalah interaksi mahasiswa dalam kelas. Data didapat dari observasi kelas, kuesioner, interview, dan catatan dosen tentang proses belajar di kelas. Penelitian ini menemukan bahwa apa yang dianggap sebagai kearifan lokal Bugis/ Makassar, khususnya hormat kepada yang lebih tua dan gotong

royong, dapat mendukung sekaligus menghambat proses SCL di kelas MBIZ.

Kata kunci: kearifan lokal, interaksi mahasiswa, hormat kepada orang tua, gotong royong

INTRODUCTION

December 2013 edition of *Identitas* reported the sixth-year implementation of student-centred learning (SCL) in Hasanuddin University (Unhas) which does not seem to show any difference with the previously practised teaching-centred learning. What may have triggered this unchanged learning process ?

SCL is a learning approach which was highly influenced by Lev Vygotsky, as cited in Brown (2007), who said that students are responsible for their learning. Students reconstruct what they learn in class into something relevant to them and become independent of their own learning inside and outside the class. It is clear that students, as the primary factor in learning process, belong to the society where they live or come from. This means that the students and the society are interchangeably influenced one another. This implies that the efforts to implement SCL in Unhas are inseparable from the traditions in the society. This further indicates the necessity to study relevant local wisdoms, which occurs in SCL-based classrooms in Unhas. The local wisdoms here refer to all products, processes or traditions rooted in Indonesian society, especially in South Sulawesi, and are apart of the traditions influencing Indonesian people's activities in their community.

LITERATURE REVIEW

A. The main features of student-centred learning

Donnelly & Fitzmaurice's (2005) review on SCL from lecturers' and students' perspectives highlights a number of important SCL features in teaching English at university. One of them is the better interaction between teachers and students. The hierarchical relationship between teachers who are often associated as the knowledge provider and students who receive the knowledge is minimized in such a way that teachers do not merely teach but listen to students' needs and facilitate their learning activities in classroom.

Learning in Vygotskian view is a social interaction which plays an important role in developing students' cognition. Such social interaction can be seen when learners interact with their classmates during their learning activities and from the culture or traditions ascribed to students' life. Brown (2007) cited Vygotsky who claims that everything is learned from our interaction with others and the result of the learning is integrated into our mental structure.

Meanwhile Donnelly & Fitzmaurice (2005) believes that sociocultural belief on second language learning considers that learners' behaviour in class can be well understood when teachers involve them as individuals and as groups of learners where the learning strategies are used and developed. Their utterance and behaviour in class reflect their cultural traditions which form their learning process. Thus, quoting Jang and Jimenez (2011), it is socioculturally important to study learners' traditions. They say that the strategies used in class are inseparable from the relationship between learners and their teachers in class.

In their review of two different forms of SCL in higher education namely collaborative project based learning and problem based learning, Donnelly & Fitzmaurice (2005) clarify the roles of teachers and learners. Teachers in student-centred learning are involved more in designing and assessing the project or problem based learning. Quoting Aspy et. al. (1993), they also highlight teachers' roles to keep students on track, avoid negative feedback, and assume the role of fellow learner.

In student-centred learning, teachers and students should work out together clearly defined criteria of assessment in which students are allowed to assess their own learning and their peers' based on their individual or group learning targets (Savin-Baden & Major, 2004). Such an assessment, which should help students monitor their own learning, includes among others the team skills, interpersonal skills and communication skills and need to be clear, positive and specific.

The important feature of student-centred learning lies on the student's range of roles and responsibilities. They should take initiative on their own learning goals, identify their learning strategies, decide some procedures to reach the goals, and evaluate learning outcomes. To reach these goals they should shift their paradigm from being a passive listener and note taker to critically question the raised arguments and actively contribute to solving problems emerging in their learning process, and above all they should keep

being motivated to reach their learning target. In this way the knowledge students acquired is no longer the one directed by the teacher. Instead the acquired knowledge is blended with their own specific target.

B. Review of studies on SCL practices

In her study of communicative approach in improving students' academic reading achievement, Irmawati (2012) reported that minimum contribution in class discussion activities and teacher domination in learning process are two major factors that inhibit the learning in classroom. This finding is relevant to student-centred learning with its communication skill as one of the important skills required from students.

Nguyen (2011) who researched on the problems faced by Vietnamese, Thai and Indonesian students during their study in Australia found that the students are difficult to express their views due to the fact that, in the living cultures in Asia, people tend to avoid disharmonious relationship with the interlocutors, especially the elderly, resulted from having different opinions.

Sawir (2005) who conducted an in-depth interview with students from five Asian nations confirmed that language difficulties focused on grammar and reading skills in teacher-centred classrooms are rooted from students' prior learning experiences in their home countries which do not enhance student's confidence in speaking and proactive role in classrooms. Such difficulty was also addressed by Marcellino (2008:57) which claims that "the success of English teaching Indonesia cannot be freed from the student cultural backgrounds, values, customs" which assumes that to contradict or criticize teachers' ideas is unacceptable.

A study on the self-directed learning readiness, perception toward student-centered learning and predisposition toward student-centered behaviour at Sultan Agung Islamic medical school shows students from Java Island showed a higher tendency towards student-centered behaviour when compared to those from outside Java Island (Lestari & Widjajakusumah, 2009).

Using Causal Layered Analysis (CAL), Pham Thi (2010) resorts the major challenge of implementing SCL in Vietnamese universities to Vietnamese people's way of thinking. This review claims that the student-centredness does not need to impose a set of principles to students but upgrade the infrastructure to make local cultures support the SCL and modify SCL principles in order to adapt to local people traditions.

All these studies indicate that to uncover challenges of implementing SCL we must go beyond the classrooms where students live their tradition while having to make use English orally. In this study, the practice of SCL process in MBI2 class is explored in the way it is shaped by Buginese/Makassarese local wisdoms.

C. The role of local wisdoms in SCL-based classrooms

Although definition of 'culture' is debatable and often mixed up with 'tradition,'Kartawinata (2011, p. viii) pointed out that 'tradition is something transmitted and passed on from past to current generation in the form of patterns or images of our behaviour, belief, rule, advice and prohibition which continuously change, and this tradition is later on interpreted as 'local wisdom.' Kartawinata (2011) stated that the term 'local wisdom,' also known as indigenous or local knowledge, or as local genius, can be defined as local ideas which are thoughtful, invaluable, rooted and followed by its society. This further indicates that students' background can be in contrast with learning principles they live in, and in turn affects their way of thinking.

These wisdoms, like the river culture in South Kalimantan and *siri* in South Sulawesi, are normally orally practised in daily life. Another indigenous knowledge in the life of Indonesian people, the spirit of *gotong royong* is originated from the traditional Javanese village, where labour is accomplished through reciprocal exchange and the villagers are motivated by concern for the common good (Mardiasmo & Barnes, 2013). Especially in disaster affected areas, this culture of 'gotong royong' provides the necessary spirit needed to endure the hardships and for all involved. Nowadays these wisdoms are gradually eroded and tend to be left behind by their people although undeniably such wisdoms are still strongly attached to their believers and influence their daily utterances. These local cultures provide a context of those practised traditions with their own characteristics.

In response to the globalisation in Indonesia, there is a greater awareness among universities in Indonesia to base their academic policies on the local culture where the university is established. For instance, the SCL approach to learning applied at Gadjah Mada University was inspired by *Patrap Triloka*, a local wisdom originally introduced by Ki Hadjar Dewantoro, the Indonesia's first Minister of Education (Widayati et. al. 2010). In a teaching-learning process. *Patrap Triloka* literally refers to three good conducts that a teacher should practice in facilitating his/her students' learning *-ing ngarso sung tulodho, ing madyo mangun karso and tut wuri andayani ~*

which means that teachers should be a model for their students, facilitate their students and empower students to develop their own potentials. These qualities are expected to bring the student-teacher relationship into a harmonious academic atmosphere. Another example of local wisdom-based policy is reflected in strategic programs of the research unit at Padjajaran University and on research road map at many universities in Indonesia such as Padjadjaran University and Andalas University. Besides, local wisdoms have been widely used as learning resources such as digital story telling (Susanti 2013) or in shaping student's character (Faridi, 2014).

Bax (2003) emphasised that the feature of context where the language is used should be attended to when applying communicative language teaching. Without considering the culture and the context where the teaching and learning happens or experienced, teachers would fail conveying their message to students. This means that the influence of culture and its local wisdoms to students is inevitable in learning process irrespective of the approach used including the learner-centred approach. The embedded values of culture which bears student's identity (Savin-Baden & Major, 2004:47) unavoidably affect student's interaction in classroom.

Due to the role of local wisdoms, the occurrence of dynamic interaction in SCL-based writing class may not take place despite the fact that such an interaction is expected to lead student's writing activity and guide its relevance to student's interest and writing process. Savin-Baden & Major (2004) reminded that certain local wisdoms may disrupt the successful implementation of SCL. For example, the local wisdom of respecting older people, which requires students to respect and not to make their teacher lose face, may discourage students to critically raise questions in which the teacher may not be able to answer. Thus, such efforts of facilitating students to share their views and ask questions and at the same time learn from the group members or from their classmates in class discussion may be counterproductive to the implementation of SCL principles. Pertinent to this study, it is necessary to search for the values of Buginese / Makassarese local wisdoms that shape the learning process of Unhas students attending MBI2.

D. Buginese and Makassarese ethnicities

The term Buginese/Makassarese indicates two different ethnicities which dominantly inhabit South Sulawesi and West Sulawesi provinces. This combined term of Buginese and Makassarese ethnics makes many people

think that Buginese is synonymous with Makassarese. Pelras (1996, p.14) who wrote the well known book *The Bugis* argued that many publications written by local experts such as *Siri: Bagian Kesadaran Hukum Rakyat Bugis-Makassar* (Marzuki, 1995) and *Kebudayaan Bugis Makassar* (Mattulada, 1971) tend to minimize the difference between the two ethnics due to the way the two names of ethnics written as a compound word. Pelras explained that this tendency was due to the same Islamic religion adopted by the two peoples which reduces the difference in their ethnicity and language. These local experts on Buginese and Makassarese note that the way of living of Buginese and Makassarese are principally the same. Although many Buginese words can be found in Makassarese or vice versa, the way such words are pronounced can indicate whether the speaker is Buginese or Makassarese. For instance, the word *pesseé* in Buginese and *paccé* in Makassarese both literally refer to being *irritated* or *painful* looking at someone's suffering (Marzuki, 1995, p.132).

Mattulada (1985, p. 5) stated that from the four major ethnics in South Sulawesi, namely To-Ugi (Bugis), To-Mangkasara (Makassar), To-raja and To-Menre' (Mandar), the Buginese has the biggest population and occupy fourteen out of twenty three regencies in South Sulawesi: Maros, Pangkep, Bone, Soppeng, Wajo, Luwu, Sidrap, Bulukumba, Sinjai, Pinrang, Enrekang, Pare-pare, Barru, and Polmas. While Makassarese people mostly live in Gowa, Takalar, Bantaeng, Jeneponto and Selayar regencies, Makassar, Maros and Pangkep are currently considered as transitional areas where Buginese and Makassarese are both used in daily conversations.

We can say that Bugis and Makassarese have been recognized as one entity, at least, since the use of the same script *lontara* which spread throughout the southern tip of Sulawesi island. Although Buginese and Makassarese people seem to be geographically separated, these two ethnics seem to spread all over the regencies in South Sulawesi with some distinctive regions for Buginese and Makassarese and the so-called transitional area in Makassar, the capital city of South Sulawesi.

E. Core Values in Buginese and Makassarese

Rahim (1985) said that in Buginese tradition there are six core values, namely honesty, scholar, appropriateness, determination, efforts and *siri* which are all used in Buginese expressions stated in *lontara*. These values are interchanged in framing the behaviour of Buginese people. The following is the summary of Rahim's (1985) account of these values.

First, honesty (*lempu*, Buginese) literally means *sincere, correct, good*, yet, it could refer to good behaviour and fear the Lord. One's honesty is considered so important that the judge La Pagala Nenek Mallomo (1546-1654) at Sidenreng considered it is equalled to death penalty sentenced to his own child who did not practise honesty (Rahim 1985, p. 149). Second, the Buginese people's *scholarly* characteristic means that nothing is difficult and difficulties are responded with sincerity and kindness. Having an academic degree does not automatically bestow intellectuality, but those Buginese figures mentioned in *lontara* who were not holding university degree were very influential in their era and can be grouped as being scholastic.

Third, the concept of appropriateness (*assitinaja*, Buginese) which originates from the word *tinaja* (appropriate) refers to one's physical and spiritual ability in carrying out a mandate or assignment. The fourth concept, determination (*getting*, Buginese), means that Buginese people are strong and determined in principle, and committed to the work being done. The fifth, effort (*reso*, Buginese), is the key to the successful implementation of honesty, scholariness, appropriateness, and determination. These four concepts can be effective if they are accompanied by some efforts. Some excerpts in *lontara* denounce effortless people.

The last but the most important is, *siri*, central to South Sulawesi especially to Buginese and Makasarese and has been defined by many Buginese scholars as "shame" or "honour" and is reflected in their behaviour and way of thinking (Abdullah 1985 as cited in Samsuni, 2010).

In Buginese/Makassarese tradition, the way we orally talk which shows how we respect others, called *sipakatau* in Buginese/Makassarese, can be shown in three ways which are reflected in their different expressions. First, someone *mappakaraja* when he/she shows his/her respect to someone older or more highly educated, richer or more powerful. For instance, whenever we greet a lecture *idi puang* (*Ya bu X*, said to senior lecturer) we treat him/her a senior lecturer who is more educated). Second, the respect for our colleagues or others who are at the same age or position is called *sipakalebi/sipakalabirik*. Third, *mapakamase*, is said to people who are younger or have lower positions. Another feature of relation is expressed in *siammatuuruk* (Buginese)/ *sibali-balii* (Makassarese) which means helping one another.

METHODOLOGY

The qualitative case study was utilized in this study to get clear illustration of SCL process in semester-three university writing class. Following Seliger & Shohamy (1989), the case study here specifically attends to students' interaction in writing class in order to have a more detailed data on the forms of local wisdoms practised while interacting in class. This study assumes that students' patterns of interaction in each subject is different due to different teaching methodology, the objectives, and teaching/learning materials. Seliger & Shohamy (1989) emphasized that data in a qualitative study should focus on the observed participants in order that researcher's cultural and intellectual biases do not interfere the collection, presentation and interpretation of data. The only problem in qualitative study is in data collection because data are not measured statistically like in quantitative study. McKay (2006) argues that the lack of control in qualitative study can be eliminated by the researcher's intensive engagement in data collection, continuous and persistent observation, and the use of various data and methods. This leads to the main purpose of qualitative research applied here that is to contextualise and to interpret rather than to generalize, to predict and to explain causal relationships between variables.

A. Sources of data

Data in this study were collected from four different sources. First, the native speakers of Buginese and Makassarese languages employed in this study were two academics - one is Buginese, and the other one is Makassarese who can clearly pinpoint aspects of Buginese and Makassarese traditions and way of thinking, which they have gone throughout their lives. Second, data on classroom activities were video-recorded to observe the interaction among students and between students and their teachers. Third, although this study does not focus on teachers' perspectives, teachers' note is considered important to support the observation data, especially between students and lecturers. Fourth, the questionnaire was distributed to find out detailed information on student's ethnicity and tradition.

Because it is not easy to determine whether student's background tradition is influenced by certain tradition and to find out the form of influence of local wisdom towards the student-based learning process, the tradition in this study refers to student's place of birth, hometown where student spent their time before pursuing their education at Hasanuddin University, and the location of their senior high school. For example, a

student who was born in Buginese-based Bone, has spent his time in Buginese-dominated Soppeng and has joined high school which is in Wajo, which is also Buginese dominated, we can consider that the Buginese tradition has to some extent formed this student's tradition. Thus, the questionnaire provided the information on students' dominant tradition influencing the learning process in MBI2 class in the second semester 2013/2014.

Table 1:
Student's dominant traditions in MBI2 class

Place of Birth /Hometown/Location of high school and elementary school	Class A	Class B	Class C	Class D	Total
1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Buginese(B)	10	10	10	9	39
2. Makassarese (M)	0	2	2	4	8
3. Mix of B and M	0	5	4	2	11
4. Mix of (B or M) and non (B or M)	0	6	5	3	14
5. Non B or M	3	5	6	5	19
6. Transitional areas	3	10	11	10	34
Total	16	38	38	33	125

Note:

1. Column 1 refers to the grouping of areas which are dominantly inhabited by Buginese and Makassare in Sulawesi (Mattulada 1985, p. 5), the information on place of birth, hometown and location of high schools is subdivided into groups of regencies dominated by Buginese tradition (number 1), by Makassarese (number 2), group of mixed Buginese and Makassarese (number 3), group of mix of Buginese and Makassarese and of non Buginese/Makassarese (number 4) and areas which are dominated by neither Buginese nor Makassarese (number 5), and group of transitional areas of Buginese/Makassarese (number 6).

2. Columns 2, 3, 4 and 5 show the number of students for the 6 groups in each parallel MBI2 class.

B. Participants

The main participants in this study were Unhas English Department students who took MBI2 in the second semester 2013/2014. This sample of this study represented all Unhas English Department students.

C. Procedure of data collection

First, lecturer and students in four parallel classes carried out the teaching and learning process of the subject MBI2. The researchers observed the four classes in turns, using checklist while the recording was performed by the student involved in this study. The recording was carefully watched several times in order to identify students' interaction in classroom, especially the interaction between students and lecturer, between individual students, and between students and students in group works or when these students represent their groups and interact with students from other groups in class discussion. The meeting with native Buginese and Makassarese was conducted to search for information on Buginese and Makassarese traditions. The questionnaire was distributed in meeting sixteen to find out students' background tradition. Based on the information from this questionnaire, two students from each class, representing Buginese and Makassarese, were interviewed to dig out further explanation on specific aspects of students' traditions such as chatting, marriage proposal, parents' burial ceremony, and relationship with older people and friends.

D. Procedure of data analysis

Raw data from classroom observation, recording and the questionnaire, including information from the Buginese and Makassarese resource persons, were triangulated. The typical interactions in classroom were identified and were related to relevant values of Buginese and Makassarese local wisdoms. The result was cross-checked with the teacher's notes on the interaction between students and teacher, and with students' information from the interview. .

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In this section we present the activities in each observed class, including the important points on students' interaction, and teacher's notes on students' interaction in SCL-based class.

A. The outline of activities in the four writing classes

Following Schrifin's (1994) functional approach, Ellis & Barkhuizen (2005) claim that the grammar feature which is embedded in an utterance is *functional* because in essence language is used more to communicate a meaning than simply to be a form, and to understand the meaning of a word in an utterance we need to know the context of the utterance. Although this research does not focus on language function, but the utterances reflected from the interaction between students should be looked at from the perspective of each classroom. The following is the important features of activities in each class based on the recording.

Class A

Before attending the MBI fourteenth meeting, students have decided one of the three given topics for the two-sided arguments and have proposed a writing outline based on the chosen topic. In class, the lecturer led the negotiation among all sixteen students to decide which topic would be the majority. Then, for about fifteen minutes students worked in groups of three and proposed one possible outline for a two-sided essay based on determined topic. The lecturer walked around from one group to the others and facilitated them just in case they have problems in outlining which needs to be solved. Some students tried to show them the outline they were working with.

Every representing student was asked to present their outline before their friends and at the same time the lecturer noted the group outline's important points on the whiteboard while other students in their groups were asked to check for the relevance and coherence. At the end of each presentation, the other groups were asked to offer comments, questions and inputs to the presented outline which were then responded by the presenting group. Most of the time students' responses to the questions or comments were said in Bahasa Indonesia. When this happened the lecturer encouraged students to say them out in English by saying for example "*Are you from another planet?*" At the end of this meeting, students were instructed to submit the two-sided essay in the facebook group, and were reminded of things to prepare for the next meeting.

Class B

Following what has been discussed in the previous meeting, i.e. the structure of *problem solution* essay, the 34 students in this class were put into

11 groups of three or four people. They were asked to determine a problem and propose some possible solutions to the problem. During the meeting the lecturer walked around the class, and checked whether students were doing what they have been asked for.

From the beginning until the end of the class, there was no interaction between students or between groups of students. The only interaction noted was when a student, with her loud voice due to the noisy classroom, asked whether what she understood about the lecturer's instruction has been correct. Soon after the lecturer clarified the instruction, the students from the nearby groups echoed "oooo" which can indicate that they now understand the teacher's instructions. This can also indicate a support to their friend who has raised a question. The only question raised by student followed by the echoing "oooo" may indicate that other students also needed help but was reluctant to ask the lecturer.

Class C

The class began when the lecturer informed the planned activities in classrooms with regard to the topic 'dowry' while students listened attentively. Students formed their groups based on their ethnicities. For instance, in one group all members are Makassarese. There are two groups whose members are Makassarese, two are Buginese, and one is Torajanese. There is one group whose members consist of various ethnicities. Working in their groups, students are allowed to brainstorm their ideas on 'dowry' which are going to be put in their group's one-sided essay. After fifteen minutes, the lecturer walked around each group and facilitated the progress of their discussion. This group discussion rose some noises because all students were quite interested in the topic and were so eager to tell how dowry has been practiced in their tradition. After about 20-minute group discussion, each group briefly presented their arguments about the amount of money to be paid as dowry in their tradition while the other groups commented and compared with their group's argument on dowry. While the Buginese and Makassarese groups clearly indicated that dowry was so determining in their tradition, the Torajanese group claims that not all Torajanese people especially from the bride's family consider dowry a must for a marriage proposal to be accepted.

Class D

While waiting for students to get into the class, the lecturer wrote the important points which will be discussed in class including the reminder for

the next meetings. When students were all in classroom the lecturer then explained those points which included the mid-test date and the submission of essay via emails because the next meeting is a holiday. When a student asked whether he could bring a dictionary while doing the test in class, the lecturer said she would think about its necessity and let him know in the next meeting.

The lecturer asked students to continue the group discussion which started in the previous meeting which discussed the topic 'living together.' While being observed, the lecturer attended all the six groups which consist of four or five students. Two groups agreed to living together, while four groups showed their disagreement to practice living together.

After ten minutes, the lecturer and students discussed the points in each paragraph in the passage and the following exercises. While every group provided their answer, a few students very actively respond to the lecturer's questions and their classmates' statements about the points being talked about. These same students who represented their group appear to take all the opportunity to answer their lecturer's questions so the lecturer commented "... I am happy you want to give a try to answer my question but I'd like to give the opportunity to your other classmates." This reply was timely in the sense that the lecturer noticed a number of students who looked very passive and never responded to hers since the class began. The lecturer indicated this when she said "Who else would like to answer my question" directing to such students and waiting for their response. These students never responded either their lecturer or their classmates even when the other members of the group where they belong to told them the answer of the question. At the end of meeting the lecturer reminded again what the students are going to do in the next meeting.

B. Important interactions from the class observation

There are three types of typical interactions observed in the four classes. The first type is the interaction between students representing their groups and students from other groups. Their sample interactions are as follows. When the lecturer's question was answered by a student / group, the lecturer provided an opportunity to students from other groups to comment on this student's answer. The following is the lecturer's statement encouraging students to participate.

Datum (1)

“... Anymore answer? So we all agree to Lt’s? Does anybody disagree with Lt’s, with Lt’s, explanation?” (D003, 00:29-0.35)

Following this utterance, a student who was sitting in front of her and on her right side of Lt provided his response (see datum 2).

Datum (2)

“...eee according to Lt...eee...we have to take the answer after the underlined words...” (D1/4, D003 0.50)

While directing her eyes to other student who was raising his hand, the lecturer said ‘yes’ which indicated that the lecturer gradually moved her attention from student D1/4 to other student who said the following (datum 3).

Datum (3)

“I think ...e... the underlined word is it’s a clue...every number of exercise.
[so what’s so, it’s a clue]
...so ... eee... we cannot we cannot ...say .. say that the underlined words is
.....it says ... it says using the underlined words is just to help...
[ya just to help...ok?]”

(A1/1, D003, 01:22-01:50)

Datum (4)

“E... I agree with the number one...cose it’s more ...more specific than number one mam.
[ya]
[ok.. more specific than number 2] (D1/4, 2:14-2.41)

It can be seen here that two students presented their comments on Lt’s answer. The second type of interaction can be noted when the lecturer asked student from other groups to express their comment on the group four’s outline. While starting to express her opinion in English, she does not seem to have enough vocabulary to continue what she would like to say and finally she said in Bahasa Indonesia.

Datum (5)

“They said that But how how if a student and teacher have...elected but in in that elected there is.... I don’t know how to say ... dalam benak saya bagaimana kalau semua pelajar semua....” (A0111, 8:40-9.35)

After one group presented their answer the members from groups sitting close to the presenting groups talk directly to each other whisperingly comment on what has just been presented ignoring the other groups who might also want to know what is being talked about. (A0111 22.57 – 23.04). The lecturer then asked to share ideas with other friends.

Datum (6)

“Come on share with your friends” (A111, 22.58-22.60).

Second, some interactions occur between individual students and the lecturer. Just when a lecturer has finished his instructions on what to do in group work, a student sitting close to the wall spontaneously and loudly asked him to repeat his explanation. This was because the class, consisting of 34 students. Once the lecturer finished her explanation, we could hear this voice from a number of students.

Datum (7)

[ooooo] (B0066, 00:58 – 01.20).

This voice may signal that they have understood the explanation and will try to work out the task based on the lecturer’s explanation. Before presenting her group’s comment on the other groups’ comment, a student named H from group one corrected one point in their outline which has been put down on the whiteboard.

Datum (8)

“Firstly, I would say the ‘conclusion’ you wrote is a bit wrong. [Oh Yes - L] We do not mean all nepotisms but it could reduce the nepotism.” (A111, 9.47-10.00)

A student attempted to offer her response to the group which thought that students and lecturers had the right to select the faculty’s dean and this selection is similar to the selection of leaders in Indonesia. He stated hesistantly in Bahasa Indonesia

Datum (9)

“Tadi kan ee... misalnya kalau mahasiswa memilih....the dean eee tetapi eee apa oh my God”

[ha ha ha – teman yang duduk di dekat mahasiswa yang bersangkutan tertawa mungkin karena dia tidak berhasil menyampaikan gagasannya]. (A111, 9.47-10.00)

At the same time, students’ noise and laughter burst out, and the lecturer interrupted these saying.

Datum (10)

“Oh look look let me sum up the points of arguments H’s arguments ok that number one says that....all students must select. That’s the point” (A 0111 23.36-24.23).

After the lecturer summed up the student’s point of talk, which was initially intended to said in Bahasa Indonesia, the student suddenly said the following.

Datum (11)

L: “... All students must select. We must select. That’s the point.”

S: Yes, that’s it

All SS: [Ha haha ha ha ha]

(A 0111, 24.24-24.26)

Everyone in the class laughed when a student suddenly echoed the lecturer’s statement. This lecturer’s utterance indicates that the student might consider what has just been said by the lecturer was exactly the same with the point she wanted to raise. Another possible reason for this utterance is that the student wanted to end the interaction between herself and the lecturer and her classmates because she was confused what she would say further.

This kind of interaction between lecturer and students indicates that they are close enough one another because they can laugh at their classmates’ silly reply and she was brave to say what she thought, although she was not sure of what she just said. Third, some other forms of interaction inside the class are illustrated below.

Datum 12

When the lecturer finished writing the points of the group's outline on the whiteboard, she turned around and found two students raised their hands which does not only indicate that they want to talk but can also be interpreted that these students asked for permission to talk (A 0111 16.58-17.02). This willingness to share what they think showed students' initiative without having to be appointed by lecturer.

There were a number of students in class D who never talked at all. One of these students was A who sat at the very back and belonged to the group of students sitting nearby him. This student was attended by the lecturer who asked him a question. There was a silence for about one minute waiting for this student's response when finally the lecturer encouraged him to speak by saying as follows (see datum 13).

Datum 13

Silence for about one minute (A0111 16.30-17.25)

... Andre Come on everyone waiting...they are waiting for you...come on say

[the student smiled at the lecturer]

something... so so what's your answer then ... what's your group answer for number 3... you can ask Zn or Lt or ... or anyone ... so what's the answer ...[silence 17.25-17.38]... Several people view... You have the answer or not ...so just read it...

[his friend pointed to him the statement he had to read]...

(A111-17.25- 19.10)

Towards the end of the meeting, the lecturer asked a student about the lesson learnt which he got from the class today. Busily browsing the pages of his handout, he did not say any single word. Even when lecturer signaled him what to say or his friends told him what to say in Bahasa Indonesia just in case he did not understand the instruction, he just mumbled unclearly uttered his answer while following what the lecturer said. Finally the lecturer read the answer which should be stated by the student (D103 23:48-25.20).

Datum 14

...What is the benefit ... Apa gunanya ... Apa ya ... Yang pertama berpikir secara kritis. Apa lagi yang lain. [silence] Apa sebenarnya maksud dibalik itu... What is the ...how to connect the sentences ya...

[... how to connect This student very softly mumbled this, almost unheard)

(D103 23.48-25.20)

This student looked as if he said something but it was very soft and almost unheard. He did this while looking at his friend who seemed to tell him what to say in responding to the lecturer's question.

C. Teaching Notes

The following is the notes on students' interaction in class C and the reflection made by the lecturer in charge. It happened in one of observed teaching sessions when the lecturer assigned the students to have small group discussion on "Living Together" before they were to write their group's agreed opinion about the topic. A student seemed to agree with the idea of the whole class that "Living Together" is a sin and an act against culture. Each group was busy organizing their text.

Just before the group work activity was resumed, the student raised his hand asking for the lecturer's permission if he could express his idea that "Living Together" was actually not a sin, nor an act against culture. The lecturer allowed him but thought what came across his mind. He said that for a man to stay in one of the rented single rooms in a house and for a woman to stay in the other rented room in the same house can be called "Living Together" and this is not a sin, neither an act against culture. The class was quiet. The lecturer guessed the students were waiting for the lecturer's response. The lecturer took the opportunity complementing the student for having his own definition of "Living Together" (although the lecturer understood that his definition is quite contrary to the universal definition of "Living Together"). The class was noisy, as the other students in class did not seem to be impressed with his idea.

There are four lessons learnt from the teacher's notes. First, as a member of the group, he seemed to feel that he should agree with the class idea. Perhaps, culturally he did not feel appropriate to go against the group opinion. Second, perhaps, as a result of his passion to argue against the class idea, he felt that it was appropriate to express his own idea after the group session was resumed. However, as a cultural being, he felt that he needed to ask the lecturer's permission to express his idea. Third, only after the lecturer gave a permission that he felt he was entitled to express his idea. Had the lecturer not given the permission, he might keep his idea to his own self. Fourth, the lecturer found later in her interview with the student that he is a Makassarese.

From this teacher's notes, it can be assumed that the SCL method can be said to have an effect to this particular student as he was able to express himself in class by arguing against the class opinion. However, his culture belief may have constrained him to do so during the class discussion, as he was obliged to wait until the class discussion session was concluded before he took the opportunity to ask his teacher's permission to allow him to express his own idea.

D. Discussion

There are two important points that can be drawn from the findings. First, there are a few cases of interaction which cannot be clearly fitted into either between lecturer and students or between individual students and their classmates. For instance, datum 13 and datum 14, which show that a few number of students almost never participate, interact in classroom, ask questions or respond to the lecturer's question or statement can be clearly reflected from their limited interaction only to the group where he belonged to. Marcellino (2008) also noted this tendency for students to wait for teachers' questions or calling their names otherwise they are just busy talking with their friends. Such tendency though depends on the way the teacher encourages their students to actively participate in class.

The finding from this study strengthens Lestari & Widjajakusumah (2009) on the SCL implementation in the Medical Faculty at Moslem University of Sultan Agung which indicated that students from Javanese, compared with those from outside Java, tend to follow SCL principles. Following Guild (1994) and Gutierrez (2003), as cited in Lestari & Widjajakusumah (2009), they argued that this was possibly attributed by their cultural tradition which influenced their study skills. This then fits what is claimed by Marcellino (2008) that values of student's cultural tradition plays a crucial role in shaping the teaching and learning process in classroom but does not seem to promote the success of student-centred learning.

Such an inhibition to SCL process was also noted by the lecturer in charge of class C who pointed out that although students had the initiative to be against with his classmates he should ask permission from the lecturer to say out his different opinion on the topic being discussed in the class. If taking initiative is covered in the concept of *barani* in Makassarese and Buginese culture, which is in line with student-centred learning, this taking one's standpoint should be carried out in such a way that shows honor to

teachers or parents being older people and it does not hurt others. The importance of paying respect to the parents is reflected in *Sangkarupa Kelong Mangkasara* which is a collection of poetic rhymes telling among others how older people especially parents and teachers should be highly respected.

Second, while waiting for students with very limited participation in class to show his interaction in classroom, his friends helped him by providing the specific answer that he should say to the lecturer. We can see that the cultural value ‘gotong royong’ was implemented here. *Gotong royong* which is commonly stated as *mutual assistance*) can be seen when a number of people work and help each other to finish a certain task. Thus, members in the group would help the other members so then their group would finish the task and possibly a reward follows.

Although it was claimed to be “depicted” in most traditional villages in Java (Mardiasmo & Barnes, 2013, p.1), this mutual assistance is commonly practiced throughout Indonesia such as in moving or building a house (*sakai sambayan* in Lampung, *masohi* in Maluku or *merawale* in Minahasa) or in day-to-day activities among disaster victims. This mutual assistance clearly indicates that the various forms of participation and interaction among members of the society have been rooted in the traditional cultures in Indonesia.

Nowadays, though, this value of mutual assistance has been degraded. As reported in *Kompas* (26 November 2014, p.11), this changing value has slowly began since the New Order era where mutual assistance has been modernized by such appreciation and assessment and lacked the sense of togetherness. In the context of learning and teaching process in classroom, this tradition of helping one another while working in groups was carried away to other activities; not only when the question is directly addressed to the group but also to individual students in the group or when offering answers to friends in the exam.

Thus, while we acknowledge that *gotong royong* supports the student-centred learning when students work together to finish the assigned task, such a practice in the exam does not acknowledge one’s competence and discourages the student-centred learning. These features of local wisdoms and their relation to the SCL practice in classroom are summed up in the following table 2.

Table 2:
Buginese/Makassarese local wisdoms in SCL-based writing class

LOCAL WISDOMS	STUDENT CENTRED LEARNING	
	SUPPORTING	INHIBITING
<i>Barani</i> versus RESPECT	Ability to express one's opinion (despite being different with classmates)	Inability to interrupt class discussion led by lecturer, possibly to respect to the elderly. Students need to ask for lecturer's permission to comment on the given topic.
Mutual help (<i>gotong royong</i>) versus less respect to other people's ability	Participation in class activities Working together in group to finish the assigned task	Helping friends answer the lecturer's questions. Misuse of friends's helps during exams by providing answer/clues

Third, the findings from interview and class observation on students' interaction in the four MBI2 classes showed that it is difficult to claim that respect for parents (see teachers' notes) and mutual assistance (*gotong royong*) is the local wisdom specific to Makassar/ Buginese. The main reason for this is the fact that the context of this research, which is Hasanuddin University, is the meeting point for students from various ethnicities (see appendix 1 and appendix 2) to pursue their undergraduate studies. Thus, those so-called Buginese and Makassarese students mix up with students from other traditions in Indonesia. The fact that MBI2 was offered in fourth semester means that for over one and half year students have experienced such a 'mixed' culture and this quite possibly leads to their fading tradition. Thus, from the findings of this study, it is difficult to claim whether what happened in the four MBI2 classes is influenced by either Buginese or Makassarese cultures.

CONCLUSION

This study concludes that what is thought as Buginese or Makassarese local wisdoms can both support and inhibit the student centred learning process in MBI2. Such local wisdoms include *barani* versus respect to older

people and mutual help. As depicted from this study, *siri* here which was indicated from data, can boost the competition which means if other people can do it, why I cannot do it, while *barani* can means the bravery to express one's opinion. Thus, while these local wisdoms do occur in classrooms, we have to consider their effects to students learning process. Because of this, the subject outline or learning contract should be very detailed in stating what students must perform in class, so that students can understand the importance of being active in taking part in SCL classes. This further requires teachers' continuous updates and trainings which allows them self-evaluate their classroom activities whether they have followed the SCL principles.

It is necessary to replicate this study with different subjects both content and skill subjects to see whether the claim made in this study can generally represent all other subjects offered to students. It is interesting to see to what extent the teacher-centred learning which has long been practiced influences teachers and students' interaction in classroom and, as a result, whether the university policy to implement the SCL principles across all faculties should be improved. Students' utterances and behaviours in SCL-based classrooms and their relation with students' essays are also worth investigating to see whether the SCL implementation has effectively contributed to students' success in learning.

REFERENCES

- Bax, S. (2003). The End of CLT: a Context Approach to Language Teaching. *ELT Journal*, 57 (3), 278-287.
- Brown, H.D. (2007). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*, 5th ed. New York: Pearson Education.
- Donnelly, R & Fitzmaurice, M. (2005). Collaborative project-based learning and problem-based learning in higher education: a consideration of tutor and student roles. In G. O'Neill, S. Moore, B. McMullin. (Eds). *Emerging Issues in the Practice of University Learning and Teaching* (pp. 87-98). Dublin: All Ireland Society for Higher Education (AISHE). Retrieved from <http://www.aishe.org/readings/2005-1/>
- Ellis, R. & Barkhuizen, G. (2005). *Analysing Language Learner*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Faridi, A. (2014). The difficulties of English teachers in instilling character building through narrative stories at elementary schools in Central Java Indonesia. *International Journal of Contemporary Applied Science*.1 (2), 68-82. Retrieved from (<http://ijcas.net/Files/CMSUserOwnFolder/issue/Oct-2014/05.pdf>).
- Irmawati, N.D. (2012). Communicative approach: an alternative method used in improving students' academic reading achievement. *English Language Teaching*, 5 (7), 90-101. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/1027548884/fulltextPDF/1424A2FE64C218CCC7B4/19?accountid=39870>
- Jang, E.; Jimenez, R.T. (2011). A sociocultural perspective on Second Language Learner Strategies: Focus on the Impact of Social Context [Abstract]. *Theory Into Practice*, 50 (2), 141-148. Retrieved from <http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ922732w>.
- Kartawinata, A.M. (2011). Pengantar editor: Meretas kearifan lokal di tengah modernisasi dan tantangan pelestarian. In A. Makmur (Ed.). *Kearifan Lokal Ditengah Modernisasi* (pp. v-xviii). Jakarta: Pusat Penelitian dan Pengembangan Kebudayaan Badan Pengembangan Sumber Daya Kebudayaan dan Pariwisata Kementerian Kebudayaan dan Pariwisata Republik Indonesia.
- Lestari, E. & Widjakusumah, D. (2009). Students' self-directed learning readiness, perception toward student-centered learning and predisposition towards student-centered behaviour. *South East Asian Journal of Medical Education* 3 (1), 52-56. http://seajme.md.chula.ac.th/articleVol3No1/OR8_Endang%20Lestari.pdf.
- Marcellino, M. (2008). English language teaching in Indonesia: a continuous challenge in education and cultural diversity. *TEFLIN Journal*, 19 (1), pp. 57-69 < <http://journal.teflin.org/index.php/teflin/article/viewFile/15/16>>, retrieved 24 April 2013.
- Mardiasmo, D. & Barnes, P.H. (2013). Community response to disasters in Indonesia: Gotong Royong; a double edged-sword. In P. H. Barnes & A. Goonetilleke (Eds.) *Proceedings of the 9th annual international conference of the international institute for infrastructure renewal and reconstruction* (pp. 301-307). Brisbane:Queensland University of Technology. Retrieved from <http://eprints.qut.edu.au/61482/>
- Marzuki, H.M.L. (1995). *Siri: Bagian Keasadaran Hukum Rakyat Bugis-Makassar (sebuah telaah filsafat hukum)*. Makassar: Hasanuddin University Press.
- Mattulada. (1971). Kebudayaan Bugis Makassar. In Koentjaraningrat (Ed). *Manusia dan kebudayaan Indonesia* (pp 264-283). Jakarta: Djambatan.

- Mattulada. (1985). *La Toa: Satu lukisan analitis terhadap antropologi politik orang Bugis*. Yogyakarta: Gadjah Mada University Press.
- McKay, S.L. (2006). *Researching second language classrooms*. New York: Routledge.
- Nguyen, C.T. (2011). Challenges of learning English in Australia towards students coming from selected Southeast Asian countries: Vietnam, Thailand and Indonesia. *International Education Studies*, 4(1), pp. 13-20. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/859113632/fulltextPDF/1424A453C0B5555BE5/1?accountid=39870>. Retrieved 12 December 2013.
- Pelras, C. (1996). *The Bugis*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Rahim, H.A.R. (1985). *Nilai-nilai utama kebudayaan Bugis*. Makassar: Hasanuddin University Press.
- Samsuni. (2010). Siri'na Pessé: Pride in the mind of Buginese. *Melayu Online*. Retrieved from <http://melayuonline.com/eng/culture/dig/2613/siri-na-pess-pride-in-the-mind-of-buginesesouth-sulawesi>. Downloaded on March 3, 2015.
- Savin-Baden, M. & Major, C.H. (2004). *Foundations of problem-based learning*. Berkshire: Open University Press.
- Sawir, E. (2005). Language difficulties of international students in Australia: The effects of prior learning experience. *International Education Journal*, 6 (5), pp. 567-580. Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ855010.pdf>. Retrieved January 1, 2015.
- Schriffin, D. (1994). *Approaches to discourse*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- SCL perlu berbenah. (2013, December). *Identitas* 39 (803), p. 9.
- Seliger, H.W. & Shohamy, E. (1989). *Second language research methods*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Susanti, I.L.M.H. (2013). Developing digital storytelling based local wisdom through blended learning as an innovative media for teaching English at eighth grade students of SMP Negeri 1 Petangin the academic year 2012/2013. *Asia-Pacific Collaborative Education Journal* 9 (2), pp. 95-102. Retrieved from http://apcj.alcob.org/index.php?document_srl=356&mid=Issue. Retrieved January 27, 2005.
- Thanh, P.T.H. (2010). Implementing a student-centered learning approach at Vietnamese higher education institutions: Barriers under layers of Casual Layered Analysis (CLA). *Journal of Futures Studies*, 15(1), pp. 21 -38. Retrieved

from <http://www.jfs.tku.edu.tw/15-1/A02.pdf>. Retrieved December 10, 2013.

Widayati, D., Luknanto, D., Rahayuningsih, E., Sutapa, G., Harsono, Sancayaningsih, R.P., Yohanes, H.C. (2010). *Guidelines Research Based Learning*. Yogyakarta: Universitas Gadjah Mada. Retrieved from <http://ppp.ugm.ac.id/wp-content/uploads/pupbringgris.pdf>. Retrieved December 12, 2013.

Acknowledgement

This study was supported by Hasanuddin University 2014 Research Grant (No. 1454/UN4.20/ PL.09/2014)

APPENDIX 1:

The number of 2013/2014 students across four non-exact faculties at Hasanuddin Universities

Provinces	TL	AD	SMA
Sulsel	1232	1307	1273
Sulbar	43	51	54
Sulteng	33	26	25
Sultra	36	29	28
Sulut	9	4	5
Gorontalo	3	6	7
Jabar	16	21	23
Jateng	6	4	5
Jatim	20	15	19
DKI Jakarta	35	14	25
DKI Jogja	1	0	1
Banten	1	2	4
Kalbar	1	1	0
Kaltim	32	31	38
Kalsel	5	4	2
Kalteng	0	0	0
Aceh	0	0	0
Sumut	6	5	4
Sumbar	1	1	2
Riau	3	5	5
Jambi	0	0	0
Bengkulu	1	0	0

Lampung		1	1
Sumsel	2	1	2
Bangka Belitung	2	1	1
NTT	9	10	6
NTB	9	5	10
Maluku	16	14	14
Maluku Utara	5	3	4
Papua	20	10	14
Papua Barat	5	4	4
Bali	1	1	1
Luar negeri	7	0	0
Timor Leste	1	0	0
Malaysia	15	0	0
Kinibalu	1	0	0
Kaero	0	1	0
Total	1577	1577	1577

TL = Place of Birth, AD = hometown address, SMA = senior high school location

APPENDIX 2:

The number of 2013/2014 students across four non-exact faculties at Hasanuddin Universities

Areas	TL	AD	SMA
Bugis ¹	519	531	489
Makassar ²	88	103	109
Transitional areas ³	587	624	620
Toraja	37	47	54
Toraja Utara	-	1	-
Others (Sulsel)	1	1	1

TL = Place of Birth, AD = hometown address, SMA = senior high school location

Bugis¹ refers to regencies in South Sulawesi in which the majority of their population speak Buginese.

Makassar² refers to regencies in South Sulawesi in which the majority of their population speak Makassarese.

Transitional areas³ refers to regencies in South Sulawesi in which Buginese and Makassarese are spoken by the people.