

Teacher's and Students' Attitudes Toward the Indonesian Language in Learning Interaction at Senior High School



Ammar Faqih Utomo^{1*}, Dini Restiyanti Pratiwi²

¹Muhammadiyah University of Surakarta, Surakarta, Indonesia

²Muhammadiyah University of Surakarta, Surakarta, Indonesia

ARTICLE INFO

Received: 04/05/2026
Reviewed: 11/05/2026
Accepted: 12/06/2026
Published: 28/06/2026

Keywords:

*Language attitude,
Language loyalty,
Language pride,
Awareness of the
norm*

ABSTRACT

The teaching of Indonesian language plays an important role in shaping positive attitudes toward the Indonesian language. This study aims to analyse the language loyalty, language pride, and awareness of the norm attitudes of teachers and students in classroom learning interaction using a descriptive qualitative approach. Data were collected through non-participatory observation, audio recording, and note-taking, and subsequently analysed using the Miles, Huberman, & Saldana model with theory and source triangulation as validity measures. The findings of this study indicate that the teacher and students of Class XI-5 at SMA Muhammadiyah 1 Surakarta have (1) demonstrated language loyalty attitudes reflected in the consistent use of Indonesian as the primary medium of learning, the minimal use of elements from other languages in formal academic contexts, and the absence of language switching in the delivery of substantive subject matter, (2) demonstrated positive language pride attitudes toward Indonesian reflected in the confident use of Indonesian as a symbol of academic identity across all domains of formal learning, without any tendency to switch to other languages considered more prestigious, as well as the ability to distinguish between the use of Indonesian as a marker of national identity and Javanese as a marker of local identity in a coexisting manner, and (3) demonstrated language norm awareness attitudes reflected in the appropriate use of academic vocabulary in accordance with the formal register in the delivery of learning materials, although the application of standard language norms at the level of sentence structure and grammatical consistency has not yet been fully optimal, particularly in spontaneous oral speech on the part of both the teacher and students.

© 2026 The Authors

INTRODUCTION

The classroom is one of the most strategic domains in the formation of language attitudes, as it is here that teachers and students interact directly using Indonesian as the primary medium of learning. The interactions that take place in the classroom do not merely function as a means of knowledge transmission, but also as a space in which attitudes toward language are actively shaped, reinforced, or even weakened through patterns of language use that occur on a daily basis. Language attitude is defined as the beliefs or views that a person holds about a language, which in turn shape their reactions and actions toward that language (Kirilenko, 2024). These attitudes can be either positive or negative: positive attitudes will motivate a person to learn and use language effectively, while negative attitudes can hinder the process of language learning and use. In the context of national education, Indonesian has been established as the primary language of instruction, as affirmed in the

*Corresponding author(s):

Email: a310220023@student.ums.ac.id (Ammar Faqih Utomo)
<https://doi.org/10.26740/nld.v7n1.p44-58>

Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta, Surakarta, Indonesia

Regulation of the Minister of Primary and Secondary Education of the Republic of Indonesia Number 2 of 2025, Article 4, Paragraph 3, Point d. Thus, the classroom is not merely a place for learning language, but also a space in which national linguistic identity is reproduced and maintained through every interaction that takes place.

Garvin and Mathiot (1968) identify three characteristics of language attitude that are relevant in this context, namely language loyalty, language pride, and awareness of language norms. Language loyalty encourages a language community to preserve its language and, if necessary, to resist the influence of other languages. Language loyalty includes maintaining the language in everyday life, minimising the use of foreign terms, and resisting pressure to switch to another language. Language pride encourages people to develop their language and use it as a symbol of identity and community unity. Language pride includes a sense of pride in using the language in public and using the language appropriately in accordance with the situation as an expression of identity. Meanwhile, awareness of language norms encourages speakers to use their language carefully and politely, as well as adherence to linguistic rules in speech. These three components constitute an analytically relevant framework for examining how teachers and students adopt attitudes toward Indonesian in the context of classroom learning interaction.

The urgency of studying language attitudes in the school context is increasingly growing amid the challenges currently faced by the Indonesian language. The process of globalisation has created significant external influences, including within the domain of language (Mckenzie & Jensen, 2024). English, which grew into a global language as a result of British colonialism and post-World War II geopolitical dominance, brings various benefits such as the creation of employment opportunities, access to education abroad, and openness to global knowledge (Zeng & Yang, 2024). On the other hand, the dominance of foreign languages also carries risks, among them: communities becoming more familiar with foreign cultures than their own, the emergence of a sense of shame in speaking one's own language, and the increasing likelihood of regional languages and even the national language experiencing a decline in use. Cases such as those of Belarusian, Navajo, Euskara, Irish, and Hawaiian prove that no language is entirely immune to the pressures of extinction (Benally & Viri, 2005; Brenzinger & Heinrich, 2013; Komorovskaya, 2016; Ceallaigh, 2021; de la Rosa, 2022). Although the extinction of Indonesian is not under immediate threat, the decline in the quality of its use as evidenced by the prevalence of spelling errors, grammatical mistakes, and poor word choice across various domains of everyday communication constitutes a matter that needs to be addressed seriously.

Various efforts have been made to maintain the continuity and quality of Indonesian language use. At the national level, a spirit of language awareness has long been embedded through the Youth Pledge, the third clause of which reads: "We, the sons and daughters of Indonesia, uphold the language of unity, namely the Indonesian language." Indonesian was chosen as the language of unity because it is considered more easily understood and used by all Indonesian citizens, thereby facilitating communication across ethnic groups and regions without eliminating their respective mother tongues (Sihombing et al., 2024). At the policy level, the government through the Regulation of the Minister of Primary and Secondary Education of the Republic of Indonesia Number 2 of 2025 actively monitors the use of Indonesian with the aims of, among others, cultivating positive attitudes so that the community feels proud, loyal, and aware of the rules of the Indonesian language, as well as improving the quality of language use by minimising linguistic errors (Chapter II, Article 2, Points a–g). At the educational level, Indonesian language teachers also play an active role through the slogan "Prioritise Indonesian, preserve regional languages, master foreign languages", a message that explicitly affirms the hierarchy of language priorities in the context of national life. These efforts demonstrate that the maintenance of the Indonesian language is a shared responsibility involving individuals, communities, educational institutions, and the state simultaneously.

The teaching of Indonesian in schools plays a key role in cultivating positive attitudes toward the national language, as its objectives are not limited solely to the mastery of linguistic rules, but also encompass the formation of a sense of pride and loyalty toward the language that defines national

identity. This includes the development of sensitivity toward the appropriate and polite use of language based on the context of the communicative situation, with the expectation that students will be encouraged to prioritise the correct and proper use of Indonesian amid the advancement of the digital media era. Nevertheless, the reality of good, correct, and polite Indonesian language use continues to face various challenges, as evidenced by the prevalence of language errors found in family environments, schools, markets, workplaces, and even on social media platforms such as Instagram, Facebook, X, WhatsApp, and YouTube. One preventive measure that can be taken is to pay close attention to the dynamics occurring within the classroom, particularly the interactions between teachers and students during the learning process. Therefore, this study aims to analyse the language loyalty attitudes of teachers and students toward Indonesian, the language pride attitudes of teachers and students toward Indonesian, and the awareness of language norm attitudes of teachers and students toward Indonesian within the context of classroom learning interaction. The findings of this study are expected to serve as evaluative material for more effective Indonesian language teaching strategies oriented toward the comprehensive formation of positive language attitudes, as well as to provide an initial foundation for future researchers to examine language attitudes more deeply within the context of learning interaction in both formal and non-formal educational settings.

METHODS

Design

This study employs a descriptive qualitative method, grounded in the characteristic of this research that emphasises the interpretation of meaning from a phenomenon in its natural context (Wekke, 2019:35). The approach used in this study is sociolinguistic, as it describes how teachers and students demonstrate their attitudes toward Indonesian within the context of classroom learning interaction.

Participants and Context

The participants in this study were teacher and students. The researcher selected a teacher who teaches Indonesia language at Muhammadiyah 1 Senior High School of Surakarta. The researcher also selected students from Class XI-5. This class was selected using purposive sampling, considering the recommendation from the school and teacher. The class consisted of 18 students, comprising 9 male and 9 female students. The teacher has been teaching Indonesian language for 10 years.

Data Collection

The three types of data gathering used in this study were non-participant observation, audio recording, and note-taking. Non-participant observation is defined as an observation wherein the researcher does not join the interaction being observed. Audio recording involved the process of the researcher recording the interactions among students and the teachers through a voice recording application. Note-taking referred to the transcription of the recordings by the researcher. In this qualitative study, the researcher served as the main instrument, given the direct involvement in observing, recording, and transcribing the interactions in the classroom. In addition to the researcher's role, several supporting instruments were used to facilitate the data collection process. A voice recording device was used to capture the natural interactions between the teacher and students during the teaching and learning process. Field notes were also employed to record contextual information that could not be captured through audio recording alone, such as nonverbal cues and classroom situations. These supporting instruments worked complementarily with the researcher's direct observation to ensure that the data obtained were comprehensive and accurately reflected the language attitudes expressed during classroom interactions.

Data Analysis

The data analysis techniques used in this study are based on the model developed by Miles, Huberman and Saldana. These techniques were used to analyse the types of data relating to the first and second research questions. There were three stages of activity: data condensation, data display and conclusions drawing. For the first research question, data condensation was used by the researcher to select, focus, simplify, separate, and transform the ‘raw’ data contained in written notes and transcriptions. The researcher sorted out which information supported the research data; for example, data depicting positive and negative attitudes, including pride, loyalty, and awareness of Indonesian language norms. Subsequently, the researcher displayed this data in the form of dialogue. Following the display of the data, the researcher drew conclusions regarding the overall attitudes of teachers and students towards the Indonesian language whether these tended to be positive or negative based on the interactions that had taken place.

Ethical Consideration

Before data collection began, the researcher obtained informed consent from the teachers and students participating in this study, explaining the study’s objectives, procedures, and their right to withdraw at any time without any consequences. The identities of the participants were kept confidential, and pseudonyms or codes were used in the presentation of data to protect their privacy. All recordings and transcripts were stored securely and used solely for the purposes of this study. Furthermore, this study was conducted with respect for the participants’ autonomy and dignity, ensuring that their involvement did not disrupt the natural teaching and learning process in the classroom.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This study views learning interactions as a cornerstone in shaping students’ attitudes towards the Indonesian language. Whether students can speak Indonesian well and correctly depends on their teacher, who is a figure they trust and emulate. In learning interactions which are formal situations, particularly in Indonesian language lessons, teachers and students inevitably must use formal Indonesian, observing its rules and, of course, etiquette. This does not mean that other subjects (apart from regional and foreign languages) may disregard all the above rules; rather, they must continue to use proper and correct Indonesian. It has been emphasised that Indonesian is the primary language of instruction at all levels of education, a tool for scientific communication, and a unifying force for the diversity of students.

However, from the results of the research conducted, the researchers found differences in attitudes towards the Indonesian language in the process of learning the Indonesian language between the teacher and the students of Class XI-5 of SMA Muhammadiyah 1 Surakarta. Variation here means that not 100% of teachers and students have a positive attitude towards the Indonesian language; rather, there are negative attitudes as well. This can be seen from the forms of language attitude, such as the use of quite formal and informal varieties of Indonesian, a mixture of Indonesian and Javanese, as well as errors in Indonesian language usage in speech. It should also be emphasised that their attitudes are influenced by the situation, the conversation partner, and the purpose of the conversation. More specifically, the researchers present the results of their interactions in the following table.

Table 1. *Conversation between Teacher and Students (Conversation 1)*

Context: The teacher announced the schedule for Monday and Tuesday		
Speaker	Conversation Content in Indonesian Text	English Translation
T	<i>Informasi terkini, besok anak kelas 12 juga jual bersama eee kemudian besok kebetulan eee sepertinya besok... sepertinya lho yaa itu eee diisi kayak P5. Pertanyaannya pulang jam</i>	Latest update: Tomorrow, the 12th graders will also be selling things together, um... and tomorrow, as it happens, um... it looks like tomorrow... well, it looks like, you know, that, um, will be filled in like P5. The question is,

Context: The teacher announced the schedule for Monday and Tuesday		
Speaker	Conversation Content in Indonesian Text	English Translation
	<i>berapa Pak? Nah nek logikanya biasanya tuh hari Jum'at.</i>	what time do we get out, sir? Well, logically speaking, it's usually on Fridays.
SS	<i>Jam sewelas!</i>	It's eleven o'clock!
T	<i>Bismillah seperti itu, itu karena hari Jum'at ada jumatan nggih. Dilanjutkan senin dan selasa tanggal 20 dan 21 kartini fest. Jadi temanya 10 atau 11 itu kartini fest nanti ada main beberapa drama perang.</i>	In the name of God, that's because there's Friday prayers on Friday, right? Then on Monday and Tuesday, the 20th and 21st, there's the Kartini Festival. So, on the 10th or 11th, during the Kartini Festival, there will be several war-themed plays performed.
S.1	<i>Rabune ngopo Pak?</i>	What's on the schedule for Wednesday, sir?
T	<i>Rabunya yo...</i>	The Wednesday...
SS	<i>Rapotan!</i>	Report card distribution!
T	<i>Lha nanti eee di Mei mungkin Mei tengah, Mas. 15 sampe 23 itu udah UAS. UASnya 10 11 karena Juni sudah terima raport. Wisudanya tanggal 6.</i>	Well, it'll be in May—maybe mid-May, bro. The 15th through the 23rd are the final exams. The exams are on the 10th and 11th because we'll already have received our report cards by June. Graduation is on the 6th.

Table 2. Conversation about the rainy season and exam outline (Conversation 2)

Context: The teacher discussed the rainy season and the exam outline		
Speaker	Conversation Content in Indonesian Text	English Translation
T	<i>Eh, Mas Mbak ini eee memang musimnya musim hujan nggih di sini. Saya enggak tahu ya, saya hari sehari enggak hujan, tapi begitu sehari enggak hujan, besoknya...</i>	Oh, guys, it's definitely the rainy season here. I don't know—it doesn't rain every day, but as soon as there's a day without rain, the next day...
S.2	<i>Udan deres Pak!</i>	It's raining heavily, Sir!
T	<i>Ya. Sambil menunggu LKS ya, pertama kisi-kisi saya sampaikan itu tidak jauh dari apa yang kita pelajari insyaallah. Kedua, untuk kisi-kisi itu eee penulisannya karena 50 soal, hati-hati dengan soal bacaan. Kenapa saya bilang hati-hati? Banyak soal mengecoh yang memang ada di situ. Kata kuncinya ada 3 untuk kata pengecoh itu tidak, selain hal itu, dan kecuali. Yang ketiga, ini setiap materi yang ada di LKS atau di papan tulis yang sering Bapak tulis ya jangan luput ya dibaca ya...</i>	Yes. While we wait for the Student Worksheets, first of all, I'd like to mention that this test guide isn't much different from what we've already learned, insha'Allah. Second, regarding the test instructions—since there are 50 questions—please be careful with the reading comprehension questions. Why do I suggest being careful? There are many trick questions there. There are three key words to watch out for in these trick questions: "not," "in addition," and "except." Third, make sure you don't miss reading any of the material in the Participant Worksheet or on the whiteboard that I often write on...

Table 3. Conversation about correcting the answers (Conversation 3)

Context: Teacher and students correct the answers together		
Speaker	Conversation Content in Indonesian Text	English Translation
T	<i>Ya, langung D. Saya bacakan nggih. Ya halaman 60 eh 71 ya. D halaman 71.</i>	Yes, go ahead, D. I'll read it out loud. Yes, page 60—oh, wait, 71. On page 71.
SS	<i>Pak, pelan-pelan Pak.</i>	Sir, take it easy, sir.
T	<i>Karena kisah eee halaman...</i>	Because the story is eee pages long...
SS	<i>No 5! No 5 Pak!</i>	No. 5! No. 5, sir!
T	<i>Eh 36</i>	Oh, 36
SS	<i>Halaman 71! Nomor 5 Pak!</i>	Page 71! Number 5, sir!
T	<i>Mengapa kesimpulan menjadi bagian penting dalam teks karya ilmiah? Jawabannya adalah karena merangkum temuan penelitian dan menjawab pertanyaan penelitian.</i>	Why is the conclusion an important part of a scientific paper? The answer is that it summarizes the research findings and answers the research questions.
T	<i>Kalau benar, lima.</i>	If that's true, five.
S.3	<i>Pak, kalau merupakan intisari dari seluruh jawaban atas rumusan masalah?</i>	Sir, what is the summary of all the answers to the problem statement?
T	<i>Oh betul. Boleh Mas, lima nggih. Jadi kalau isi itu tidak saket ya.</i>	Oh, right. Sure, five, okay.

Context: Teacher and students correct the answers together

Speaker	Conversation Content in Indonesian Text	English Translation
T	<i>Nomor enam. Apakah yang dimaksud karya tulis ilmiah? Ya karya tulis ilmiah adalah sebuah karya yang ditulis berdasarkan pemikiran atau eee berdasarkan observasi. Jadi sebuah karya, karyanya kan, sebuah karya ditulis berdasarkan fakta di lapangan dan sesuai dengan kaidah keilmuan. Wis ngunu wae karya ilmiah.</i>	Number six. What is a scientific paper? Well, a scientific paper is a piece of writing based on ideas or—um—on observations. So, a scientific paper is a piece of writing based on facts gathered in the field and in accordance with scientific principles. That’s basically what a scientific paper is.
T	<i>Kata kuncinya ya berdasarkan fakta di lapangan.</i>	The key is to base it on the facts on the ground
T	<i>Nomor 7. Jelaskan maksud karya yg bersifat objektif! Objektif itu eee menuliskan sebuah karya itu apa adanya. Objektif independen. Jadi gini, pernyataan-pernyataannya berdasarkan pandangan umum, tidak berdasarkan pandangan pribadi penulis.</i>	Number 7. Explain what is meant by an objective work! Being objective means, um, writing a work that presents things as they are. Objectivity is independent. So, the statements are based on general perspectives, not on the author’s personal views.
S.4	<i>Kalau berdasarkan fakta zaman itu?</i>	What about based on the facts of that time?
T	<i>Faktanya sesuai kaidah keilmuan ora? Nek fakta nggak ada petunjuk kaidah keilmuan yo harus punya pedoman. Kalau enggak punya pedoman apa? Yo nanti yang mau ditutup eh yg mau dipelajari apa?</i>	Are the facts in line with scientific principles? If the facts don’t follow scientific principles, then we need guidelines. If we don’t have guidelines, what then? What are we supposed to study—or rather, what are we supposed to leave out?
T	<i>Sekarang nomor berapa? Delapan ya?</i>	What number is it now? Eight, right?
T	<i>Delapan pak!</i>	Eight, sir!
T	<i>Terangkan sifat masalah dalam karya ilmiah. Jadi, masalah dalam karya ilmiah ini bersifat objektif dan Formal. Objektif artinya apa? apa yang dianalisis itu berdasarkan atas keputusan pribadi, bukan pengaruh orang lain. Jadi gini, ada landasan teori, ada teori, ada landasan teori ada teori dipakai untuk penelitian.</i>	Explain the nature of the problem in this research paper. So, the problem in this research paper is objective and formal in nature. What does “objective” mean? It means that the analysis is based on personal judgment, not on the influence of others. So, there is a theoretical framework, there are theories, and the theoretical framework and theories are used for the research.
T	<i>Nomor berapa sekarang? Sembilan yuk! Termasuk bagian apakah paragraf penggalan karya ilmiah tersebut? Di sini nomor 9 penggalan paragraf tersebut termasuk, pendahuluan?</i>	What number is it now? Let’s go with nine! Which part of the scientific paper does this paragraph excerpt belong to? Here, does paragraph excerpt number 9 belong to the introduction?
T	<i>Ini ya nomor 9 kalau misalnya bagian apa di sini eee lebih ke bagian... nah sistematika. Termasuk dalam bagian sistematika karya ilmiah ya... Jawabannya adalah sistematika kaya ilmiah.</i>	So this is number 9—if, for example, this section is more about... well, the structure. It falls under the section on the structure of scientific papers... The answer is the structure of a scientific paper.
T	<i>Apa toh sistematika itu? sistematika itu urutan dari bagian pembuka, isi, dan penutup nggih Mas Mbak.</i>	What exactly is structure? Structure is the sequence of the introduction, body, and conclusion, right, guys?
S.5	<i>Pendahuluan salah pak, pendahuluan?</i>	“Introduction”—that’s wrong, sir. “Introduction”?
T	<i>Opo? Salah. Anu masuk dalam sistematika karya ilmiah.</i>	What? That’s wrong. That’s part of the structure of a scientific paper.
T	<i>Baik eee untuk nilainya karena ini modelnya lama ya, silakan eee nilainya ditotal ya.</i>	Okay, as for the score since this is an older model, please go ahead and add up the scores.

Language Loyalty

Based on the first conversational data between the teacher and students, it was found that Indonesian was consistently used by the teacher as the primary medium for conveying academic and institutional information. The teacher delivered information regarding the school activity schedule, including the implementation of P5, Kartini Fest, the final examination schedule, and the report card

distribution, entirely in Indonesian. This consistent use of Indonesian in the delivery of formal information constitutes a concrete manifestation of language loyalty as defined by Garvin and Mathiot (1968), namely that language loyalty encourages speakers to maintain their language in everyday life. The choice of Indonesian in the context of delivering institutional information reflects a collective conviction that Indonesian is the legitimate and appropriate language for use in the institutional domain of education. Garvin and Mathiot further state that language loyalty constitutes a form of linguistic independence on the part of a speaker, and this independence is reflected in the teacher's steadfastness in not replacing Indonesian with another language despite the social context of the environment being heavily influenced by Javanese. Thus, the first conversational data demonstrates that the teacher's language loyalty manifests functionally through the stable and purposeful use of Indonesian within the domain of formal communication in the classroom.

The second conversation reveals that language loyalty also manifests in the context of delivering academic subject matter that is both technical and informative in nature. The teacher systematically used Indonesian to explain examination outlines, procedures for answering questions, and to emphasize important keywords such as "*tidak*" (not), "*selain hal itu*" (apart from that), and "*kecuali*" (except) as distractors in examination questions. This continuous use of Indonesian in the delivery of scientific content demonstrates that the teacher views Indonesian as a language possessing the full capacity to convey technical and academic information. Holmes (2001) affirms that a positive attitude toward a language is reflected in the speaker's support for using that language across various domains, as well as in the speaker's ability to refrain from switching to another language even when socio-cultural pressures might otherwise permit it. In this data, despite the highly dominant Javanese cultural background of the speech environment, the teacher consistently chose Indonesian as the sole medium for delivering important and technical academic information. The fact that students also responded in Indonesian during critical moments, such as when answering the teacher's questions or raising academic inquiries, further demonstrates the existence of a reciprocal form of language loyalty within the classroom interaction. This reinforces the finding that language loyalty in this data is not merely individual in nature, but also collective, operating as an interactional norm mutually accepted within the learning context.

The emergence of Javanese elements across the three conversations, such as "*nek*", "*nggih*", "*lha*", "*yo*", and "*wis ngunu wae*", must be understood within the framework of language loyalty that is non-exclusive in character. Sholihah (2024) argues that language loyalty can be identified by the minimal use of elements from another language without clear justification within a speaker's utterance, and in this data the use of Javanese does not occur in the context of delivering core academic content, but rather emerges only in interactional slots that are affective and interpersonal in nature. Garvin and Mathiot (1968) do not define language loyalty as an absolute rejection of the presence of other languages, but rather as an effort to maintain one's own language as the primary language while preventing the influence of other languages from displacing its important functions. In the context of this data, Javanese serves as a complement to social closeness, not as a replacement for Indonesian in its academic functions. This pattern demonstrates that the teacher and students have unconsciously engaged in functional allocation of languages, whereby Indonesian fulfils the formal-academic function while Javanese fills the spaces of more informal and emotional interaction. This functional allocation further reinforces the position of Indonesian as the loyally maintained language within the educational domain, since its position remains uncontested in the most critical functions.

In the third conversation, which encompasses a question-and-answer session and the correction of student answers, language loyalty is most consistently evident in the way the teacher maintained Indonesian as the primary code for explaining scientific concepts. The teacher explained the concept of academic writing, the nature of objectivity, the structure of scientific writing, and the distinction between general perspectives and personal viewpoints all using Indonesian as the primary language of instruction. Although Javanese insertions such as "*ora*", "*opo*", and "*wis ngunu wae*" were present, these elements did not displace Indonesian from its central position as the language of knowledge

transmission. Garvin and Mathiot affirm that language loyalty constitutes a form of linguistic independence reflected in the consistency of language use in situations that most demand communicative precision. This third conversational data demonstrates that the teacher actively chose Indonesian to explain content with high epistemic weight, reflecting the assessment that Indonesian possesses adequate capacity to express scientific concepts accurately and effectively. The fact that students also responded in Indonesian when raising substantive questions, as seen in student S.3's utterance "*Pak, kalau merupakan intisari dari seluruh jawaban atas rumusan masalah?*" and student S.4's "*Kalau berdasarkan fakta zaman itu?*", further affirms that language loyalty within this academic context is bidirectional. Thus, the third conversational data reinforce the conclusion that Indonesian is preserved and maintained particularly in moments carrying the greatest academic significance.

These findings are consistent with a number of recent sociolinguistic studies on the relationship between Indonesian and regional languages in the educational sphere. Cahyani, Courcy, and Barnett (2018) found that teachers' code-switching to Javanese in bilingual classrooms in Indonesia generally occurs in affective and interpersonal interactional slots, while the delivery of core content remains consistently in Indonesian. This pattern aligns with Ntou's (2024) findings on Javanese-Indonesian diglossia, which demonstrate a division between high and low varieties based on the level of formality in educational contexts. Recent findings by Nugraheni and Hasan (2026) in multilingual rural elementary schools further reinforce this pattern by showing that Indonesian consistently dominates formal academic contexts, while regional languages persist in informal daily interactions. Mukhamdanah, et al (2025) add an important note that a positive attitude toward a language does not automatically guarantee its active preservation; thus, the consistent use of Indonesian by teachers and students in the data from this study serves as a stronger indicator of language loyalty than a mere positive attitude alone. Thus, the pattern of functional allocation identified in the three conversations in this study is not an isolated local phenomenon but rather a reflection of broader sociolinguistic trends in Indonesia's multilingual society, as also reflected in national policy support for strengthening and internationalizing the position of the Indonesian language (Susanto et al., 2024).

Taken as a whole, the language loyalty documented across the three conversations reveals a consistent pattern, namely that Indonesian is maintained as the dominant and primary language in all interactions related to learning and the transmission of knowledge. Garvin and Mathiot (1968) state that language loyalty also encompasses efforts to prevent the influence of other languages from displacing the functions of the language being maintained, and in this data, there is no instance in which Javanese assumes the function of delivering academic subject matter from Indonesian. Holmes (2001) adds that positive language loyalty supports efforts to maintain a language across various domains of life, and this data demonstrates that the educational domain is the domain in which Indonesian is most strongly preserved. The teacher, as an authoritative figure in classroom interaction, plays a significant role in establishing Indonesian as the operative interactional norm, and the pattern demonstrated by the teacher is subsequently adopted by the students. Language loyalty as reflected in this data is therefore not merely static as a possessed attitude, but also dynamic as a process continuously constructed through every interaction taking place within the classroom environment. This finding affirms that schools as educational institutions play a crucial role in the maintenance and development of language loyalty toward Indonesian within a multilingual society.

Language Pride

In the first conversational data, language pride is reflected through the way the teacher uses Indonesian naturally and without hesitation in delivering institutional information to students. Garvin and Mathiot (1968) define language pride as an attitude that encourages a person to develop their language and use it as a symbol of identity and community unity. The teacher's use of Indonesian in conveying school agendas, such as the implementation of Kartini Fest and the report card distribution schedule, reflects the view that Indonesian is a worthy and adequate language for representing official institutional communication. Holmes (2001) affirms that speakers who possess pride in their language

will use it confidently across various domains without perceiving it as less capable than other languages. In this data, there is no indication of any tendency on the part of the teacher to switch to a foreign language or another language that might be considered more prestigious in the delivery of formal information, which demonstrates confidence in the capacity of Indonesian to fulfil the required communicative functions. This confidence constitutes one manifestation of implicit language pride, which is not expressed verbally but is rather reflected through the linguistic choices made by the speaker. Thus, the first conversational data shows that language pride exists as an underlying attitudinal disposition that informs the teacher's language practices in the context of formal communication in school.

The second conversation reveals a more specific dimension of language pride, namely in relation to the use of Indonesian as a marker of academic and professional identity on the part of the teacher. When the teacher delivered examination outlines and reminded students of strategies for answering questions, Indonesian was used in a structured and purposeful manner, as though it were the only legitimate code for the transmission of knowledge in a formal educational setting. Garvin and Mathiot (1968) state that a language used as a symbol of identity and community unity reflects collective pride toward that language, and in the context of schools as state institutions, the teacher's use of Indonesian represents a professional identity as an educator within the national education system. Holmes (2001) further states that positive attitudes toward language, including pride, are reflected in the speaker's support for using that language across various domains and in assisting fellow speakers to maintain it. In this data, the teacher not only uses Indonesian for personal communication, but also implicitly encourages students to use Indonesian through the interactional patterns established in the classroom. Students' acceptance of this Indonesian-speaking interactional pattern demonstrates that the language pride modelled by the teacher has successfully established a shared linguistic norm within the classroom community. This phenomenon reveals that language pride is not solely an individual phenomenon, but also a social one that can be constructed and reinforced through interactions among members of a speech community.

The presence of Javanese elements across the three conversations warrants examination within the framework of language pride that is inclusive and non-exclusive in character. Sholihah (2024) found that language pride can be influenced by local cultural norms that remain actively applied in everyday interaction, such that the emergence of a regional language alongside the national language does not necessarily weaken pride toward the national language. In this data, the use of Javanese elements such as "*nggih*", "*wis ngunu wae*", and "*ora*" by the teacher occurs in interactional contexts that are informal and affective in nature, not in the context of delivering formal academic content. The fact that Indonesian continues to be used for all academic content while Javanese only emerges in moments of social closeness demonstrates that the teacher possesses the capacity to distinguish between contexts that call for more formal expressions of language pride and contexts that permit the expression of local identity. Garvin and Mathiot (1968) themselves do not define language pride as an attitude that must preclude the presence of other languages, but rather as an attitude that encourages the development and use of a language as a meaningful identity marker. Thus, the coexistence of Indonesian and Javanese in this data reflects a mature form of language pride, namely pride that acknowledges national identity through Indonesian while not relinquishing the roots of local identity through Javanese. This pattern reinforces the understanding that language pride in a multilingual context is not monolithic, but rather layered in accordance with the context and communicative function of the interaction taking place.

The third conversation provides the richest data for analysing language pride, particularly because it involves discussion of scientific concepts that require complex linguistic capacity. The teacher used Indonesian to explain the concept of academic writing, the nature of objectivity, the structure of scientific writing, and the distinction between general and personal perspectives, without switching to a foreign language as an alternative medium. Garvin and Mathiot (1968) state that language pride encourages speakers to develop their language and use it across various functions,

including intellectual and scientific functions. The teacher's choice to explain the concept of objectivity through the statement "*Objektif itu eee menuliskan sebuah karya itu apa adanya*" and the concept of systematics through "*sistematika itu urutan dari bagian pembuka, isi, dan penutup*" demonstrates that the teacher views Indonesian as a language that is both capable and appropriate for expressing scientific ideas accurately. This trust constitutes an expression of language pride grounded in recognition of the intellectual capacity of Indonesian. Student S.3's response in Indonesian "Pak, kalau merupakan intisari dari seluruh jawaban atas rumusan masalah?" and student S.4's "Kalau berdasarkan fakta zaman itu?" further reinforce that language pride is not only evident on the teacher's side, but also among students who use Indonesian as a tool for articulating their scientific thinking. These findings demonstrate that language pride in the context of scientific learning functions as a bond of shared academic identity between the teacher and students.

These findings are consistent with a number of recent relevant studies in the sociolinguistic literature. Kirilenko (2024) asserts that a positive attitude toward a language can enhance its prestige while simultaneously reinforcing its use in formal contexts. This aligns with the pattern consistently observed in the way teachers and students in Class XI-5 regard Indonesian as the sole legitimate code for conveying academic content. Dewi and Goebel (2023) found that Indonesian is positioned as a prestigious and neutral variety in formal contexts, while Javanese fulfills affective and interpersonal functions. This precisely reflects the inclusive sense of linguistic pride identified in the data from this study. Alhazmi (2023) adds that language attitudes are multidimensional, encompassing status, solidarity, and dynamism and that education has been shown to foster more unbiased attitudes toward language variation. Thus, the pride in the Indonesian language evident in these classroom interactions stems not only from individual affective attitudes but also from a linguistic habitus institutionally shaped through the educational sphere. Rusdiansyah, et al (2025) reinforce this point by finding that attitudes toward the prestige of Indonesian as the language of instruction in Indonesian schools have become deeply rooted as an institutional norm that transcends mere individual preference; thus, the pride in the language evident in learning interactions is not merely an affective expression but also a reflection of a systematically formed linguistic norm. Thus, the pride in the language identified in this study is not an isolated phenomenon but rather part of a broader, empirically documented sociolinguistic pattern, in which Indonesian consistently occupies a dominant position in the realm of formal education as a symbol of academic and national identity that is mutually recognized by teachers and students.

Taken as a whole, the language pride documented across the three conversations reveals a character that is functional and implicit in nature, manifested through the consistent and purposeful practice of using Indonesian across the most important academic domains. Garvin and Mathiot (1968) affirm that positive language pride encourages a person to develop their language and use it as a symbol of identity, and in this data that identity is constructed through the use of Indonesian across all the most critical academic domains. Holmes (2001) adds that positive language pride supports efforts to maintain the language and assists speakers in sustaining its use even in the presence of pressure from other language groups. No indication is found in the data that either the teacher or students regard Indonesian as inferior compared to Javanese or a foreign language, which constitutes a strong indicator of stable language pride. The teacher's consistent use of Indonesian as an authoritative figure in classroom interaction also implicitly functions as a role model for students in building their own pride toward the national language. Thus, language pride in this data is not merely static as a possessed attitude, but also dynamic as a process continuously constructed through every interaction occurring within the classroom environment.

Awareness of the Norm

The first conversational data reveals the presence of language norm awareness reflected in the teacher's effort to use Indonesian throughout the formal delivery of information to students. Garvin and Mathiot (1968) define awareness of language norms as an attitude that encourages speakers to use

their language carefully and politely, and note that this constitutes a factor of significant influence on actual language behaviour. In the first conversation, the teacher attempted to deliver information in a structured manner by mentioning the name of each activity, its time of implementation, and its relevance in sequence, reflecting an awareness that formal information must be conveyed in a manner comprehensible to all students. Nevertheless, several deviations were observed at the level of sentence structure, such as the repetition of the phrase “*sepertinya besok...sepertinya lho yaa*” and the relatively frequent use of filler words such as “*eee*”, indicating that the application of language norms in oral communication has not yet been fully optimised. Garvin and Mathiot (1968) affirm that norm awareness encompasses the careful use of language in terms of linguistic form and structure, as well as the appropriate selection of vocabulary suited to the context. Based on these criteria, the teacher in the first conversation demonstrates norm awareness that is partial in nature, strong in terms of communicative intent and topic selection, but not yet fully realised in terms of structural precision at the sentence level. Thus, the first conversational data reflects a condition in which language norm awareness is present, yet its application in spontaneous oral speech continues to encounter performance-related obstacles.

In the second conversation, the teacher’s language norm awareness is more prominent, as reflected in the selection of vocabulary appropriate to the academic register and the learning context. The teacher consistently used technical terms such as “*kisi-kisi*” (examination outline), “*soal bacaan*” (reading questions), “*kata pengecoh*” (distractor words), “*kata kunci*” (keywords), and “*materi*” (subject matter), all of which form part of the formal register in pedagogical discourse. Garvin and Mathiot (1968) state that language norm awareness encourages speakers to use language carefully and appropriately, including in the selection of vocabulary suited to the situational context of the utterance. The use of these academic terms reflects that the teacher possesses adequate knowledge of the register applicable within formal educational contexts, thereby enabling the selection of appropriate words for conveying technical information to students. However, the same conversation also reveals the use of non-standard forms such as “*enggak*” (colloquial for *tidak/not*), “*udah*” (colloquial for *sudah/already*), “*sampe*” (colloquial for *sampai/until*), and “*nggih*” (Javanese for *ya/yes*), which are normatively less appropriate within the standard formal Indonesian register. Fasold (1984) explains that a speaker’s attitude toward language norms is influenced by beliefs and feelings toward a particular language variety, such that the choice to use non-standard forms may reflect certain pragmatic considerations beyond mere unfamiliarity with the norm. Based on this analysis, the teacher’s language norm awareness in the second conversation is identifiably stronger at the lexical level than at the grammatical and phonological levels, indicating an uneven distribution of norm awareness across the different linguistic strata.

The third conversation presents the most complex data for analysing language norm awareness, as it contains a fairly clear tension between the demands of formal language norms and the reality of everyday language use. During the answer correction session and the explanation of academic writing materials, the teacher used Indonesian to convey scientific concepts such as objectivity, systematics, and field-based facts, reflecting an awareness that academic content must be delivered in a language carrying formal credibility. Garvin and Mathiot (1968) state that language norm awareness is reflected in a speaker’s effort to use language in accordance with the rules applicable within their speech community, and within the classroom context, these rules require the use of standard Indonesian in the delivery of lesson materials. However, a number of deviations were also found at the sentence structure level, such as the repetition of the phrase “*jadi sebuah karya, karyanya kan, sebuah karya*” (so a work, the work itself, a work), suggesting that the flow of thinking in oral speech had not been fully organised according to the norms of effective sentence construction. Garvin and Mathiot affirm that norm awareness is a factor of great influence on language use behaviour, and this data indicates that this influence is stronger at the level of topic selection and vocabulary than at the level of syntactic structure. Alongside this, the simultaneous use of standard and non-standard forms within a single utterance, as in “*nek fakta nggak ada petunjuk kaidah keilmuan yo harus punya pedoman*”,

demonstrates that the teacher operates within a diglossic condition in which standard and non-standard language norms coexist simultaneously. This pattern indicates that the teacher's norm awareness is already sufficient to guide content selection and register broadly, even though it has not yet fully guided every grammatical and lexical choice in a consistent manner.

The responses of students across the three conversations provide a distinct perspective regarding the level of language norm awareness compared to the teacher. Student utterances such as “*Jam sewelas!*” (Eleven o'clock!), “*Rabune ngopo Pak?*” (What's on Wednesday, Sir?), “*Udan deres Pak!*” (It's raining hard, Sir!), and “*No 5 Pak!*” (Number 5, Sir!) normatively reflect a much stronger tendency toward informal language use and toward the incorporation of Javanese elements. Garvin and Mathiot (1968) affirm that language norm awareness encourages a person to comply with applicable language rules, and based on this criterion, the students' aforementioned utterances indicate that the internalisation of standard Indonesian norms into their everyday language practice has not yet been fully achieved. The sentence “*Rabune ngopo Pak?*”, for instance, contains Javanese lexical elements (*rabu* used with *ngopo*, meaning what/why in Javanese) that are normatively inconsistent with the formal Indonesian standard expected within classroom interaction. Nevertheless, student S.3's response using the academic sentence “*Pak, kalau merupakan intisari dari seluruh jawaban atas rumusan masalah?*” and student S.4's “*Kalau berdasarkan fakta zaman itu?*” demonstrate that some students are capable of using more formal Indonesian when the context of discussion demands a more academic register. This finding indicates that language norm awareness among students is variable, influenced by the degree to which the academic demands of the ongoing interactional context activate their awareness of formal language norms. Fasold (1984) explains that speakers develop attitudes toward language through their social experiences and interactions, such that variation in norm awareness among students reflects differences in their exposure to formal language norms within the classroom environment.

The structured pattern of information delivery by the teacher in this first conversation aligns with the findings of Sastromiharjo, et al (2025), who identified pedagogical discourse strategies deliberately designed by Indonesian language teachers during the pre-teaching phase to maintain clarity of communication, even though spontaneous speech is prone to disfluencies. However, not all teachers consistently apply awareness of linguistic norms, as emphasized by Yulianto, et al (2023), who noted that practices for fostering critical language awareness in the classroom vary widely, some are actively pursued, while others occur without any conscious effort at all. Such variations are also reflected in the measurement instrument developed by Maruti, et al (2022), which indicates that teachers' critical language awareness can be positioned on a continuum rather than a binary category of being aware or unaware of linguistic norms. On the students' side, the findings of Susandi, et al (2024) regarding violations of the maxim of politeness in Indonesian language learning interactions in elementary schools reinforce the picture that informal and impolite speech, as seen in responses such as “*Jam sewelas!*” and “*Udan deres, Pak!*”, is a common phenomenon, not a case-specific deviation. This disparity in the application of language norms between academic and informal contexts is further explained by Rohmah, et al (2024), who show that formal language policies in school settings institutionally favor the standard variety and high-status language in formal contexts, while everyday interactions remain open to non-standard variations.

Taken as a whole, the language norm awareness documented across the three conversations reveals a pattern that is selective and context-dependent in nature, whereby norm awareness is more strongly activated in moments that demand the use of technical and academic language, and less consistent in moments of more spontaneous and informal interaction. Garvin and Mathiot (1968) state that norm awareness is the greatest factor influencing actual language behaviour, and this data confirms that the strength of that influence is highly dependent on the situational context faced by the speaker at any given moment. Fasold (1984) adds that a speaker's attitude toward language norms is influenced by beliefs, feelings, and behavioural tendencies that operate jointly in every communicative situation. Based on both of these theoretical perspectives, it can be concluded that the teacher and students in

this data possess a level of norm awareness sufficient to maintain Indonesian as the primary language of learning, even though its application in terms of structural precision and the consistent use of the standard register continues to develop. This condition reflects the sociolinguistic reality of a multilingual society operating under conditions of language contact, in which formal and informal language norms are simultaneously present and mutually influential in every speech event. Language norm awareness in this data therefore constitutes a dynamic and continuous phenomenon, namely a process that is continuously shaped and reinforced through the academic interactions occurring each day within the classroom.

CONCLUSION

It can be concluded that the three components of language attitude as formulated by Garvin and Mathiot (1968): language loyalty, language pride, and awareness of language norms are all present and identifiable, albeit with varying degrees of manifestation across each component. Language loyalty is reflected in the consistent and purposeful use of Indonesian as the primary medium of academic interaction, with regional language elements appearing only in affective and interpersonal interactional slots without displacing the dominant function of Indonesian. Language pride manifests implicitly through the confident and unquestioned use of Indonesian in the delivery of scientific and institutional content, demonstrating that both the teacher and students recognise Indonesian as a legitimate symbol of academic and national identity. Meanwhile, awareness of language norms is evident primarily at the lexical level through the selection of vocabulary appropriate to the academic register, although its application at the grammatical and structural levels remains inconsistent, particularly in the spontaneous oral speech of both the teacher and students. The coexistence of Indonesian and Javanese throughout the interactions does not diminish the overall positive language attitude observed, but rather reflects the sociolinguistic reality of a multilingual speech community in which functional allocation between languages operates as a natural and stable phenomenon. Taken together, these findings affirm that the classroom serves as a significant domain for the maintenance and reinforcement of positive language attitudes toward Indonesian, and that the interactional patterns established by the teacher as an authoritative figure play a central role in shaping the collective language attitudes of the students within the learning environment.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Extended gratitude to Dini Restiyanti Pratiwi, S.Pd., M.Pd. as the researcher-supervisor and Muhammad Supriyanto as the supervising teacher throughout the data collection process at the school.

REFERENCE

- Alhazmi, L. M. (2023). Language Attitudes in Fast-Growing Societies: New Insights in the Dynamism Dimension. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 10(1), 478. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-023-01988-1>.
- Benally, A., & Viri, D. (2005). Diné Bizaad [Navajo Language] at A Crossroads: Extinction or Renewal? *Bilingual Research Journal*, 29(1), 85–108. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2005.10162825>.
- Brenzinger, M., & Heinrich, P. (2013). The Return of Hawaiian: Language Networks of the Revival Movement. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 14(2), 300–316. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14664208.2013.812943>.
- Cahyani, H., Courcy, M. De, & Barnett, J. (2018). Teachers' Code-Switching in Bilingual Classrooms: Exploring Pedagogical and Sociocultural Functions. *International Journal of*

- Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 21(4), 465–479.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2016.1189509>.
- Ceallaigh, B. Ó. (2021). Economic Disruption and Language Shift—Some Ethnographic Data from Ireland After the 2008 Crash. *Studia Celtica Posnaniensia*, 6(1), 17–45.
<https://doi.org/10.2478/scp-2021-0002>.
- de la Rosa, F. J. U. (2022). The Basque Language (Euskera) As an Ideological Instrument in the Historical Construction of Basque Ethnic Identity. *Journal of Nationalism, Memory & Language Politics*, 16(2), 234–254. <https://doi.org/10.2478/jnmlp-2022-0007>.
- Dewi, U. P., & Goebel, Z. (2023). Discursive Valuing Practices at the Periphery: Javanese Use on Indonesian Youth Radio in Multilingual Solo. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 283, 113–137. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ijsl-2022-0039>.
- Fasold, R. (1984). *The Sociolinguistics of Society*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Garvin, P. L., & Mathiot, M. (1968). The Urbanization of Guarani Language: Problem in Language and Culture. In J. A. Fishman, (Ed.) *Reading in Text Sociology of Language: Paris-The Hague*.
<https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110805376.365>.
- Holmes, J. (2001). *An introduction to sociolinguistics* (2nd ed.). London: Longman.
- Kirilenko, S. V. (2024). Language Attitudes: Sociolinguistic Aspect. *Research Result. Theoretical and Applied Linguistics*, 10(1), 17–30. <https://doi.org/10.18413/2313>.
- Komorovskaya, V. (2016). The Future of the Belarusian Language: Is It Doomed to Extinction? Controversies and Challenges in the Language Maintenance and Revitalization. *Acta Philologica*, (48), 15–28.
- Maruti, E. S., Yulianto, B., Suhartono, S., Yohanes, B., & Cahyono, B. E. H. (2022). Scale Development as A Measuring Tool of Critical Javanese Language' Awareness for Pre-Service Javanese Teachers. *Cogent Arts & Humanities*, 9(1), 1–15.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/23311983.2022.2127987>.
- Mckenzie, J., & Jensen, L. A. (2024). The Globalization and Localization of Moral Values: A Cultural-Developmental Study of Adolescents and Their Parents. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 48(2), 179–189. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01650254231222418>.
- Mukhamdanah, Zaman, S., Khairiah, D., Nurhuda, P., Firdaus, W., & Hardaniwati, M. (2025). Language Use and Attitudes of Young Speakers of Skou, Tabla, and Biak in Jayapura. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 15(1), 209–223.
<https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v15i1.75114>.
- Ntou, S. R. (2024). Exploring Complex Diglossia in Javanese Society. *Cogent Arts & Humanities*, 11(1), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311983.2024.2313286>.
- Nugraheni, A. S., & Hasan, M. F. (2026). Indonesian Language Learning Adaptation Strategies in Regional Language Environment: A Phenomenological Study in Rural Primary Schools. *Cogent Education*, 13(1), 1–27. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2026.2635805>.
- Rohmah, Z., Sholihah, D. N., Basthomi, Y., & Milal, A. D. (2024). School-Scape as A Linguistic Battlefield: An LL Study at Darussalam Education Complex of Gontor, Indonesia. *Cogent Arts & Humanities*, 11(1), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311983.2024.2348301>.
- Rusdiansyah, Gunawan, W., Kurniawan, E., & Hakim, M. A. (2025). Navigating Inconsistencies: The challenges of Implementing Multilingual Education Policy in Rural Indonesia. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, 11, 101601. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2025.101601>.

- Sastromiharjo, A., Ansas, V. N., Mulyati, Y., & Damaianti, V. S. (2025). Demystifying Pedagogic Discourse of Indonesian Language In-Service Teachers in the Pre-Teaching Phase of Communication. *International Journal of Language Education*, 9(1), 58–80. <https://doi.org/10.26858/ijole.v1i1.71703>.
- Sholihah, R. A. (2024). Menjadi Ponoragan: Sikap Bahasa Mahasiswa Ponorogo. *Naturalistic: Jurnal Kajian Penelitian dan Pendidikan dan Pembelajaran*, 9(1), 471–485. <https://doi.org/10.35568/naturalistic.v9i1.4161>.
- Sihombing, A. R. D., Sianturi, A., Butar-butur, F. K., & Surip, M. (2024). Peran Bahasa Indonesia sebagai Bahasa Persatuan di Era Globalisasi. *Sadewa: Publikasi Ilmu Pendidikan, Pembelajaran, dan Ilmu Sosial*, 2(3), 9–18. <https://doi.org/10.61132/sadewa.v2i3.912>.
- Susandi, A., Zamzani, Prabowo, M., & Yulianto, B. (2024). Portrait of Students' Language Politeness in Elementary School. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education (IJERE)*, 13(1), 141–150. <https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v13i1.24872>.
- Susanto, G., Pickus, D., Espree-conaway, D., Suparmi, Rusiandi, A., & Noviyya, H. (2024). Indonesian Language Policy and Perspectives on Its Implementation in Promoting Bahasa Indonesia as An International Language. *Cogent Arts & Humanities*, 11(1), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311983.2024.2364511>.
- Yulianto, B., Maruti, E. S., Suhartono, Yohanes, B., Shodiq, S., & Parji. (2023). Stimulating Critical Awareness of Javanese Language in Elementary Schools: Exploring Mother Language Teaching Practices in Indonesia. *Cogent Education*, 10(1), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2023.2202782>.
- Wekke, I. S. (2019). *Metode Penelitian Sosial*. Bandung: PT. Refika Aditama.
- Zeng, J., & Yang, J. (2024). English Language Hegemony: Retrospect and Prospect. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 11(1), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-024-02821-z>.