

DIRECTIONS FOR INDONESIAN LANGUAGE POLICY IN EDUCATION: TOWARDS A TRANSLINGUAL PERSPECTIVE

Grady Mitchell^{1✉}, Nurul Chojimah², Ika Nurhayani³

Universitas Brawijaya Jl. Veteran, Malang, Indonesia^{1,2,3}

Article Info

Article History:
Received May 2022
Accepted August 2022
Published September 2022

Keywords:
Indonesia;
translanguaging; language
policy; language attitudes;
decolonization

Abstract

This study overviews literature regarding the development of Indonesian, language endangerment, language attitudes, and ideologies, as well as emerging teaching methodologies to provide the context of the current challenges facing Indonesia's sociolinguistic situation. The establishment of Bahasa Indonesia as the national language helped unite the country but, at the same time, created new challenges for addressing linguistic diversity. The dissemination of English education has complicated the situation and has been associated with exacerbating inequalities. These inequalities have not only had consequences for linguistic diversity but also for access to employment and education. Language policies continue to treat language as static rather than dynamic processes which involve one's communicative repertoire. While some language scholars studying Indonesia have begun acknowledging the advantages of translingual/multilingual education, there remain under-addressed obstacles to its successful implementation and the risk of co-option for ulterior purposes. We conclude that advocacy for language policy in Indonesia should be a part of a broader effort to address the needs of marginalized communities and harness students' diverse and dynamic linguistic repertoires to improve the quality of learning and inclusivity in the classroom.

✉Correspondence:
Email: Gradys2@student.ub.ac.edu

INTRODUCTION

Indonesia has gone through a significant number of changes in language policy and attitudes since the country's inception in 1945. These changes have impacted the national language's development and attitudes towards other languages spoken in the archipelago, especially indigenous languages and English. Within the last decade, many studies have shown shifts in research and teaching policies and practices in Indonesia (Zein et al., 2020). Indigenous languages are becoming increasingly at risk of going extinct (Anderbeck, 2015), and at the same time, the demand for English education continues to rise (Zein, 2020; Zein et al., 2020). Throughout the world, the invention of the nation-state (Anderson, 2006) and the impact of globalization (Duchêne, A., & Heller, 2012; Piller & Cho, 2013) appear to push minority languages, cultures, and their speakers further to the margins in favor of the dominant state and international languages. Indonesia is no exception to this trend (Zentz, 2012). With the increased concern over the status of linguistic diversity in Indonesia, some scholars have begun to look at ways in which language education can be inclusive to all languages through translanguaging (Cahyani et al., 2018; Rasman, 2018; Zein, 2019) and propose policies which may give more significant support to indigenous and other minority language speakers (Zein, 2020). However, the number of studies on critical language teaching in Indonesia has been relatively limited, although Zein et al. (2020) have shown a steady rise in research on this issue.

In this study, the researchers provide an overview of the history of the Indonesian language, language endangerment, and sociolinguistic trends to provide adequate context for the current linguistic situation in Indonesia. The researchers then discuss language policy and translanguaging and how policies (both by governmental institutions and teachers) can positively reshape language attitudes in the classroom and promote diverse linguistic practices. The goal is to identify areas where research and language policy in Indonesia can be critically addressed and improved upon. Finally, the researcher will make suggestions for future areas of research and language policies that can be implemented at local and state levels.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

A Brief History of The Indonesian Language and its Implementation

The Indonesian language, or *Bahasa Indonesia*, was officially declared on October 28th, 1928, as the official and national language of the soon-to-be nation-state during a gathering of young

Dutch-educated nationalists planning their independence from the Netherlands (Sneddon, 2003). This event, known as the *Sumpah Pemuda* (Youth Pledge), became a national holiday and is often referred to as the birth of the language. The origins of *Bahasa Indonesia*, however, date back much earlier. Sneddon notes that *Bahasa Indonesia* came about from a variety of Malay used initially as a literary language in the Riau-Johor sultanate but was also heavily influenced by colloquial varieties of Malay and other indigenous and foreign languages. Wide varieties of Malay were spoken all over the archipelago and in the regions that became present-day Malaysia and Brunei. The Dutch encouraged the use of Malay, often to maintain control of their colonial subjects and spread Christianity, which sometimes led to language loss (Ewing, 2014).

When indigenous nationalists began to advocate for their independence, Malay appeared to be a natural choice. A selection of any other language would not have likely been as widely accepted by most citizens of the new nation (Sneddon, 2003). The choice of the Dutch was not seen as reasonable because of the associations with the colonizer. Although considered the national language, Javanese, the most widely spoken indigenous language in the archipelago, was rejected for fear of showing ethnic favoritism, which would not have been ideal for national unity. English, despite its international status and political power at the time, was not chosen as most Indonesians did not have familiarity with this language. Malay was the only language that did not directly relate to one ethnic group or colonizing power. Thus, on August 17th, 1945, Indonesian officially became the national language, and in the following years, it began to be taught in schools all over the archipelago.

While Indonesia could have tried to gain independence without a national language, having an official language was essential for gaining international recognition and support from powerful nation-states and becoming accepted into the international community (Anderson, 2006; Sneddon, 2003). The ideology of a country being united by language and only language was prevalent in Indonesia's language planning and policy building. Zein (2020) points out that a revision of the original *Sumpah Pemuda* was changed from "uphold the unifying language, Indonesian," to "We have one language, that is, the Indonesian language." This subtle change in wording appeared to have significantly influenced the language policy of Indonesia in the following decades. Zein describes how in the early years of independence, some regions of Indonesia were forbidden from using or teaching their indigenous languages in the classroom and instructed to use only Indonesian. It was done mainly to discourage regional separatism in fear of Indonesia's goal of

achieving unity failing. The spread of *Bahasa Indonesia* education was massively increased during the thirty-year New Order rule under president Suharto (Sneddon, 2003). This era saw a massive jump in national literacy (Sneddon, 2003) and restrictions on freedom of speech (Martin, 2017). Sneddon (2003) notes that Bahasa Indonesia, especially Bahasa Baku (standard language), became associated with authoritarianism and bureaucracy in this period. Teaching some indigenous languages became allowed and even encouraged during this time, although the emphasis was still on using Indonesian in most formal settings (Zein, 2020). Additionally, English education became mandatory in school curriculums with the primary goal of increasing international communication. Some cultural influence from Western culture began to seep in as American and British movies and songs, despite heavy censorship under the New Order government, became massively popular among urban youth. Thus, from early independence, all the way through the New Order period, *Bahasa Indonesia* and English gained significant ‘symbolic capital’ (Bourdieu, 1991) among Indonesians.

Following the fall of the New Order regime, restrictions on free speech and language education began to loosen, although not entirely and not without resistance (Aspinall, 2018). The *reformasi* period (1998-present) allowed for media and individuals to express their social and political opinions with less fear of backlash from authorities (Martin, 2017). Many films, novels, and music discussing topics initially considered taboo were now allowed to be shared openly with the public. However, some of these media have been met with fierce resistance from some religious groups and government censorship. Some Indonesian artists have worked around this by using *Bahasa gado-gado* or drawing from a broad linguistic repertoire, including Standard Indonesian, English, and Standard colloquial Jakartan Indonesian in speech/writing. Martin’s dissertation provides detailed examples where Indonesian authors and filmmakers deliberately use English phrases and vocabulary when discussing “off-limits” topics in Standard Indonesian. Also, English appears to have a role in expressing certain emotions, especially love. Those who acquire some knowledge of English may find themselves more comfortable using phrases such as ‘I love you’ in English rather than the Indonesian equivalents (*aku sayang kamu, aku cinta kamu*), which to some may sound awkward or inauthentic. Cahyani et al. (2018) have noted that in giving expressions of praise to students, some university lecturers found it more comfortable to use English phrases over Indonesian ones. Nevertheless, English has seen a rise in status in Indonesia as a “new H variety” (Zein, 2020). This status has been questioned by some Indonesians, and some

scholars have expressed concerns about the current role of English in Indonesian education (Manara, 2014; Zentz, 2012). The phrase *sok Inggris* (English show-off) has gained notoriety in the past decade and has been associated with urban elite youth and ‘mixed’ language practices perceived as ‘unnationalistic.’ To the researcher’s knowledge, *sok Inggris* has yet to be critically investigated in any academic publication.

The standard language still has a significant role in Indonesia, which will likely not change anytime soon. However, colloquial varieties of Indonesian have gained a significant presence (Martin, 2017; Sneddon, 2003), including in areas traditionally considered the domains of standard Indonesian such as novels (Djenar, 2008). What has also been observed, however, is that despite the loosening of restrictions on language use in the reformasi era, language loss has been accelerating rapidly. This issue is discussed in more detail in the next section.

Language Endangerment and Revitalization in Indonesia

The language situation for indigenous languages in Indonesia does not look bright. Anderbeck (2015) has estimated that 300 languages in Indonesia could disappear entirely in the next twenty years. Some scholars have provided evidence while arguing that even the largest languages, such as Javanese and Sundanese, which have millions of speakers, can be at risk of endangerment (Cohn & Ravindranath, 2014; Ewing, 2014). While others have suggested that this is not the case for Javanese (Quinn, 2012), it is clear that many languages have seen a significant drop in the number of speakers over the past few decades (Anderbeck, 2015; Ewing, 2014). There are many reasons for this. One factor mentioned above is the spread of the Indonesian language and Malay varieties. Another is increasing urbanization (Tapsell, 2017) and the trend of middle-class youth (especially women) shifting from local languages to Indonesian (Ewing, 2014; Smith-Hefner, 2009). A national law passed in 2009, *UU No. 24 Tahun 2009*, made *Bahasa Indonesia* the required official language in all media, education, business, and governmental activities, only providing room for local languages in situations deemed appropriate (Badan Pemeriksa Keuangan Republik Indonesia, 2009; Zentz, 2012). This law appears to have remnants of language attitudes during the New Order period when standard Indonesian language education was heavily enforced.

Nevertheless, this policy and policies under the New Order period resulted in many Indonesians growing up hearing and reading only *Bahasa Indonesia* on television and in the classroom. Spaces traditionally the domain of local languages were taken over by the national language. Zentz noted in her study of Javanese students studying English at a university in Solo

that many felt shame and embarrassment for being unable to speak *krama* (high register of Javanese) to elders and their parents and were, at times, shunned for this. Zentz argues this often happens with urban Javanese children as many are longer in environments where they can be exposed to the H varieties of Javanese. Factors such as the transmigrasi program have also led to more intercultural interactions, including marriages, which have often resulted in couples and communities choosing to speak in Indonesian instead of indigenous languages (Ewing, 2014). Furthermore, proficiency in *Bahasa Indonesia* is essential for access to education and employment in higher-paying jobs (Zentz, 2012). All these factors result in the shrinking of spaces where local language use is tolerated, acceptable, and spoken as the preferred mode of communication. On top of all this, studying foreign languages in place of local languages has also contributed to language loss. One language, in particular, has had a significant role in this.

The dominance of English education and internationalization has significantly affected indigenous language vitality and education. While two hours of *muatan lokal* (local content) has already been required by the national government (Zentz, 2012), many schools have chosen to use this time to teach English instead of indigenous languages (Zein, 2020). English has been taught in most secondary schools in Indonesia since the 1960s. However, the demand for English education has greatly increased in recent years. Zein et al. (2020) discuss how public schools and universities struggle to meet demand. As a result, many English teachers hired had limited proficiencies in the language and received inadequate training and resources to teach students (Zein et al., 2020; Zentz, 2012), as creating an educational system that supports all schools, teachers, and students has been an ongoing struggle since the early days of independence (Bjork, C., & Raihani, 2018). An international school program was initiated from 2009 until 2013, providing English-only education in certain classes. This initiative was met by protests that contested that the schools were only available to wealthy students (Sugiharto, 2014; Zein et al., 2020).

Nevertheless, demand for English education has continued to skyrocket, and students of higher socioeconomic backgrounds have often chosen to take private courses and study abroad to get an English education that appears to be lacking in public institutions (Lamb & Coleman, 2008; Zentz, 2012). All of this has contributed to the elevated status of English, which Zein (2020) argues competes with Indonesian as the dominant H variety. indigenous languages are often set placed as L varieties, where they are only to be spoken in certain contexts such as at home, at the

marketplace, at cultural events, and in casual social gatherings between members of the same ethnic and language groups. The impact of government policies and globalization have contributed to the status of languages and thus language attitudes (more on this in the following section), which encourage language shift to H varieties.

As for efforts on revitalization, some initiatives have taken place but appear to have had limited success. For example, the Special Region of Yogyakarta began an initiative to encourage Javanese language use among its residents (Nurhayati, 2013). It included mandatory Javanese education through secondary school and outdoor excursions for students to cultural events and places where Javanese is spoken as the primary medium of communication. Additionally, every Saturday was made ‘Javanese Day,’ where all citizens, especially those at offices and schools, are encouraged to speak Javanese. Despite these efforts, Ewing (2014) notes that Javanese use still appears to decline, at least among urban youth.

One problem of revitalization that appears to occur often is that projects are focused on supporting ‘languages’ and not their speakers (Costa, 2013; Pennycook & Makoni, 2019). There are no significant financial incentives for gaining proficiency in indigenous languages, but there are many for becoming proficient in H varieties. Additionally, the origins of language revitalization efforts can be traced back to the histories of Christian missions in tandem with colonization projects where indigenous peoples were seen as inferior by European colonists and in need of ‘saving’ (Makoni & Mashiri, 2006). From the 1500s until the 20th century, many missionaries learned to communicate with indigenous people so that they could develop biblical texts in their languages and more easily convert them to Christianity. It benefited colonial powers as knowledge of indigenous people gave colonists more power and surveillance over them and led to the insertion of hegemonic European knowledge and ways of thinking into their standardized languages (Heryanto, 2006). Thus, Indigenous languages were often invented and described by European missionaries and linguists, not by indigenous people. It helped create social and political divides between groups who initially saw themselves much differently from the colonizer’s gaze. Makoni & Mashiri (2006) describe how the description and control of indigenous languages continued into the discourse of modern language documentation and revitalization projects in the twentieth century.

The construction of languages as objects (Makoni & Pennycook, 2006) reinforces a myth that languages should be taught in a monolingual format where other languages known by the speaker

are seen as a hindrance to the learning process. This strategy can result in the further marginalization of indigenous languages, as has appeared to be the case in Scotland (Smith-Christmas, 2017). In this country, children learn to see their heritage language as an academic performance or skill rather than part of their daily communicative practices and identities. Similarly, Zentz (2012) reported many Javanese students who felt isolated from their own language in their secondary school years, with one describing Javanese class as dull, stating that they go to “a place where students daily speak Javanese go to get told they cannot speak Javanese.” The Javanese taught in school courses is typically the H variety, which originates from Yogyakarta and Solo (Connors, 2008). The problems with teaching only a wide variety of Javanese only in school are that 1) it isolates an already endangered variety of a language from other contexts where it can be spoken, 2) it erases the multilingual history of Javanese speakers and interactions with other groups such as Sundanese and Malay speakers and assumes that there once existed a Javanese kingdom and society that were entirely monolingual. If language education aims to promote and support all languages, teaching and using indigenous languages cannot be isolated from teaching other languages, especially the H varieties. Zein (2020) suggests models that could allow for more linguistically inclusive teaching methods in the classroom. It is discussed in more detail in the concluding section. Suppose indigenous languages are to survive and thrive under pressures from nationalization and globalization. In that case, efforts must be made to provide space for their use in combination with H varieties, and (more significantly) language revival efforts must be community led and part of broader collaborative efforts to fight social inequality. This will help create a positive shift in languages attitudes towards indigenous languages and their speakers. Addressing issues of attitudes towards language use and speakers is the topic of the next section.

Language Attitudes, Ideologies, and Sociolinguistic Trends in Indonesia

Studies on language attitudes in Indonesia appear to be still quite limited. Nevertheless, it is undeniable the influence that English has had on mainstream Indonesian culture, particularly inner circle varieties. As mentioned above, the demand for English has continued to rise. It is largely due to the associations of English with high socioeconomic status (Zentz, 2012) and the myth of its universalness (Makoni & Pennycook, 2006). Many Indonesian companies require applicants to submit a TOEFL or IELTS certificate with a minimum score to be considered for employment. It helps reinforce the belief that English is an essential language for Indonesians to become proficient in to achieve financial success. Zentz (2012) notes that this is not necessarily the case in many

situations. While many jobs require an English language proficiency certificate, most businesses still use Bahasa Indonesia as the primary mode of communication. Some of these workplaces may hardly use English outside of the application process. As for international employment, Zentz cites labor statistics showing that most Indonesians working abroad are in countries where English is not widely spoken, or proficiencies in inner circle varieties are not necessary, such as Malaysia, Singapore, Saudi Arabia, and Korea. While some Indonesians may get the chance to study abroad or work in high-paying jobs in anglophone countries, these opportunities are often only available to Indonesians from privileged backgrounds, as scholarships and job openings in these countries are often quite limited and require more skills than just language proficiency. Zentz argues that English carries more of a symbolic power that functions as a “semiotic hitch-hiker” (Mendoza-Denton, 2011) associated with high socioeconomic status and uncritically viewed as a valuable economic resource. She advocates for localized English teaching that meets the needs of students and their communities rather than the teaching of dominant or ‘global’ varieties.

With English’s association with discourses of financial and academic success, it is not surprising to see the surge in private English courses in Indonesia (Zentz, 2012), especially those that use American and British varieties and speakers as a selling point. The literature on world Englishes has helped to problematize discourses of ‘native’ speakers (Higgins, 2003, 2009; Kachru et al., 2006; Rohmah, 2005), arguing for a more inclusive definition of who is considered a speaker of English. Unfortunately, language attitudes and policies still favor inner circle varieties and often associate ‘native speakerness’ with whiteness in Indonesia (Harsanti & Manara, 2021) and worldwide (Flores & Rosa, 2015; Kubota & Fujimoto, 2013). Many classroom materials for Indonesian teachers come from British and American sources (Dewi, 2017; Hermawan & Lia, 2012), and there remains the issue of TOEFL and IELTS exams which are still being used as an entry requirement for many applications for jobs and postgraduate and doctoral study programs. English (along with Arabic and Chinese) continues to be considered a ‘foreign’ language, despite speakers in the country who have never set foot abroad (Zein, 2020), and the ideal speaker is still considered by most as an American or British anglophone. Access to adequate exposure and interaction with these inner circle varieties of English is minimal for most Indonesians. The presumed superiority of standard American/British English has seldom been questioned in popular culture. Thus, it is not too surprising that a phrase like *sok Inggris* has emerged.

Since the beginning of the *reformasi* era, more Indonesian youth have engaged in reportedly ‘code-switching’ and ‘code-mixing’ practices where they draw upon features of American/British English, Standard Indonesian, and colloquial Jakartan Indonesian in their daily linguistic repertoires (Martin, 2017). Many reported engaging in this perceived linguistic behavior are from middle- and upper-class backgrounds, i.e., those with greater access to English education and learning resources. There may be a sense of fear among some Indonesians of being left behind because of the increasing demand for English in the job market and education. Criticisms of language use, especially of the language choices of youth, women, and other marginalized groups, often reflect anxieties over social and economic changes (Inoue, 2003).

Additionally, the use of English has often been associated with elements of Western culture and ideas that are considered against nationalist Indonesian values (Martin, 2017). It may, in part, explain the reported increased use of the phrase *sok Inggris*, which has been increasingly reported in news articles (e.g., Farisi, 2020; Jonata, 2018; Wurinanda, 2016) and by famous Youtube personalities (e.g., Bening, 2020; Farhana, 2021; Izzati, 2021; Skinnyindonesian24, 2017) over the past few years. Similar findings have been reported in the neighboring Philippines with the phrase *conyo* (Reyes, 2017a, 2017b). In the Philippines, the term ‘Taglish’ has been used for quite some time. English education expanded much earlier than in Indonesia due to American colonization and continued military and economic presence. Thus, ‘taglish’ has a more neutral connotation than *sok Inggris* in Indonesia. However, the term *conyo* is used with a more negative connotation. It refers to upper and upper-middle-class Filipino youth who are heard and seen by other upper-middle-class Filipino ‘listening subjects’ (Inoue, 2003) as possessing ‘mixed’ semiotic features, which include perceived excessive use of Taglish and bodily movements (Reyes, 2017a). Reyes notes that no Filipino identifies themselves as ‘conyo,’ yet they appear to be seen and heard by other listening subjects who reportedly live among them. Reyes argues that the term has emerged due to anxieties resulting from a post-colonial history that privileged the ‘mestizo’ (mixed) elite with greater access to economic and symbolic resources, including access to inner circle varieties of English.

Similar trends appear in Indonesia with the phrase *sok Inggris* and the term *anak Jaksel* (*South Jakarta kid*), which can be seen as the Indonesian equivalent of *conyo*, where urban youth’s semiotic practices are associated with socioeconomic status and ‘mixedness.’ While the invention of the term *anak Jaksel* has yet to be discussed critically in academic literature, many news articles

and opinion pieces report on it as a linguistic phenomenon (e.g., CNN Indonesia, 2018; Hikmatika, 2018; Kakisina, 2021; Nurdiansih, 2018), frequently citing instances of code-mixing and the use of phrases such as ‘which is’ and ‘literally’ in everyday speech. The effects of terms such as *sok Inggris* and *anak Jaksel* may contribute to the association of English with foreign and anti-national values while at the same time promoting the economic status of English by linking its usage to Indonesians of higher educational and socioeconomic backgrounds. In order to address language attitudes and the symbolic statuses of language practices, policies must focus on changing conditions that lead to such attitudes in the first place.

DISCUSSION OF THE MAIN THEMES

Language Policies in Indonesia

Zein (2020) reports that the current administration is working to move English education towards the campaign of ‘character building’ to build stronger national and international identities among Indonesian citizens. He argues that this may indicate the movement of English education away from the ‘native’ inner circle varieties and towards an Indonesian English more suitable for an Indonesian national context. However, it is yet to be seen if the administration’s educational policies will entirely shift away from inner-circle varieties. While Indonesianized English may include phonological, grammatical, and cultural classroom barriers for students in the classroom, standardized Indonesian English might only reestablish social hierarchies connected to language access, ethnicity, and class (Makoni & Pennycook, 2006; Zentz, 2012). Nevertheless, this move by the government indicates a possibility for more inclusive, relevant, and nationally appropriate learning materials in the English classroom.

However, according to the state, English is still viewed as not belonging to Indonesia and Indonesians. Zein (2020) cites a government regulation passed in 2014 that identifies all languages other than *Bahasa Indonesia* and ‘indigenous’ languages as foreign. It is an issue that will likely have to be addressed soon if the country wants to promote English as a lingua franca (Zacharias, 2014; Zein, 2018a, 2018b) and combat Eurocentrism in English education. As mentioned above, one issue that has often occurred in Indonesian education policy is the replacement of *Bahasa Daerah* (regional language) courses with English ones. Even in schools where the regional language is taught for two hours a week, the amount of time is not enough to give students adequate exposure and practice (Ewing, 2014), and classes tend to focus only on the standardized prestige

form of the language which may be quite different from students' daily linguistic practices (Arps, 2010; Zentz, 2012). If only H varieties are taught, students may learn to associate their mother tongue with academic performance (e.g., Smith-Christmas, 2017; Zentz, 2012) rather than a local cultural expression of one's identity. School curriculums and teachers must allow for more inclusive linguistic practices in the classroom. It can be accomplished by encouraging students to participate in a practice that many of them often already do in their daily lives, translanguaging.

The Translanguaging Shift

Within the past two decades, scholars have begun to rethink fundamental assumptions in linguistics and applied linguistics (Pennycook, 2001) and seek ways to decolonize the field from the 'northern gaze' which has historically marginalized people and people's linguistic practices in the Global South (Pennycook & Makoni, 2019). Not only did the invention of languages as a colonial project foreground many of the language issues many countries are facing today (Makoni & Mashiri, 2006; Makoni & Pennycook, 2006), the scientific conception of language as an object in the establishment of the field of linguistics led to flawed assumptions about linguistic processes and the erasure of and discrimination against diverse linguistic practices among marginalized communities (Thorne & Lantolf, 2006). For instance, linguistic practices perceived as 'mixed' are often described as creoles, pidgins, or mixed languages to deny marginalized speakers' ownership of dominant languages. Makoni & Pennycook (2006) argue that this categorization is flawed and contest that, in reality, "all languages are creoles."

In the past two decades, scholars in critical applied linguistics have begun to examine the problems of many conventions and assumptions traditionally given as fundamental to linguistics (Makoni & Pennycook, 2006; Pennycook, 2001; Pennycook & Makoni, 2019). Labeling linguistic practices as 'mixed' or deviant from standard varieties can have real social consequences for marginalized groups (Flores & Rosa, 2015; Johnson et al., 2022; Otheguy & Stern, 2011). For example, Otheguy & Stern (2011) argue that the term 'Spanglish' should be discarded entirely from academic discourse as it "deprives the North American Latino community of a major resource in this globalized world: mastery of a world language."

One new theoretical perspective that has emerged from critical applied linguistics to challenge hegemonic linguistic conventions is translanguaging (García & Wei, 2014). Translanguaging can be seen as language use that seeks effective communication and cooperation at an individual level

while ignoring the political and linguistic boundaries established by nation-states (Otheguy et al., 2015). Translanguaging is defined by Vogel, S., & García (2017) as:

... a theoretical lens that offers a different view of bilingualism and multilingualism. The theory posits that rather than possessing two or more autonomous language systems, as has been traditionally thought, bilinguals, multilinguals, and indeed, all users of language, select and deploy particular features from a unitary linguistic repertoire to make meaning and to negotiate particular communicative contexts.

Translanguaging is distinguished from terms such as ‘code-switching’ and ‘code-mixing,’ as the latter terms assume a belief in languages as separate objects that are not influenced by each other. At the same time, the former sees language as a dynamic and communicative process where participants draw on their ‘linguistic repertoires’ to convey meaning and manage social relationships. Translanguaging also presumes multilingualism as the norm rather than monolingualism. Vogel and Garcia note that theories on translanguaging have significant implications, especially in education, where languages have been and continue to be taught monolingually. They also note other areas where theories of translanguaging can be applied, such as in translation. They suggest it can help understand and explain “all the multimodalities that form part of users’ semiotic meaning-making repertoire.” Nevertheless, some scholars have skepticism towards the shift and perhaps overenthusiasm for translanguaging theories. Kubota (2016) and Flores (2013) expressed concern of translanguaging discourse being used for neoliberal ‘profit’ (Duchêne, A., & Heller, 2012) means. Canagarajah (2017) responded to this criticism arguing that by definition, translanguaging itself can never be thoroughly co-opted and manipulated for profit interests since the foundations of translanguaging theory go against capitalist objectives of mere efficiency and standardization.

Nevertheless, obstacles do appear in the implementation of translanguaging in the classroom. One concern brought up by Canagarajah (2012) is that teachers and schools still must deal with traditional conventions on language testing and writing, which tend to require the use of one standard language. Allowing for an “anything goes” approach in the classroom where students can use any language variety in all activities in assignments is currently not feasible in most classrooms worldwide. However, Cangarajah suggests that teachers can allow for and encourage some translingual practices in the classroom, pushing schools towards “pluralization of academic literacy and classroom discourse,” which could make education more inclusive for minority language speakers.

Translanguaging is perhaps the most widely discussed in the field of language education. Although discussion on translanguaging is not limited exclusively to the education domain, it has great potential to influence linguistic practices in the classroom and how students view language. Some initiatives on translanguaging teaching methods in the classroom have already begun. Zavala (2015) shows a study in Peru where students (many of whom are of Quechuan descent) living in urban areas are enrolled in a Quechua course. Quechua is one of two indigenous languages spoken in Peru, and its speakers have often been marginalized and associated with ruralness. In Peru, Spanish is the dominant H variety. Like indigenous languages in Indonesia, the indigenous language Quechua use is low or absent among many urban youths, while those living in rural areas still maintain high proficiency. Zavala studies the linguistic practices of three teachers but highlights the teaching methods of one teacher in particular who uses translanguaging methods with her students. The Quechua classes are filled with a mix of students with varying proficiencies in the language. To include all students in the activities, one teacher uses both Spanish and Quechua in class and allows students to respond to the teacher using either or both languages while still encouraging the use of Quechua. It allowed the students to use their entire linguistic repertoire in the classroom and be equally included regardless of their proficiency levels. Zavala also reported that after the observation period, some older family members of students were pleased to see their children beginning to speak Quechua more often. This teacher's linguistic practices appeared to affect the students' language attitudes, especially toward their indigenous language. These findings are relevant to the context of Indonesia and could address the issues of much urban youth who are reported to be increasingly shifting away from local languages to Indonesian (Anderbeck, 2015; Cohn & Ravindranath, 2014; Smith-Hefner, 2009) and tend to not speak indigenous languages in class for fear of ridicule and disappointment from teachers and older community members (Zentz, 2012).

Some classroom studies have found similar findings to Zavala (2015) in teaching English to Indonesian students. Cahyani, H., de Courcy, M., & Barnett (2018) studied the code-switching practices of lecturers in business and economic classrooms at Politeknik Negeri Malang. The researchers found that the lecturers code-switched to English for a variety of purposes which included: making sure students understood the material, especially in instances where cultural differences occurred, creating social distance or closeness between students, and expressing emotions that the lecturers felt may otherwise appear awkward or inappropriate if spoken in

Bahasa Indonesia. The first point, ensuring comprehension of classroom materials, is very important in tertiary education contexts where in many cases, learning materials are provided chiefly or only in English, which is often a result of universities' pursuit of internationalization (Zentz, 2012). Without translating texts into *Bahasa Indonesia*, many students may rely on using Google translate or consult with friends to seek help with understanding classroom materials. Thus, clarification of materials and concepts by lecturers in Indonesian and local languages through translanguaging can be quite crucial in many academic situations for ensuring students' success.

In another study, Rasman (2018) examines the translanguaging practices of middle school students who are instructed to review for their upcoming English exam. The teacher puts no restrictions on the languages they can use. What is found in this case is that the students often used Indonesian and Javanese to 'scaffold' each other in checking their answers. Using the students' more dominant language(s) helps them comprehend the questions and catch each other's mistakes. On the other hand, Rasman notes hegemonic language attitudes that emerge from this exercise. In a few instances, the students speak Javanese and use Javanized pronunciation of English words for a humorous effect. The author argues that this reflects socio-political attitudes which view indigenous languages such as Javanese as inappropriate to be spoken in the classroom and promote the idea that students should strive for more inner circle 'native-like' pronunciations. It is an important finding for the teaching of English in Indonesia as well as addressing language attitudes. Teachers, schools, and local communities need to be aware of students' and teachers' language attitudes and how these attitudes may be challenged, such as through translanguaging strategies found in Zavala's (2015) study.

With promising results from emerging research on translanguaging practices, how can more inclusive language policies be implemented on a broader scale in Indonesia? Zein (2020) provides some directions that local governments can take up. He suggests seven types of models in which local communities can approach their language education approaches. These include a different emphasis on different language categories, such as indigenous languages, regional lingua francas, and heritage languages. Some prioritize instruction in indigenous languages, while others focus on regional lingua-francas or foreign languages such as English and Arabic. All include Indonesian in the classroom to promote national identity, and most include at least some recognition or assistance in indigenous languages. Zein's suggestions are a good start for (re)planning Indonesian

language education. They appear to be the most feasible under the current socio-political situation in Indonesia.

Nevertheless, the success of implementing these models will fall primarily on local communities. As Subhan Zein (2020) and other scholars have noted, many schools are understaffed and under-trained in language teaching (Sneddon, 2003), especially in the teaching of indigenous languages and English (Zentz, 2012). The focus of English education cannot be simply on the language itself (Zentz, 2012). For the teaching of indigenous languages to be implemented successfully, local universities must develop teacher training programs that acknowledge the diverse linguistic practices of Indonesians and not only focus on teaching the literary and prestige varieties. As for learning materials, funding, training, and resources should be allocated to schools to develop their textbooks and classroom activities that are better suited for local contexts since national textbooks may provide inadequate information on local knowledge, cultures, and traditions and have, at times shown to provide poor representations of local cultures and women (Damayanti, 2014; Hermawan & Lia, 2012; Sari, 2011).

The proper implementation of funding, resources, and training can significantly impact teachers' capacities to promote multimodal learning and translanguaging in the classroom, which in turn can significantly influence students' attitudes toward languages and their own language practices and help maintain linguistic diversity. However, all these efforts must be taken with caution as these policies and the concepts of translanguaging are prone to co-option, which may weaken their effectiveness in battling language inequality (Jaspers, 2018; Pennycook & Makoni, 2019). Pennycook, A., & Makoni (2019) remind us that some of the most influential work on translanguaging by García (2009) and García & Wei (2014) has always been political and aimed at decolonization. Translanguaging cannot fall into the same trap of being depoliticized and commodified that occurred with bilingual education (Flores, 2013a); (Mena & García, 2021). Language education must go beyond prescribing the standard forms if it is aiming to empower local communities. It should challenge the eurocentrism in English studies that associates 'native speakers' with inner circle countries and the white European/American. It should also challenge the notion that local languages are inappropriate in academic settings (Rasman, 2018). Finally, language pedagogy and policy must promote diverse linguistic practices in the classroom and challenge sociolinguistic hierarchies so that students may find greater pride and confidence in their local identities (Zavala, 2015).

CONCLUSION

The invention of languages and the nation-state has profoundly impacted how linguistic practices are viewed and mediated. In Indonesia, language policies that once aimed to promote proficiency in one language have moved towards promoting multilingualism, making some progress for local languages, yet, so far, only to commodify and standardize their practices and cultures. On the other hand, it has been reported that speakers of indigenous languages continue to decline, with speakers increasingly shifting towards *Bahasa Indonesia* and regional lingua francas. Attitudes towards language use Indonesia still believes in the separate use of languages, especially of ‘national’ and ‘foreign’ languages such as English. With the loosening of language restrictions following the beginning of the *reformasi* era, and the body of research on critical applied linguistics and translanguaging advocating for more inclusive perspectives and policies on language use, attitudes towards code-mixing appear to be becoming increasingly tolerant. However, resistance to translingual practices still occurs in governmental and classroom policies and reported comments from *netizens* (Indonesian internet users). In order for linguistic diversity in Indonesia to thrive in an increasingly globalizing world, language policies and ‘policy makers’ need to find ways to give more space for languages in Indonesia, such as providing online programs that use the speakers’ native language(s), classroom activities that deformatize testing, and exercises that encourage students critically look at the status of their language(s) and language practices. These implementations may succeed more if they are implemented in tandem with national and religious values, such as adapting English teaching to fit the needs of Islamic schools.

Further studies on translanguaging pedagogy are needed within various local contexts throughout Indonesia. Teaching methods that work well in a major Javanese city may not be able to be applied in other parts of Indonesia with different sociolinguistic dynamics. Without efforts toward more inclusive language policies, language diversity in Indonesia is projected to die out. Promoting translingual practices on a broader scale in Indonesia will not be an easy task. As mentioned, it risks becoming co-opted for other purposes, but implementing these language policies is essential for the vitality of linguistic diversity and for the equality of Indonesians who face linguistic marginalization. However, these language policies and pedagogical implementations must constantly be reevaluated and changed based on the needs of local communities. They must work to decentralize the power of inner circle varieties of English and empower those most marginalized by linguistic imperialism and other social inequalities.

REFERENCES

- Anderbeck, K. (2015). Portraits of language vitality in the languages of Indonesia. In I. W. Arka, N. L. N. S. Malini, & I. A. A. Puspani (Eds.), *Language documentation and cultural practices in the Austronesian world* (pp. 19–47). Pacific Linguistics.
- Anderson, B. (2006). *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. Verso.
- Arps, B. (2010). Terwujudnya bahasa Using di Banyuwangi dan peranan media elektronik di dalamnya (selayang pandang, 1970–2009). In Mikihiro Moriyama & M. Budiman (Eds.), *Geliat bahasa selaras zaman: perubahan bahasa-bahasa di Indonesia pasca-Orde Baru* (pp. 225–248). Kepustakaan Populer Gramedia.
- Aspinall, E. (2018). Democratization: Travails and achievements. In *Routledge Handbook of Contemporary Indonesia* (pp. 83–94). Routledge.
- Badan Pemeriksa Keuangan Republik Indonesia. (2009). *Undang-undang (UU) tentang Bendera, Bahasa, dan Lambang Negara, serta Lagu Kebangsaan* (No. 24). LN. 2009/ No.109 , TLN NO. 5035, LL SETNEG : 29 HLM. <https://peraturan.bpk.go.id/Home/Details/38661/uu-no-24-tahun-2009>
- Bening, E. (2020). *Malas Belajar Bahasa Inggris Tapi Rajin Ngatain Sok Inggris—#KomentarNetizen 10*. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6--Bp9D8EAg>
- Bjork, C., & Raihani, R. (2018). Moving towards the stability: Development of the Indonesian education system. In *Routledge handbook of contemporary Indonesia* (pp. 68–79). Routledge.
- Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power*. Harvard University Press.
- Cahyani, H., de Courcy, M., & 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>
- Canagarajah, S. (2012). *Translingual practice: Global Englishes and cosmopolitan relations*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203073889>
- Canagarajah, S. (2017). Translingual practices and neoliberal policies. In *Translingual practices and neoliberal policies* (pp. 1–66). Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-41243-6_1
- CNN Indonesia. (2018). *Fenomena campur aduk “Bahasa anak Jaksel.”* CNN Indonesia. <https://www.cnnindonesia.com/gaya-hidup/20180919154522-282-331461/fenomena-campur-aduk-bahasa-anak-jaksel>
- Cohn, A. C., & Ravindranath, M. (2014). Local languages in Indonesia: Language maintenance or language shift. *Linguistik Indonesia*, 32(2), 131–148. <https://doi.org/10.26499/li.v32i2.22>
- Connors, T. J. (2008). *Tengger Javanese*. Yale University.
- Costa, J. (2013). Language endangerment and revitalisation as elements of regimes of truth: Shifting terminology to shift perspective. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 34(4), 317–331. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2013.794807>
- Damayanti, I. L. (2014). Gender construction in visual images in textbooks for primary school students. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 3(2), 100–116. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v3i2.272>

- Dewi, A. (2017). The English(es) to teach after study and life in Australia: a study of Indonesian English language educators. *Asian Englishes*, 19(2), 128–147. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13488678.2017.1279762>
- Djenar, D. N. (2008). On the development of a colloquial writing style: Examining the language of Indonesian teen literature. *Bijdragen Tot de Taal-, Land- En Volkenkunde / Journal of the Humanities and Social Sciences of Southeast Asia*, 164(2), 238–268. <https://doi.org/10.1163/22134379-90003658>
- Duchêne, A., & Heller, M. (Ed.). (2012). *Language in late capitalism: Pride and profit*. Routledge.
- Ewing, M. C. (2014). Language endangerment in Indonesia. *International Journal of Education*, 8(1), 12–22. <https://www.learntechlib.org/p/208949/>
- Farhana, N. (2021). *SOK INGGRIS? Maybe you are*. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4VrxPXV06oM&t=121s>
- Farisi, B. A. (2020). *Di-bully “Sok Inggris”, Boy William sebut juga ingin pukul diri sendiri*. <https://www.kompas.com/hype/read/2020/11/30/134742766/di-bully-sok-inggris-boy-william-sebut-juga-ingin-pukul-diri-sendiri?page=all>
- Flores, N. (2013a). The unexamined relationship between neoliberalism and plurilingualism: A cautionary tale. *TESOL Quarterly*, 47(3), 500–520. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.114>
- Flores, N. (2013b). Silencing the subaltern: Nation-state/colonial governmentality and bilingual education in the United States. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, 10(4), 263–287. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15427587.2013.846210>
- Flores, N., & Rosa, J. (2015). Undoing appropriateness: Raciolinguistic ideologies and language diversity in education. *Harvard Educational Review*, 85(2), 149–171. <https://doi.org/10.17763/0017-8055.85.2.149>
- García, O. (2009). Education, multilingualism and translanguaging in the 21st century. In T. Skutnabb-Kangas, R. Phillipson, A. K. Mohanty, & M. Panda (Eds.), *Social Justice through Multilingual Education* (pp. 140–158). Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781847691910-011>
- García, O., & Wei, L. (2014). Language, bilingualism and education. In *Translanguaging: Language, Bilingualism and Education* (pp. 46–62). Palgrave Pivot. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137385765_4
- Harsanti, H. R., & Manara, C. (2021). “I have to teach The ‘English’ English”: Native-speakerism ideology among the English teachers. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 11(2), 330–340. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v11i2.26379>
- Hermawan, B., & Lia, N. (2012). Traces of cultures in English textbooks for primary education. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 1(2), 49–61. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v1i2.84>
- Heryanto, A. (2006). Then there were languages: Bahasa Indonesia was one among many. In *Disinventing and Reconstituting Languages* (pp. 42–61). Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781853599255-004>
- Higgins, C. (2003). “Ownership” of English in the outer circle: An alternative to the NS-NNS dichotomy. *TESOL Quarterly*, 37(4), 615–644. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3588215>
- Higgins, C. (2009). *English as a local language: Post-colonial identities and multilingual practices*. Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781847691828>
- Hikmatika, N. I. (2018). *Cuitan kocak netizen soal gaya anak Jaksel*.

- <https://inet.detik.com/cyberlife/d-4197222/cuitan-kocak-netizen-soal-gaya-anak-jaksel>
- Inoue, M. (2003). The listening subject of Japanese modernity and his auditory double: Citing, sighting, and siting the modern Japanese woman. *Cultural Anthropology*, 18(2), 156–193. <https://doi.org/10.1525/can.2003.18.2.156>
- Izzati, F. (2021). *Jangan sok Inggris*. YouTube. <https://encrypted-vtbn0.gstatic.com/video?q=tbn:ANd9GcSCwFySJ7liQZhubx-zwesCkjaidHBQh1pKBA>
- Jaspers, J. (2018). The transformative limits of translanguaging. *Language & Communication*, 58, 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langcom.2017.12.001>
- Johnson, D. G., Mattan, B. D., Flores, N., Lauharatanahirun, N., & Falk, E. B. (2022). Social-cognitive and affective antecedents of code switching and the consequences of linguistic racism for black people and people of color. *Affective Science*, 3(1), 5–13. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42761-021-00072-8>
- Jonata, W. (2018). *Prilly Latuconsina ladeni kritik netizen yang bilang dirinya sok Inggris*. Tribunnews.Com. <https://www.tribunnews.com/seleb/2018/08/10/prilly-latuconsina-ladeni-kritik-netizen-yang-bilang-dirinya-sok-inggris>
- Kachru, B. B., Kachru, Y., & Nelson, C. L. (2006). Introduction: The world of world Englishes. In B. B. Kachru, Y. Kachru, & C. L. Nelson (Eds.), *The handbook of world Englishes* (pp. 1–16). Blackwell Publishing Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470757598>
- Kakisina, J. (2021). *Bahasa slang anak-anak muda Jaksel*. Kompasiana.Com. <https://www.kompasiana.com/jeniferkakisina2377/61813cfb8777f608ff616402/bahasa-slang-anak-anak-muda-jaksel>
- Kubota, R. (2016). The multi/plural turn, postcolonial theory, and neoliberal multiculturalism: Complicities and implications for applied linguistics. *Applied Linguistics*, 37(4), 474–494. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amu045>
- Kubota, R., & Fujimoto, D. (2013). Racialized native speakers: Voices of Japanese American English language professionals. In *Native-Speakerism in Japan* (pp. 196–206). Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781847698704-018>
- Lamb, M., & Coleman, H. (2008). Literacy in English and the transformation of self and society in post-Soeharto Indonesia. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 11(2), 189–205. <https://doi.org/10.2167/beb493.0>
- Makoni, S., & Mashiri, P. (2006). Critical historiography: Does language planning in Africa need a construct of language as part of its theoretical apparatus? In *Disinventing and Reconstituting Languages* (pp. 62–89). Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781853599255-005>
- Makoni, S., & Pennycook, A. (Eds.). (2006). *Disinventing and Reconstituting Languages*. Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781853599255>
- Manara, C. (2014). “That’s what worries me”: Tensions in English language education in today’s Indonesia. *International Journal of Innovation in English Language Teaching and Research*, 3(1), 21–35. <https://www.proquest.com/openview/76a9230651c64a3e33212fa859bd043d/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=2034865>
- Martin, N. (2017). *Bahasa gado-gado in Indonesian popular texts: Expanding indonesian identities through code-switching with English* [The University of Wisconsin-Madison]. <https://www.proquest.com/openview/ac8abdc14545e6d8c94be80c306c6d2/1?pq->

origsite=gscholar&cbl=18750

- Mena, M., & García, O. (2021). 'Converse racialization' and 'un/marking' language: The making of a bilingual university in a neoliberal world. *Language in Society*, 50(3), 343–364. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404520000330>
- Mendoza-Denton, N. (2011). The semiotic Hitchhiker's guide to creaky voice: Circulation and gendered hardcore in a Chicana/o gang persona. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 21(2), 261–280. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1548-1395.2011.01110.x>
- Nurdiarsih, F. (2018). *Kolom bahasa: Gaya bahasa anak Jaksel, cuma tren atau keruwetan berpikir?* Liputan6.Com. <https://www.liputan6.com/citizen6/read/3643014/kolom-bahasa-gaya-bahasa-anak-jaksel-cuma-tren-atau-keruwetan-berpikir>
- Nurhayati, E. (2013). Strategi pemertahanan bahasa Jawa di propinsi Daerah Istimewa Yogyakarta. *LITERA*, 12(1), 159–166. <https://doi.org/10.21831/ltr.v12i01.1338>
- Otheguy, R., García, O., & Reid, W. (2015). Clarifying translanguaging and deconstructing named languages: A perspective from linguistics. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 6(3), 281–307. <https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2015-0014>
- Otheguy, R., & Stern, N. (2011). On so-called Spanglish. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 5(1), 85–100. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1367006910379298>
- Pennycook, A. (2001). *Critical applied linguistics: A critical introduction*. Routledge.
- Pennycook, A., & Makoni, S. (2019). *Innovations and challenges in applied linguistics from the global south*. Routledge.
- Piller, I., & Cho, J. (2013). Neoliberalism as language policy. *Language in Society*, 42(1), 23–44. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404512000887>
- Quinn, G. (2012). Emerging from dire straits: Post-New Order developments in Javanese language and literature. In K. Foulcher, M. Moriyama, & M. Budiman (Eds.), *Words in Motion. Language and Discourse in Post-New Order Indonesia*. National University of Singapore Press.
- Rasman, R. (2018). To translanguage or not translanguage? The multilingual practice in an Indonesian EFL classroom. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 7(3), 687–694. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v7i3.9819>
- Reyes, A. (2017a). Ontology of fake: Discerning the Philippine elite. *Signs and Society*, 5(S1), S100–S127. <https://doi.org/10.1086/690067>
- Reyes, A. (2017b). Inventing postcolonial elites: Race, language, mix, excess. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 27(2), 210–231. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jola.12156>
- Rohmah, Z. (2005). English as a global language: Its historical past and its future. *Bahasa Dan Seni*, 33(1), 106–117. <https://sastra.um.ac.id/wp-content/uploads/2009/10/English-as-a-Global-Language-Its-Historical-Past-and-Its-Future-Zuliati-Rohmah.pdf>
- Sari, N. T. A. (2011). Visible boys, invisible girls: The representation of gender in 'Learn English with Tito.' *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*.
- Skinnyindonesian24. (2017). *Dovi & Jovi - Jangan sok Inggris x Agung Hapsah x Fathia Izzati*. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dBFcvoXfc14&ab_channel=skinnyindonesian24
- Smith-Christmas, C. (2017). 'Is it really for talking?': The implications of associating a minority language with the school. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 30(1), 32–47.

- <https://doi.org/10.1080/07908318.2016.1230619>
- Smith-Hefner, N. J. (2009). Language shift, gender, and ideologies of modernity in Central Java, Indonesia. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 19(1), 57–77. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1548-1395.2009.01019.x>
- Sneddon, J. (2003). *The Indonesian language*. University of New South Wales Press Ltd.
- Sugiharto, S. (2014). Disentangling linguistic imperialism in English language education: The Indonesian context. In M. Bigelow & J. Enns-Kananen (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of educational linguistics* (1st ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315797748>
- Tapsell, R. (2017). *Media power in Indonesia: Oligarchs, citizens and the digital revolution*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Thorne, S. L., & Lantolf, J. P. (2006). A linguistics of communicative activity. In S. Makoni & A. Pennycook (Eds.), *Disinventing and Reconstituting Languages* (pp. 170–195). Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781853599255-009>
- Vogel, S., & García, O. (2017). Translanguaging. In G. Noblit & L. Moll (Eds.), *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Education* (pp. 1–21). <https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190264093.013.181>
- Wurinanda, I. (2016). *Dianggap sok Inggris, cuek aja!* Edukasi.Okezone.Com. <https://edukasi.okezone.com/read/2016/02/18/65/1315341/dianggap-sok-inggris-cuek-aja>
- Zacharias, N. T. (2014). The relocation of culture in the teaching of English as an international language. In R. Marlina & R. A. Giri (Eds.), *The Pedagogy of English as an International Language* (pp. 129–141). Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-06127-6_9
- Zavala, V. (2015). “It will emerge if they grow fond of it”: Translanguaging and power in Quechua teaching. *Linguistics and Education*, 32(A), 16–26. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2015.01.009>
- Zein, S. (2018a). From EFL to ELF: Implications for teacher education. In S. Zein (Ed.), *Teacher Education for English as a Lingua Franca* (1st ed., pp. 21–40). Routledge.
- Zein, S. (2018b). Setting the scene for teacher education for English as a lingua franca. In S. Zein (Ed.), *Teacher Education for English as a Lingua Franca* (pp. 1–18). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203730522-1>
- Zein, S. (2019). English, multilingualism and globalisation in Indonesia. *English Today*, 35(1), 48–53. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S026607841800010X>
- Zein, S. (2020). *Language policy in superdiverse Indonesia*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429019739>
- Zein, S., Sukyadi, D., Hamied, F. A., & Lengkanawati, N. S. (2020). English language education in Indonesia: A review of research (2011–2019). *Language Teaching*, 53(4), 491–523. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444820000208>
- Zentz, L. R. (2012). *Global Language Identities and Ideologies in an Indonesian University Context* [The University of Arizona]. <https://www.proquest.com/docview/1029837494>