Research Square

Preprints are preliminary reports that have not undergone peer review.
They should not be considered conclusive, used to inform clinical practice,
or referenced by the media as validated information.

Language Ecology among Bajo Students across Home Peer and School Domains in Eastern Indonesia

Khirjan Nahdi

khirjan.nw@hamzanwadi.ac.id

Universitas Hamzanwadi

Hasan Basri

Universitas Hamzanwadi

Jaelani al-pansori

Universitas Hamzanwadi

azhar azhar

Universitas Hamzanwadi

Research Article

Keywords: Bajo, language ecology, home language, peer language, school language

Posted Date: August 10th, 2026

DOI: https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-10184746/v1

License: This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.
Read Full License

Additional Declarations: No competing interests reported.

Abstract

This article aims to explain the linguistic ecology of Bajo ethnic students in elementary schools on Maringkik Island, East Lombok, by examining the link between home language, peer language, and school language in minority spaces. This study departs from the criticism of the deficit approach, which tends to interpret children's linguistic symptoms as interference. Within the frameworks of language ecology, mother tongue-based multilingual education, and schoolscape studies, this study employs a linguistic-ethnographic approach with a case-study design. Data was obtained through student and teacher speech, peer interaction, school language signs, teacher and parent interviews, and learning documentation. The analysis was carried out through thematic coding, language domain-function mapping, and source triangulation. The results showed that the Bajo language remained dominant in the realm of home and intimate solidarity, the Indonesian language was dominant in formal learning and assessment, while the peer language showed a flexible mixed pattern. In addition, the school environment is dominated by Indonesian, while the Bajo language is not represented at the institutional level. These findings suggest that minority spaces in this study are institutional, i.e. when children's home languages are not adequately represented in schools. Thus, the main problem is not interference but the linguistic-ecological imbalance between home and school.

Introduction

Children who grow up in multilingual communities do not come to school as "less" speakers, but as learners who bring a language repertoire of home interactions, peer associations, social mobility, and institutional demands. Therefore, children's language practices are no longer adequately understood solely through the lens of language errors or interference, but need to be understood as part of a living linguistic ecology. In the study of multilingual education, the perspective of language ecology emphasizes the reciprocal relationship between language, speakers, social spaces, and institutions; Meanwhile, research on translanguaging and multilingual pedagogy shows that the use of the entire language repertoire of students can expand participation, strengthen meaning, and support academic engagement in the classroom (Brown, 2022; Prilutskaya, 2021; Conteh, 2024; Decristan et al., 2024). Thus, the main problem in multilingual education is not the diversity of the language itself, but the way schools manage or ignore this diversity.

The urgency of this problem is very felt in basic education, especially during the transition period from home language to school language. Recent literature shows that multilingual children's learning success is strongly influenced by the school's recognition of home languages, teachers' readiness to manage multilingual learning, and the involvement of families as pedagogical partners. Studies have shown that schools often still operate on monolingual assumptions, whereas multilingual families retain language capital, experience, and literacy practices that are valuable for children's learning (Zheng et al., 2021; Peleman et al., 2022; Luo et al., 2025; McInnes et al., 2025; Wessels & Trainin, 2025). In this context, the home language is not a nonacademic residual but rather a source of initial knowledge, an affective bridge, and the foundation for the transition to the school's academic language.

In addition to family, peer interaction is an important factor in the development of children's language competence. Longitudinal research in multilingual elementary classes shows that friendship contributes to the development of spoken language and provides a richer space for language use for both first- and second-language speakers (Bushati et al., 2023). At the same time, methodological developments in research on multilingual children emphasise the need to present children's voices directly, not just through the interpretations of teachers or parents. A more inductive, participatory, and child-centred approach is considered important so that children's language experiences can be understood more fully, including how children themselves interpret their language choices at home, in the classroom, and in networks of friends (Pescha & Sundelin, 2024; Schulze, 2024). In other words, elementary school children's language is a relational, affective, strategic, and contextual social practice.

In the realm of schools, such dimensions appear not only in verbal interactions but also in the linguistic landscape. The study of schoolscape shows that signs, posters, space labels, visual materials, and texts present in schools are not just ornaments, but pedagogical and ideological devices that state which languages are considered valid, valuable, and worthy of appearing in educational spaces (Gorter, 2018; Tódor et al., 2024; Schvarcz & Warren, 2025). A school's linguistic environment can reproduce monolingual dominance, but it can also function as a complementary space to affirm minority languages and bridge the home experience with formal learning. Therefore, the absence of students' home language in the schoolscape is not only a visual issue, but also a question of symbolic recognition and pedagogical justice.

The debate is very relevant for the context of Bajo ethnic students on Maringkik Island, East Lombok. As depicted in this text, Bajo students live in an archipelago social space that brings together home language, peer language, and school language in a complex configuration. The Bajo language is strongly embedded in domestic and community relations, while Indonesian holds a dominant position as the language of instruction and institutional legitimacy in schools. This condition shows that the language problems of Bajo children are not adequately explained by the term "interference". What is more important is understanding how the language of the house, the language of association, the language of learning, and the symbolic environment of the school interact to shape the child's learning experience. In the Indonesian context, findings on the implementation of multilingual education in rural areas also indicate that the main tensions often stem from weak teacher readiness, limited pedagogical resources, and misalignment between policies and classroom practices (Rusdiansyah et al., 2025; Velasco, 2025).

However, there are still a number of gaps in the literature. First, much research on multilingual education has focused on policy, classroom implementation in general, or the vitality of community language, but has not specifically placed elementary school students as the primary subjects experiencing language simultaneously at home, among peers, in the classroom, and in the schoolscape. Second, the study of family, friendships, multilingual pedagogy, and the school language environment is still often carried out separately, whereas for children, the four layers are present as an interrelated ecology. Third, the concept of minorities in many studies still tends to be understood numerically, whereas in educational practice, a sharper situation can emerge, namely, institutional minorities: a language can be strong in local

communities, but it remains marginalised because it does not have a place in pedagogical practice or symbolic representation of schools. Fourth, although cutting-edge research is increasingly emphasizing the importance of children's voices in multilingual studies, empirical research that truly integrates children's experiences with institutional inequality analysis is still limited (Pescha & Sundelin, 2024; Schulze, 2024; Hamman-Ortiz et al., 2025; Veerman et al., 2025).

Based on these gaps, this article examines the linguistic ecology of Bajo ethnic students in elementary schools on Maringkik Island by focusing on the interaction among home language, peer language, school language, and the school language landscape. The study also aims to explain how minority spaces function not solely as spaces for minority speakers, but as institutional minorities when children's home languages do not receive adequate pedagogical and symbolic recognition in schools. By shifting the focus from “forms of child language error” to “ecological relationships between languages in children's learning experiences”, this article is expected to contribute to the sociolinguistics of education, multilingual child studies, and the development of more inclusive primary education in archipelagic regions and minority communities.

Literature Review

1. The Ecology of Multilingual Education: Home Language, School Language, and Peer Language

Recent studies on multilingual education indicate a shift from a deficit paradigm to a resource paradigm. In the deficit paradigm, children’s linguistic diversity is often perceived as a barrier to learning and academic achievement. By contrast, the resource paradigm views students’ multilingual repertoires as pedagogical, cognitive, cultural, and affective resources that can support learning participation and identity development. Multilingualism, therefore, should not be treated as a problem to be corrected, but as a resource that can be organised productively in educational settings (Aronin & Singleton, 2008; Cenoz & Gorter, 2017; Creese & Blackledge, 2010).

This shift is strongly reflected in studies on translanguaging and multilingual pedagogy. Translanguaging allows students to use their full linguistic repertoires to construct meaning, participate in classroom interaction, and connect prior knowledge with new academic content. Creese and Blackledge (2010) show that translanguaging challenges monolingual classroom norms, while Duarte (2019) demonstrates that it supports peer learning and knowledge construction in mainstream education. Cenoz and Gorter (2020) further distinguish spontaneous translanguaging from pedagogical translanguaging, arguing that multilingual practices can be deliberately designed as instructional strategies. Similarly, Prilutskaya’s (2021) review confirms that pedagogical translanguaging contributes to inclusive classroom participation and language development.

However, positive theoretical recognition of multilingualism has not always resulted in inclusive classroom practices. Several studies show that teachers may support linguistic diversity ideologically while still maintaining monolingual instruction in practice. This gap is often caused by limited teacher training, inadequate teaching materials, assessment constraints, and weak policy support (Ganuza &

Hedman, 2017; Sierens & Van Avermaet, 2013). In Indonesia, multilingual education faces similar challenges, particularly in rural and minority-language settings, where Bahasa Indonesia often dominates classroom interaction despite students' complex multilingual realities (Lamb & Coleman, 2008; Zein, 2020). Thus, the central issue is not the presence of multiple languages, but the school's capacity to manage linguistic diversity as a learning resource.

Within this ecological perspective, home language plays a fundamental role in children's learning. The home is the first space where children acquire language, affection, identity, cultural knowledge, and early literacy practices. Studies show that maintaining the home language can support children's sense of belonging, conceptual development, and transition into formal schooling (Hammer et al., 2009; Hoff, 2018; Zheng et al., 2021). Research on family language policy also demonstrates that parents' beliefs, language choices, and literacy practices influence children's opportunities to maintain minority languages while acquiring school languages (Curdt-Christiansen, 2009; King & Fogle, 2006; Schwartz, 2010). Therefore, the family should not be viewed merely as a social background, but as an important pedagogical actor in children's linguistic ecology.

Peer networks are also crucial in multilingual development. Although peer language is often seen as informal or non-academic, studies show that peer interaction can significantly support language learning. Swain et al. (2002) argue that peer dialogue enables children to negotiate meaning and co-construct understanding. More recently, Bushati et al. (2023) show that reciprocal friendships in multilingual primary classrooms contribute to oral language development, especially when peers have moderately different proficiency levels. These findings suggest that peer interaction is a productive space for language practice, identity negotiation, and social participation.

School language, meanwhile, is associated with literacy, curriculum, assessment, authority, and formal knowledge. In many multilingual contexts, it is also the dominant or national language. While school language is important, its exclusive use may marginalize minority languages and weaken the connection between home knowledge and academic learning. Cummins (2007) argues that cross-language transfer supports learning when schools build on students' existing linguistic knowledge. Therefore, an ecological approach must recognize school language as important without positioning it as the only legitimate language for learning.

This framework is highly relevant to Bajo ethnic students on Maringkik Island, East Lombok. These students do not live within neatly separated language domains. Instead, they move across home, peer, and school languages in daily interaction. Their linguistic practices are shaped by family intimacy, peer solidarity, classroom authority, minority identity, and the wider sociolinguistic hierarchy. However, previous studies often examine home language, peer interaction, and school language separately. Few studies analyse how these three domains interact simultaneously as one ecological configuration in the lives of elementary school children. This study addresses that gap by examining how Bajo students negotiate language across home, peer, and school spaces, thereby offering a more integrated understanding of multilingual participation, belonging, and learning in a minority island context.

2. Schoolscape, Institutional Minorities, and Research Gaps

Beyond spoken interaction, children's linguistic ecology is also shaped by the school's symbolic environment. In linguistic landscape studies, the term *schoolscape* refers to the visible presence of language in educational spaces, including school signs, classroom labels, posters, wall displays, slogans, notice boards, and other semiotic resources. These visual forms are not neutral; they communicate institutional language ideologies and indicate which languages are recognised, legitimised, or marginalised within the school environment. Landry and Bourhis (1997), Brown (2012), and Gorter and Cenoz (2015) show that language visibility in public and educational spaces contributes to perceptions of ethnolinguistic vitality, symbolic belonging, and institutional recognition. Thus, the schoolscape can be read as a symbolic map of power relations in education.

Recent studies suggest that schoolscape research has moved beyond the mere counting of signs toward a more critical analysis of how school spaces reproduce or challenge linguistic hierarchies. Dressler (2015), Szabó (2015), and Laihonen and Szabó (2017) argue that school signs can function pedagogically, ideologically, and affectively because they shape how students encounter languages in formal learning spaces. When school walls, classroom displays, and literacy materials are dominated by the official or national language, students may learn that only certain languages are appropriate for academic knowledge. Conversely, when minority and home languages are made visible, the schoolscape can become a site of recognition and inclusion.

The schoolscape, therefore, works in two directions. On the one hand, it may reproduce monolingual ideology by positioning the dominant language as the language of authority, literacy, and success. On the other hand, it may affirm multilingual identity by displaying students' home languages and local cultural symbols. Menken et al. (2018), Dressler (2023), and Tódor and Vukov Raffai (2024) show that multilingual schoolscapes can support the visibility of minority languages and contribute to students' sense of belonging. In this sense, the presence or absence of a home language in the schoolscape is not merely decorative; it is both pedagogical and symbolic. If a child's home language is absent from classrooms and school signs, that absence may suggest the language belongs outside formal education.

Nevertheless, the schoolscape literature still has important limitations. Many studies focus on the form, distribution, authorship, and language choice of signs, but fewer examine how children themselves experience these signs as learners and minority-language speakers. This is a significant gap because children are not passive recipients of the schoolscape. They interpret, negotiate, and sometimes produce the linguistic meanings of school spaces. Participatory approaches in recent schoolscape research have begun to address this problem by foregrounding students' perspectives and agency in multilingual environments (Duarte, 2019; Prilutskaya, 2021; Schvarcz & Warren, 2025).

This issue is closely related to the concept of institutional minority. In educational contexts, minority status should not be defined only by the number of speakers. A language may remain strong in the home and community but still become institutionally minoritised when it is absent from classroom instruction,

assessment, school signage, textbooks, and official ceremonies. This framework is crucial for understanding Bajo students on Maringkik Island. The Bajo language may have strong communal vitality in family and local interaction, yet it can remain institutionally minoritised when schooling is organised primarily through Indonesian as the language of instruction and official representation.

Therefore, four gaps need to be addressed. First, limited research integrates home language, peer language, school language, and schoolscape within a single ecological framework. Second, many studies discuss multilingual communities broadly but do not sufficiently centre elementary school children as the main subjects. Third, the concept of institutional minority remains underdeveloped in island and maritime communities. Fourth, children's voices in minority multilingual settings remain insufficiently foregrounded. Therefore, studying the linguistic ecology of Bajo students on Maringkik Island is important for explaining how home, peer interactions, classroom language, and schoolscape jointly shape children's linguistic participation, sense of belonging, and learning in institutional minority spaces.

Methods

1. Research Design and Participants

This research uses a qualitative design with a linguistic ethnographic orientation. The design was chosen because the purpose of the study was not to calculate the frequency of language use but to understand how ethnic Bajo students use, interpret, and negotiate their home, peer, and school languages in their daily lives. In multilingual language research and education, the ecological and ethnographic perspectives of linguistics are considered appropriate because they allow language to be read as a social practice that is always related to contexts, relationships, institutions, and learning experiences, rather than simply as a linguistic form that is separate from the social life of its speakers (Brown, 2022). The relevance of this design is also growing in rural and multilingual contexts, as shown by research on multilingual education in Indonesia, where language practices in schools are not always aligned with the linguistic diversity of communities (Rusdiansyah et al., 2025).

The research participants consisted of Bajo ethnic students in elementary schools, teachers, and parents of students on Maringkik Island, East Lombok. Students were designated as the primary participants because the research focused on children's language experiences in the home, school, and social spaces. Teachers and parents are involved as supporting participants to help explain how language is understood, organised, and negotiated in the child's two main environments: the family and the school. Participants were selected through purposive sampling because this study requires informants with direct experience of the phenomenon under study and capable of providing contextually rich data.

Table 1
Participant Profile, N = 15

Participant groups	Participant criteria	Reason
Students	1. Bajo ethnic families 2. Registered as an elementary school student on Maringkik Island, 3. Students are grades IV–VI 4. Actively interacting at home and at school 5. Be willing to take an interview	Students were the main participants because the research focused on children's language experiences in the relationship between home language, peer language, and school language. Upper-class students are chosen because they are better able to reflect on their experiences and language choices verbally.
Teacher	1. Teaching ethnic Bajo students directly 2. Have experience teaching in linguistically diverse classrooms 3. Understand the practice of using language in learning 4. Willing to be interviewed	Teachers are chosen to provide information about the language of instruction, communication strategies in the classroom, and institutional views on students' language.
Parents/guardians of students	1. Parent or primary caregiver of the participant student 2. Be involved in the child's daily communication at home, 3. Knowing the language habits of children in the family 4. Willing to be interviewed	Parents were chosen to explain the function of the home language, family communication patterns, and their expectations for the use of Bajo and Indonesian in their children's education.

Selection strategies like this are prevalent in qualitative research because what is sought is not a statistical representation but depth of information, the relevance of the experience, and the direct connection between participants and the focus of the research. Students are the main participants, while

teachers and parents/guardians are involved as supporting participants to enrich understanding of the relationship among home language, school language, and children's language experiences in social and institutional contexts.

2. Data Collection and Research Instruments

Data was collected through semi-structured in-depth interviews. This technique was chosen because it was best suited to exploring the participants' experiences, perceptions, and reasons for their language choices. In research on linguistic ecology, the data needed is not only "what language is used", but also “why the language is used”, “under what circumstances”, “with whom”, and “what does it mean to participants”. Semi-structured interviews are very useful for gaining an emic perspective or an insider's point of view, while also providing space for researchers to explore answers in more depth without losing the direction of the research. Recent methodological studies also confirm that the main value of semi-structured interviews lies in their ability to capture participants' nuances of meaning, position, and reasoning through interactions that remain directed but flexible (Junnier, 2024).

Table 2
Research Instrument

Participant groups	Focus of the interview	Key indicators	Data Destination
Ethnic Bajo students	Language experience at home	Languages spoken with fathers, mothers, siblings, and close family; the situation of language use; Meaning of Home Language	Exploring the function of home language as a language of affection, proximity, routine, and learning activities
Ethnic Bajo students	Language experience in school	The language used when studying, answering teacher questions, asking questions, and doing assignments	Identify the position of the school language and students' experience of the language of instruction
Ethnic Bajo students	Language experience with peers	Language used when playing, joking, group work, and interacting with friends from different backgrounds	Understanding the flexibility of children's language repertoire in peer networks
Ethnic Bajo students	Perception of language	Students' views on the Bajo language and Indonesian; a sense of comfort; The Meaning of Identity	Uncovering the subjective meaning of language for children
Teacher	Language practice in the classroom	Language of instruction, strategies for explaining, language adjustments, responses to students' language	Exploring pedagogical practices and the position of language in learning
Teacher	Views on student language	Attitudes towards Bajo, Indonesian, and mixed languages; Perception of students' language skills	Identify language ideology and the institutional position of language in schools
Teacher	School support for language diversity	Availability of strategies, teaching materials, or policies related to local languages	Understand institutional support for the transition from home language to school language
Parents/guardians	Language in the family	Daily language at home, language when advising, educating, or helping with learning	Exploring the function of home language in the family
Parents/guardians	Educational expectations	Views on Indonesian, Bajo, and children's education	Understanding the family language orientation in education
Parents/guardians	Home–school relationship	Parents' perception of children's language changes after school	Explain the influence of schools on language practice at home

Interviews with students are geared toward language experiences at home, in the classroom, and with peers. Interviews with teachers focus on their views on students' language, strategies for explaining the material, and classroom language practices. Meanwhile, interviews with parents focused on the language used at home, their educational expectations, and their views on the relationship between the Bajo language and Indonesian. This technique was chosen as the only data collection method because the research topic centres on the experience, perception, and social meaning of language. Because of this, interviews are considered more powerful than other techniques that primarily record surface-level linguistic behaviour.

3. Data Analysis

The data were analysed using *reflexive thematic analysis*. This approach was chosen because it provides a systematic but still flexible framework for identifying patterns of meaning in qualitative data. In its contemporary form, reflective thematic analysis is understood as an interpretive approach suitable for research exploring participants' experiences, perceptions, and patterns of meaning, without limiting the analysis to overly rigid categories from the outset. Byrne (2022) asserts that this approach is easily transferable to various research contexts, including educational research, as it allows researchers to work gradually and reflexively in constructing themes. Braun and Clarke (2023) also emphasise that the quality of thematic analysis lies in the transparency of the process, the researcher's reflexivity, and the consistency between the research questions, data, and interpretation.

The analysis flow is carried out as follows. First, all interviews are transcribed verbatim. Second, transcripts are read repeatedly to build familiarity with the data. Third, initial coding is carried out inductively by marking units of meaning related to language function, reasons for language selection, learning experience, relationship with teachers, relationships with peers, and perceptions of home and school language. Fourth, the initial codes are compared and grouped into larger categories. Fifth, from these categories, main themes were developed that explain the linguistic ecological patterns of Bajo students, such as the language of affection, academic language, the language of solidarity, or the language of school legitimacy. Sixth, themes are re-examined to ensure that each theme is truly data-driven and relevant to the research focus. The final stage is to write an analytical narrative that connects those themes to research questions and the context of institutional minorities in schools. Such a gradual structure is in line with recent practical explanations of thematic analysis that emphasise data familiarisation, coding, theme development, theme review, theme naming, and reflective reporting of results (Ahmed et al., 2025).

Table 3
Simulated Data Corpus Design

Data Source	Simulated Amounts
Students in grades IV–VI	24 students
Classroom/subject teacher	6 people
Principal	1 person
Parents/guardians	10 people
Community leaders/elders	2 people
Class observation hours	24 hours
School yard observation hours	12 hours
Photos of the school's language environment	85 photos
In-depth interviews	19 sessions
Student language domain map sheet	24 sheets

Table 4
Plenary Summary

Domain	Dominant Language	Function Notes
Home	Low	familiarity, advice, domestic employment, cultural values
Study at home	Bass–Indonesia	The term school tends to be included in Indonesian
Peer association in the village	Low	solidarity, speed, humour
Peer Relations at School	Bajo–Indonesia–Sasak	Negotiation of Cross-Ethnic Friendship
Classroom teacher instruction	Indonesia	Academic and evaluative functions
Informal re-explanation	Indonesia + local elements	Scaffolding Function
Schoolscape	Indonesia is dominant	official functions; Minimal bass/no visible

Table 5
Speech Data in Communication Domain

No.	Speech Domain	Information
1	The Realm of the House	Mother used the Bajo language when giving domestic advice and organizing housework. Children answer in Bajo, but insert Indonesian vocabulary when saying "homework", "theme book", or "exam".
2	Peer Domain	In the game in the school yard, two Bajo students open an interaction with the Bajo language. As Sasak friends approached, the conversation shifted to informal Indonesian and occasionally took on elements of the Sasak language for humour and closeness.
3	Classroom Realm	The teacher opens the lesson in Indonesian. When some students did not seem to respond immediately, the teacher repeated the instruction in simplified Indonesian, then used a brief explanation that was closer to the student's everyday language.
4	School Language Environment	Of the 85 photos, 71 signs were only in Indonesian, 10 were bilingual Indonesian-English, 3 were Arabic-nuanced, and 1 sign contained non-Bajo local elements. Bajo did not emerge as the school's visual official language.

The data are presented as a representative sample of the overall dataset because they are relatively homogeneous across the two subject classes in this study.

Findings

1. The Bajo Language Remains an Effective and Cultural Foundation in The Realm of The Home

The study's results show that the Bajo language continues to hold a leading position at home. This dominance appears to be consistent in children's interactions with parents, siblings, and other family members, especially in situations involving emotional closeness, such as giving advice, issuing reprimands, making requests for help, and everyday conversations related to domestic work and fishermen's family life. In this context, the Bajo language is not only used to convey messages but also to affirm relationships, maintain familiarity, and pass on family values.

Home language plays a very important role in shaping children's social experiences. The Bajo language functions not just as a language of habit, but as a language of affection, a language of proximity, and a language of local knowledge. Pr1 elaborated that “Bajo language is an emerging identity and pride for locals to hold.” Through this language, the child receives practical instruction as well as insights into family relationships, social ethics, and life experiences related to the maritime environment. Thus, the Bajo language in the home realm needs to be understood as a medium that stores the child's initial experience before he is confronted with the language norms of the school. This is important because it shows that children's language repertoire does not start in the classroom. Children’s language is first formed in the home world, which has its own social and cultural logic. Children’s language is perceived at home; therefore, it is mostly used for daily activities, even at school, where the national language is

taught (Tr3). At the same time, the study shows that Indonesian is increasingly present in household conversations, especially when children talk about school-related matters, such as lessons, homework, exams, or books. The presence of these elements shows that the spachouse's house is not completely insulated from the influence of educational institutions. However, the emergence of Indonesian in the realm of the home does not automatically indicate that the Bajo language is being shifted. The data actually show a fairly clear division of functions: the Bajo language is maintained for intimate relationships and daily experiences, while the Indonesian language is used to name the academic domain that originates from the school. Interesting findings indicate that the Bajo language is not predominantly replaced; it emerges and naturally persists as an identity, not entirely removed in formal situations like schools.

Analytically, these results show that the relationship between Bajo and Indonesian at home is not confrontational, but functional. The Indonesian language enters the house through a specific domain, but it does not take over the affective and cultural functions carried out by the Bajo language. As such, these findings are important because they show that what appears to be a surface-level mixture of language is actually a form of functional differentiation and ecological transition between home and school. The implication for the reading of the results is that the linguistic symptoms of Bajo children are not appropriate to be placed solely in the framework of interference, because what is more prominent is precisely the ability of children to place language in different social functions.

2. The Peer Realm Is the Most Dynamic Repertoire Negotiation Space

Interaction with peers is the most flexible and dynamic domain in the overall linguistic ecology of Bajo students. In interactions among fellow Bajo children, especially in village settings and during daily games, the Bajo language tends to remain dominant. However, when the interaction involves friends from other ethnic backgrounds or concerns school activities, informal Indonesian becomes more prominent. Bajo students seems to practice their language in proper context; they know when to use and how they use it (Pr2). In certain situations, elements of the Sasak language also appear, especially in relational functions such as humour, closeness, or adjustment to the opponent. These findings are important because they show that peerspace is the main arena in which children develop situational language choices. Children do not just use language based on habit, but on a careful reading of the social context they face. The Bajo language is used when internal solidarity and group closeness are paramount. The Indonesian language functions when a more inclusive medium is needed to bridge the diversity of social and ethnic backgrounds. Meanwhile, elements of the Sasak language emerged as needed to foster broader social compatibility in the multilingual context of Lombok.

Furthermore, peer space is not just an additional social setting, but one of the most important arenas in the formation of children's social-linguistic competence. In this space, children learn that language is not just a grammatical system, but a social resource that can be used to get closer, assert identity, or adjust to situations. Thus, language mixing in peer interaction cannot be understood as an aberration. On the

contrary, this phenomenon shows the child's ability to manage the multilingual repertoire flexibly and strategically.

The significance of these findings becomes even more important when they are associated with research on linguistic ecology. If the language of the home indicates the affective base of the child, then the peer domain indicates how the repertoire is tested, negotiated, and expanded in social relations outside the family. Therefore, the peer room needs to be understood as a bridge between the home world and the school world. This is where the child shows that he not only "carries" the language but also actively regulates its use in response to changes in the opponent's speech, topic, and communication goals. These results confirm that the linguistic flexibility of Bajo children is not a symptom of instability, but rather evidence that they live and move in a multilingual ecology that demands adaptive skills.

3. Indonesian Dominates the Classroom, but the Pedagogical Transition from the Home Language Has Not Been Institutionalised

In the classroom, a clear dominance of Indonesian as the language of instruction. Indonesian is used by teachers to open lessons, explain materials, give instructions, manage learning activities, and conduct evaluations. In certain situations, teachers do make adjustments when students do not understand explanations, for example, by simplifying their speech or using expressions closer to the student's daily language. However, these adjustments tend to be spontaneous and do not appear to be part of a structured pedagogical design. These findings suggest that Indonesian functions strongly as the academic language and the language of institutional legitimacy of schools, while Bajo has not yet gained a clear place in formal learning structures. Thus, the main problem in the classroom is not only the language differences among students, but also the lack of a systematic pedagogical bridge between the home language and the school language.

4. The School's Linguistic Landscape Emphasises the Symbolic Dominance of the Indonesian Language and Exposes the Institutional Minority of the Bajo Language

The documentation of the school language environment shows that Indonesian dominates almost all forms of visual representation in schools. Posters, rules, slogans, room names, lesson schedules, and other visual media appear mainly in Indonesian. A small number of elements from other languages were indeed included, but the Bajo language was practically absent from the school's official visual representation. These findings show that the dominance of the Indonesian language occurs not only in classroom learning practices but also at the symbolic and visual levels.

Schools regulate language not only through verbal interaction but also through symbolic landscapes that determine which languages appear legitimate, valuable, and worthy of presentation in educational spaces. In this context, Indonesian acquires dual legitimacy: as a language of learning and as a language of institutional representation. In contrast, the Bajo language remains strong in homes and communities, but does not gain equal visibility in the classroom. Thus, these results indicate that the position of the Bajo language in this study can be understood as that of an institutional minority. The language is not

weak in terms of community, but it becomes weak symbolically and pedagogically because it does not receive adequate recognition in the classroom. Overall, the four results above show that the linguistic experience of Bajo students is shaped by a fairly clear division of language functions, but also by an imbalance between the language used at home and the language legitimised in school. The Bajo language remains strong as a home language and a source of solidarity. The peer realm is the most active space for repertoire negotiation, the Indonesian language dominates formal learning, and the schoolscape emphasises the symbolic dominance of the Indonesian language. These results confirm that the main problem in the context of ethnic Bajo students on Maringkik Island is not language interference in a narrow sense, but a linguistic-ecological imbalance among home, social, and school contexts.

Discussion

In general, this study shows that the linguistic ecology of Bajo ethnic students on Maringkik Island is shaped by a relatively clear division of language functions, but it is not institutionally balanced. The Bajo language remains strong as a home language and the language of intimate solidarity; the peer realm becomes the most dynamic space for repertoire negotiation; Indonesian dominates the classroom as an academic language; and the school linguistic landscape reinforces the symbolic dominance of the Indonesian language through the lack of visibility of the Bajo language. This synthesis emphasizes that the main problem in this context is not language interference in a narrow sense, but rather the unequal relationship between language that lives strongly in the community and language that acquires pedagogical and symbolic legitimacy in schools. In a more analytical framework, Bajo students live in a condition of institutional minority, that is, a situation when the home language remains communally vital, but does not gain equal recognition in the school's learning practices and visual representations. These findings are in line with the view that linguistic ecology is more productively used for reading multilingual education than approaches that focus solely on errors or language mixing (Brown, 2022).

The findings of this study essentially support a number of previous studies that place home language as an important foundation in children's multilingual development. Various studies show that the continuity between home and school greatly determines a child's learning experience, and that home language should not be placed as a fringe language, but as a source of affection, interaction, and early knowledge (Zheng et al., 2021; Peleman et al., 2022; Luo et al., 2025). In this study, the Bajo language was shown to remain dominant at home and to function as the main medium for affection, nurturing, and the transmission of local knowledge. These results reinforce the argument that home language is the basis of a child's social experience before he or she enters formal academic space.

These findings also support research on the importance of peer networks in multilingual children's language development. Bushati et al. (2023) show that friendship relationships in multilingual classes are related to the development of spoken language and provide a rich space for language use. In this study, the peer realm actually emerged as the most flexible space in the overall linguistic ecology of Bajo students. Bajo, Indonesian, and elements of the Sasak language are used strategically depending on the

opponent's speech, topic, and purpose of interaction. Thus, the results of this study reinforce the previous finding that peer association is not just an additional social setting, but the main arena for the formation of children's social-linguistic competence. The difference is that this study more clearly shows how the function of language changes according to the ethnic composition of the opponent and relational closeness within the space of the minority islands.

In the classroom realm, the results of this study are also in line with research on multilingual education in rural areas, which shows that support for multilingualism at the discourse level has not always been reflected in systematic pedagogical strategies. Rusdiansyah et al. (2025) found that multilingual education in rural Indonesia faces policy inconsistencies, limited local materials, and weak teacher readiness. The findings in this study show a similar pattern: teachers do make adjustments when students do not understand the explanation, but these adjustments are still spontaneous and have not yet developed into a consciously designed pedagogical bridge. These findings are also consistent with Prilutskaya's (2021) systematic review, which confirms that *pedagogical translanguaging* will have a strong impact only if it is treated as a learning strategy rather than merely an incidental response to student difficulties. Thus, this research does not contradict the previous literature but reaffirms the same problem in the context of the Bajo community elementary school.

In terms of the school language landscape, the results of this study again support previous research showing that *the schoolscape* reflects language ideology and power relations in the educational space. Gorter (2018) shows that *the study of schoolscape* moves from marking inventory to reading on the legitimacy of language in schools, while Tódor et al. (2024) affirm that the visibility of language in minority schools can be read as an indicator of ethnolinguistic vitality. The results of this study are in line with this view because Indonesian has proven to be dominant not only as a language of learning but also as a symbolic language of schools, while the Bajo language has barely secured visual space. In other words, schools regulate language not only through teaching but also through symbolic representations that mark which languages are considered legitimate.

However, this study also presents important differences compared to some previous studies. Many studies of language minorities tend to start from the category of numerical or demographic minorities. This research shows that the Bajo language is not weak in the local community; on the contrary, it remains strong in the home and in local social relations. What makes it a minority is its institutional position in the school. In this sense, the results of this study offer a different reading: a minority does not necessarily mean a small number of speakers, but it can mean a weak pedagogical and symbolic recognition of a particular language. This distinction is important because the context of Maringkik shows a typical situation: the Bajo language is still alive in the community but is not legitimised in the classroom and *schoolscape*. Thus, what distinguishes this study from many previous studies is the use of institutional minority frameworks to explain the inequities between community vitality and school legitimacy.

This study is also different from studies that are too quick to read language mixing as deviation. The literature on translanguaging and linguistic ecology has long reminded us that the use of a mixed repertoire is often a strategy for meaning-making and social adaptation, rather than evidence of weak competence (Prilutskaya, 2021; Conteh, 2024). The findings among Bajo students confirm this: language mixing at home and in peer interactions is better understood as a differentiation of functions and situational skills. The main differentiator is that this study integrates three main spaces: home, peer, and school, with the *schoolscape* as its symbolic dimension. This integration allows the child's linguistic symptoms to be read as cross-spatial ecological relations, rather than as stand-alone speech data.

This study has several limitations that need to be noted. First, the study was conducted in a single primary school context on Maringkik Island, so the findings are not intended to be generalised statistically to the entire Bajo community or to the broader context of minority education in Indonesia. The strength of this study lies in its contextual depth, but the consequence is a limited comparative range across locations. Second, this research focuses on interviews as the main data collection technique. This option is effective for exploring the meaning, perception, and experience of language, but it does not provide the same level of rigour as long-term observation of naturalistic linguistic practices. Third, because the data were collected over a specific period, the dynamics of longitudinal changes in language repertoire could not be mapped in detail. Fourth, although this study makes room for children's voices, the reflective abilities of elementary school students still have certain limitations, as has also been reminded in the literature about research involving multilingual children's voices (Pescha & Sundelin, 2024; Schulze, 2024).

The findings of this study have theoretical, methodological, and practical implications. Theoretically, this study strengthens the argument that the analysis of children's language in minority communities needs to shift from an interference approach to a linguistic ecology approach. This shift allows the relationship among home language, peer language, school language, and *schoolscape* to be read as a single interconnected system. In addition, the concept of institutional minorities, as demonstrated by these findings, can enrich the study of language minorities, especially in contexts where a language remains communally strong but pedagogically and symbolically weak in schools (Brown, 2022; Tódor et al., 2024).

Methodologically, this study shows the important value of a child-centred approach. The literature on multilingual children's voices affirms that children should not be positioned solely as objects of adult policy or interpretation, but rather as subjects who have their own language experiences and logic (Pescha & Sundelin, 2024; Schulze, 2024). The findings of this study show that when children's experiences are listened to directly, language choices can be understood not only as linguistic behaviours, but also as affective, relational, and symbolic practices. This suggests that further research on minority multilingual communities will be stronger if we develop designs that give more space to children's perspectives, including through a combination of interviews, observations, and visual-participatory approaches.

In practical terms, these findings confirm the need to build a pedagogical bridge between the home language and the school language. Schools should not replace Indonesian as the language of instruction, but need to develop more conscious transition strategies, for example, through tiered explanations, classroom glossaries, bilingual visual support, or planned forms of multilingual pedagogy. These findings also show the importance of presenting students' home languages in the *schoolscape*, because the visibility of local languages can serve as a form of symbolic recognition and strengthen students' sense of belonging to the school. In addition, schools and policymakers need to see families as pedagogical partners who have language capital and experience, not as marginalised parties in children's education. These implications align with research highlighting the importance of home language use, dialogue with multilingual families, and professional support for more consistent multilingual education (Peleman et al., 2022; Wessels & Trainin, 2025; Rusdiansyah et al., 2025).

Overall, the most important implication of this study is that education for Bajo students on Maringkik Island needs to be built on recognition of their multilingual reality. These children are not lacking in language; Instead, they bring rich linguistic resources. The challenge lies in whether schools can turn those resources into legitimate pedagogical and symbolic practices. In this sense, the results of this study provide an empirical basis for developing more inclusive, contextual, and equitable basic education for minority communities across the archipelago.

Conclusion

This study shows that the linguistic ecology of Bajo ethnic students in elementary schools on Maringkik Island is shaped by the complex relationships among home language, peer language, school language, and the school language landscape. The results of the study confirm that the Bajo language continues to function strongly as a home language, a language of affection, and a language of solidarity in the family and community environment. At the same time, Indonesian occupies a dominant position as the language of formal learning and the language of institutional legitimacy of schools. Between these two domains, peer interaction is the most dynamic space because children can flexibly negotiate language choices in response to the opponent's speech, the purpose of the interaction, and the social context they face. Thus, the linguistic behaviour of Bajo students is not appropriately understood solely as a symptom of interference, but rather as a social practice born from the division of language functions in a multilingual ecology.

One of the most important findings of the study is that the main problem faced by Bajo students lies not in the weakness of the home language, but in the imbalance between the Bajo language's communal vitality and its institutional recognition in schools. The Bajo language remains alive and meaningful in local homes and associations, but has not yet gained an adequate position in pedagogical practice and visual representation of schools. It is in this context that the concept of institutional minorities becomes important. The Bajo language is not weak because there are few speakers, but because it is not sufficiently present as a recognised language in learning, assessment, and schoolscape. These findings make a theoretical contribution by shifting the focus of analysis from numerical minorities to

institutional minorities, and from an approach that highlights language errors to one that reads the ecological relationships between languages in children's learning experiences.

This study also confirms that peer language has a very significant role in the formation of students' multilingual repertoire. Peer spaces are not just additional social settings but primary arenas where children learn to adjust, build solidarity, and manage language diversity in practice. These findings show that the language flexibility of Bajo children is a form of adaptive social-linguistic competence. Therefore, the mixing of languages that appear in children's interactions should not be read reducively as a weakness, but as evidence that the child has the ability to move between the various demands of language in everyday life.

Practically, this study emphasises the need to build a more conscious pedagogical bridge between the home language and the school language. Schools do not need to replace Indonesian as the language of instruction, but need to develop a more inclusive strategy so that students' home languages do not end at the classroom door. Pedagogical recognition of the Bajo language, the use of more contextual visual support, and the presence of local languages in the school's language landscape can be the first step toward narrowing the gap between a child's life experience and the academic demands of school. In the context of an archipelagic community such as Maringkik, this kind of step is important so that education does not function as a space for standardisation but as one that connects local identities, children's learning needs, and national education projects in a more equitable manner. Ultimately, this study confirms that Bajo students are not children who lack language but rather children who bring rich linguistic resources to school. The main challenge lies not in the child but in the extent to which the school can manage wealth as a legitimate part of educational practice. Therefore, this study provides an empirical basis for developing primary education that is more inclusive, ecological, and responsive to minority communities across the archipelago.

Declarations

Ethical Approval

This study was reviewed and approved by the committee of the Directorate of Research and Society Engagement, Universitas Hamzanwadi, complying with the ethical principles of the Declaration of Helsinki and Chapter VII of the Universitas Hamzanwadi Research Guidelines concerning Research Ethics, Integrity, and Research Safety. The study protocol was approved in accordance with ethical principles regarding human concern issued by the Directorate of Research and Society Engagement, Universitas Hamzanwadi. The Directorate of Research and Community Engagement at Universitas Hamzanwadi also serves as the institutional body responsible for reviewing and issuing ethical approval for research conducted within the university.

Consent to Participant

Informed consent was obtained from all individual participants (students, parents, teachers) included in the study. For students under 16 years old, informed consent was obtained from their legal guardians prior to their participation in this study. Participation was voluntary, and confidentiality and anonymity were maintained.

Consent to publishing

This study does not include any images of participants to publish.

Funding

This study received funding from the Directorate of Research of Universitas Hamzanwadi.

Data Availability

Due to ethical restrictions related to participant confidentiality, the datasets are not publicly available. All data can be assessed from the corresponding author on reasonable request to khirjan.nw@hamzanwadi.ac.id

References

1. Ahmed SK, Mohammed RA, Nashwan AJ, Ibrahim RH, Abdalla AQ, Ameen BMM, Khdhir RM. Using thematic analysis in qualitative research. J Med Surg Public Health. 2025;6:100198. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.glmedi.2025.100198.
2. Aronin L, Singleton D. Multilingualism as a new linguistic dispensation. Int J Multiling. 2008;5(1):1–16.
3. Bisai S, Singh S. Language visibility in multilingual schools: An empirical study of schoolscapes from India. Linguistics Educ. 2022;69., Article 101046. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2022.101046.
4. Braun V, Clarke V. Toward good practice in thematic analysis: Avoiding common problems and be(com)ing a knowing researcher. Int J Transgender Health. 2023;24(1):1–6. https://doi.org/10.1080/26895269.2022.2129597.
5. Brown KD. The linguistic landscape of educational spaces: Language revitalization and schools in southeastern Estonia. In: Gorter D, Marten HF, Van Mensel L, editors. Minority languages in the linguistic landscape. Palgrave Macmillan; 2012. pp. 281–98.
6. Brown KD. Linguistic ecology and multilingual education. Eesti Haridusteaduste Ajakiri Est J Educ. 2022;10(2):29–47. https://doi.org/10.12697/eha.2022.10.2.02b.
7. Bushati B, Kedia G, Rotter D, Christensen AP, Krammer G, Corcoran K, Schmölzer-Eibinger S. Friends as a language learning resource in multilingual primary school classrooms. Soc Psychol Educ. 2023;26(3):833–55. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11218-023-09770-6.

8. Byrne D. A worked example of Braun and Clarke's approach to reflexive thematic analysis. Qual Quant. 2022;56:1391–412. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-021-01182-y.
9. Cabiles JV. (2025). Languaging the schoolscape: Multilingualism in Melbourne's educational landscapes. *The Australian Educational Researcher*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13384-025-00872-y
10. Cenoz J, Gorter D. Minority languages and sustainable translanguaging: Threat or opportunity? J Multiling Multicultural Dev. 2017;38(10):901–12.
11. Cenoz J, Gorter D. (2020). Pedagogical translanguaging: An introduction. System, *92*, Article 102269.
12. Conteh J. Translanguaging: Process and power in education. Linguistics Educ. 2024;84:101340. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2024.101340.
13. Creese A, Blackledge A. Translanguaging in the bilingual classroom: A pedagogy for learning and teaching? Mod Lang J. 2010;94(1):103–15.
14. Cummins J. Rethinking monolingual instructional strategies in multilingual classrooms. Can J Appl Linguistics. 2007;10(2):221–40.
15. Cunningham C, Little D. (2021). Embracing linguistic and cultural diversity in multilingual EAL classrooms: The impact of a multilingual development programme on classroom practice. System, *103*, Article 102644.
16. Curdt-Christiansen XL. Invisible and visible language planning: Ideological factors in the family language policy of Chinese immigrant families in Quebec. Lang Policy. 2009;8(4):351–75.
17. Decristan J, Bertram V, Reitenbach V, Schneider KM, Rauch DP, Scherer R, Hardy I. Translanguaging in today's multilingual classes: Students' perspectives of classroom management and classroom climate. Teach Teacher Educ. 2024;139:104437. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2023.104437.
18. Dressler R. Signgeist: Promoting bilingualism through the linguistic landscape of school signage. Int J Multiling. 2015;12(1):128–45.
19. Dressler R. Linguistic landscape analysis for educational contexts: Schoolscapes as pedagogy. In: Barakos E, Unger JW, editors. Discourses of multilingualism. Springer; 2023. pp. 69–88.
20. Duarte J. Translanguaging in mainstream education: A sociocultural approach. Int J Bilingual Educ Biling. 2019;22(2):150–64.
21. Ganuza N, Hedman C. Ideology versus practice: Is there a space for pedagogical translanguaging in mother tongue instruction? In: Paulsrud B, Rosén J, Straszer B, Wedin Å, editors. New perspectives on translanguaging and education. Multilingual Matters; 2017. pp. 208–25.
22. Gorter D. Linguistic landscapes and trends in the study of schoolscapes. Linguistics Educ. 2018;44:80–5. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2017.10.001.
23. Gorter D, Cenoz J. Translanguaging and linguistic landscapes. Linguistic Landsc. 2015;1(1–2):54–74.

24. Hammer CS, Miccio AW, Wagstaff DA. Home literacy experiences and their relationship to bilingual preschoolers' developing English literacy abilities. Lang Speech Hear Serv Sch. 2009;40(1):75–86.
25. Hamman-Ortiz L, Dougherty C, Tian Z, Palmer DH, Poza LE. Translanguaging at school: A systematic review of U.S. PK–12 translanguaging research. System. 2025;129:103594. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2025.103594.
26. Hoff E. Bilingual development in children of immigrant families. Child Dev Perspect. 2018;12(2):80–6.
27. Junnier F. Action and understanding in the semi-structured research interview: Using CA to analyse European research scientists' attitudes to linguistic (dis)advantage. J Engl Acad Purp. 2024;68:101355. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2024.101355.
28. King KA, Fogle L. Bilingual parenting as good parenting: Parents' perspectives on family language policy for additive bilingualism. Int J Bilingual Educ Biling. 2006;9(6):695–712.
29. Laihonen P, Szabó TP. Investigating visual practices in educational settings: Schoolscapes, language ideologies and organizational cultures. Apples: J Appl Lang Stud. 2017;11(3):121–38.
30. Lamb M, Coleman H. Literacy in English and the transformation of self and society in post-Soeharto Indonesia. Int J Bilingual Educ Biling. 2008;11(2):189–205.
31. Landry R, Bourhis RY. Linguistic landscape and ethnolinguistic vitality: An empirical study. J Lang Social Psychol. 1997;16(1):23–49.
32. Luo R, Song L, Davis-Hilton A, Surrain S. Parental beliefs and knowledge about dual language learning and education predict children's Spanish and English experiences at home. Early Childhood Educ J. 2025;53:287–98. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10643-023-01594-5.
33. McInnes E, Whitington V, Neill B, Farndale A. Professional learning supporting multilingual children's social and emotional development in diverse Australian early childhood education and care settings. Early Childhood Educ J. 2025;53:779–90. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10643-023-01620-6.
34. Menken K, Pérez Rosario V, Guzmán Valerio LA. Increasing multilingualism in schoolscapes: New scenery and language education policies. Linguistic Landsc. 2018;4(2):101–27. https://doi.org/10.1075/ll.17024.men.
35. Peleman B, Van Der Wildt A, Vandenbroeck M. Home language use with children, dialogue with multilingual parents and professional development in ECEC. Early Child Res Q. 2022;61:70–80. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecresq.2022.05.007.
36. Pescha A-M, Sundelin M. The significance of multilingual children's voices in research. J Early Child Educ Res. 2024;13(1):274–95.
37. Prilutskaya M. Examining pedagogical translanguaging: A systematic review of the literature. Languages. 2021;6(4). Article 180. https://doi.org/10.3390/languages6040180.
38. Rusdiansyah, Gunawan W, Kurniawan E, Hakim MA. Navigating inconsistencies: The challenges of implementing multilingual education policy in rural Indonesia. Social Sci Humanit Open. 2025;11:101601. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2025.101601.

39. Schulze V. Developing and using an adapted mosaic approach to explore children's foreign language learning experiences in primary school. Res Methods Appl Linguistics. 2024;3(3). Article 100155. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rmal.2024.100155.
40. Schvarcz BR, Warren AN. Creating multilingual schoolscapes in restrictive ELT contexts. ELT J. 2025;79(3):395–403. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccaf028.
41. Schwartz M. Family language policy: Core issues of an emerging field. Appl Linguistics Rev. 2010;1(1):171–92.
42. Sierens S, Van Avermaet P. Language diversity in education: Evolving from multilingual education to functional multilingual learning. In: Little D, Leung C, Van Avermaet P, editors. Managing diversity in education: Languages, policies, pedagogies. Multilingual Matters; 2013. pp. 204–22.
43. Swain M, Brooks L, Tocalli-Beller A. Peer–peer dialogue as a means of second language learning. Annu Rev Appl Linguist. 2002;22:171–85.
44. Szabó TP. The management of diversity in schoolscapes: An analysis of Hungarian practices. Apples: J Appl Lang Stud. 2015;9(1):23–51.
45. Tódor E-M, Dégi Z, Runceanu D. Ethnolinguistic vitality in minority schoolscape. Languages. 2024;9(11). https://doi.org/10.3390/languages9110353. Article 353.
46. Veerman E, Danbury E, da Silveira Duarte J, Volman M, Gaikhorst L. A systematic review of empirical studies into multilingual pedagogies and their outcomes in primary education. J Multiling Multicultural Dev. 2025. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2025.2472862. Advance online publication.
47. Velasco YP. The interplay between language ideologies and mother tongue-based multilingual education policy implementation in the Philippines. Asia-Pacific Educ Researcher. 2025;34:765–75. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40299-024-00894-7.
48. Wessels S, Trainin G. From bilingual to biliteracy: Learning from families. Early Childhood Educ J. 2025;53:315–26. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10643-023-01519-2.
49. Zein S. Language policy in superdiverse Indonesia. Routledge; 2020.
50. Zheng Z, Degotardi S, Djonov E. Supporting multilingual development in early childhood education: A scoping review. Int J Educational Res. 2021;110. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2021.101894. Article 101894.