

3% Overall Similarity

The combined total of all matches, including overlapping sources, for each database.

Filtered from the Report

- Bibliography

Match Groups

-  **19 Not Cited or Quoted 3%**
Matches with neither in-text citation nor quotation marks
-  **0 Missing Quotations 0%**
Matches that are still very similar to source material
-  **0 Missing Citation 0%**
Matches that have quotation marks, but no in-text citation
-  **0 Cited and Quoted 0%**
Matches with in-text citation present, but no quotation marks

Top Sources

- 3%  Internet sources
- 2%  Publications
- 1%  Submitted works (Student Papers)

Match Groups

- 19 Not Cited or Quoted 3%**
Matches with neither in-text citation nor quotation marks
- 0 Missing Quotations 0%**
Matches that are still very similar to source material
- 0 Missing Citation 0%**
Matches that have quotation marks, but no in-text citation
- 0 Cited and Quoted 0%**
Matches with in-text citation present, but no quotation marks

Top Sources

- 3% Internet sources
- 2% Publications
- 1% Submitted works (Student Papers)

Top Sources

The sources with the highest number of matches within the submission. Overlapping sources will not be displayed.

1	Internet	ejournal.gomit.id	<1%
2	Internet	repository.usd.ac.id	<1%
3	Internet	e-journal.iain-palangkaraya.ac.id	<1%
4	Internet	ejournal.upsi.edu.my	<1%
5	Internet	wsj.westscience-press.com	<1%
6	Internet	e-journal.stkipsiliwangi.ac.id	<1%
7	Student papers	Robert Kennedy College	<1%
8	Internet	www.diva-portal.org	<1%
9	Internet	jcasc.com	<1%
10	Internet	www.researchsquare.com	<1%

11	Publication	"Linguistic Ethnography", Springer Science and Business Media LLC, 2015	<1%
12	Internet	cdn.juris.id	<1%
13	Publication	Wulida Wahidatul Masruria, Zahra Kholifia Annisa. "Exploring Native Speakerism ...	<1%
14	Internet	docplayer.net	<1%
15	Publication	Renan V. da Silva, João Paulo Z. Narita, Patchanee Vichitbandha, Angsumarn Cha...	<1%
16	Publication	Christine E. Poteau, Carter A. Winkle. "Advocacy for Social and Linguistic Justice in...	<1%
17	Publication	Pham Ngoc Diem. "Enhancing the first- year English majored Students' Speaking ...	<1%

Mobile English in Local Lives: Pre-Service Teachers' Code-Switching, Polycentric Norms, and Bilingual Self-Monitoring Across Translocal Digital Spaces

Yanuaris Yanu Dharmawan¹ Bayu Andika Prasatyo²

¹Universitas Bandar Lampung, Lampung, Indonesia

²Sekolah Tinggi Bahasa Asing Technocrat, Tangerang, Indonesia

Article Info

Article history:

Received 2026-06-18

Revised 2026-06-30

Accepted 2026-06-30

Keywords:

Digital communication

EFL teacher education

Language legitimacy

Self-monitoring

Translanguaging

ABSTRACT

English use in EFL contexts increasingly extends beyond classrooms into digital communication and online platforms, where learners encounter multiple standards and sources of evaluation regarding what counts as “good English.” While previous studies have examined translanguaging and digital language practices, less is known about how pre-service English teachers negotiate legitimacy, confidence, and self-monitoring in everyday communication. This study explored how Indonesian pre-service English teachers use Indonesian–English repertoires across different contexts. Using a qualitative interpretive design, data were collected from eight sixth-semester English Education students through narrative questionnaires and participant-selected artifacts and analyzed using abductive thematic analysis. The findings identified four themes: audience and platform as drivers of language choice, code-switching as purposeful social action, the influence of multiple evaluative standards on confidence and participation, and bilingual self-monitoring through inhibition, rehearsal, substitution, and digital tool use. The findings suggest that teacher education programs should address not only English accuracy but also confidence, feedback culture, translanguaging practices, and digital communication awareness.

This is an open-access article under the [CC BY-SA](#) license.



Corresponding Author:

Yanuaris Yanu Dharmawan

English Language Education Department, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Bandar Lampung, Lampung, Indonesia

Email: yanu@ubl.ac.id

1. INTRODUCTION

English in many EFL settings, especially in developing and non-English-speaking contexts, no longer remains confined to classrooms. Students encounter English continuously through WhatsApp chats, Discord servers, Instagram captions, YouTube videos, and various forms of digital media. Learning English today, therefore, extends beyond completing textbook units or classroom tasks. It also involves navigating different

audiences and communicative spaces where language use is visible, evaluated, and sometimes permanently documented through digital technologies. This everyday circulation of English is closely connected to globalization, through which linguistic resources move across platforms, communities, and institutions and acquire different meanings and values depending on context [1]–[4]. For English language teaching, this means that learning is shaped not only by formal instruction but also by technology-mediated exposure, peer expectations, and the increasing visibility of language performance online. While these conditions create greater opportunities for input and interaction, they may simultaneously increase the social consequences of making mistakes [5], [6]. Recent Indonesian studies demonstrate these dynamics through multilingual identity construction on Instagram, technology-assisted self-directed academic writing, and the role of affective factors such as self-efficacy in speaking participation [7]–[9].

These developments are particularly significant for pre-service English teachers. Unlike many other language learners, pre-service teachers are expected not only to learn English but also to become future models, evaluators, and facilitators of language use. Consequently, they experience English simultaneously as learners, users, and prospective professionals. They participate in university classrooms, prepare for benchmark examinations such as TOEFL and IELTS, and engage in digital environments where English may provide access to opportunities while also inviting evaluation and scrutiny [13]–[15]. Indonesian ELT research further demonstrates that legitimacy pressures already influence teacher identity formation through language investment, professional aspirations, and native-speakerist ideologies [16], [17].

Within these contexts, Indonesian–English alternation, code-switching, and translanguaging are increasingly recognized as meaningful communicative practices rather than signs of linguistic deficiency. Interactional sociolinguistic perspectives suggest that language alternation functions as social action through which speakers signal stance, alignment, participation roles, and interpersonal relationships [38]–[40]. Bakhtinian perspectives similarly emphasize that speakers draw on multiple voices and genres to achieve locally relevant communicative purposes [41], [42]. Contemporary sociolinguistic research further highlights how multilingual speakers strategically orient toward different audiences and communicative boundaries in late-modern contexts [43], [44]. As a result, Indonesian–English mixing may serve functions such as expressing solidarity, creating humor, softening messages, adding emphasis, or negotiating identity. Indonesian studies support this view by documenting translanguaging practices across digital spaces, tertiary education, and social media environments [45]–[49].

At the same time, language choices are not made freely. Broader processes of evaluation and legitimacy shape them. A sociolinguistics of globalization explains that linguistic resources acquire value through circulation and recognition across different contexts [10]. Consequently, speakers often orient simultaneously toward multiple centers of authority—including lecturers, testing systems, workplaces, communities, and digital platforms—under conditions of polycentricity [10], [12], [18]. Linguistic anthropology further shows how particular forms of English become associated with labels such as “standard,” “academic,” or “native-like,” leading some varieties to be valued more highly

than others [23]–[25]. Research on language standardization, language ideology, and linguistic markets demonstrates that perceptions of correctness are closely linked to authority, legitimacy, and access to social opportunities [11], [27]–[31]. These dynamics are especially relevant in teacher education because future teachers must continually negotiate expectations regarding what counts as acceptable or desirable English [16], [17].

Digital communication further intensifies these evaluative pressures. Literacy studies describe reading and writing as situated social practices embedded within networks of people, technologies, and norms [50]–[52]. Because online communication is highly visible and often persistent, multilingual language use becomes more susceptible to evaluation, comparison, and self-monitoring [5], [6]. Indonesian studies show that students increasingly rely on technological tools to support learning, manage writing demands, and reduce perceived risks associated with language performance [8], [33]. Psycholinguistic research complements these findings by demonstrating that bilingual language use involves attentional control, inhibition, and monitoring processes that help speakers manage competing linguistic systems across contexts [58]. Such processes may be reflected in everyday behaviors such as withholding English expressions, rehearsing utterances, switching codes strategically, or relying on digital tools before communicating publicly [8], [58].

Although previous international and Indonesian studies have examined translanguaging, digital communication, language ideology, identity construction, evaluation, and bilingual control, these strands of research often remain disconnected. Existing studies frequently examine either sociocultural processes, such as legitimacy and language ideology or cognitive processes such as monitoring and control. Less attention has been given to how these dimensions intersect in everyday language practices, particularly within digitally mediated environments [10], [11], [30], [58]. Furthermore, global influences are often understood primarily in terms of interaction with international speakers, whereas the role of platform norms, media flows, testing benchmarks, and native-like ideologies as circulating value regimes remains underexplored [2], [4], [14]. Most importantly, Indonesian pre-service English teachers remain underrepresented in research despite occupying a unique position at the intersection of language learning, professional preparation, and public language evaluation [16], [17].

The present study addresses these gaps by integrating sociolinguistic, linguistic anthropological, literacy, and psycholinguistic perspectives to examine how Indonesian pre-service English teachers recalibrate Indonesian–English repertoires across audiences, platforms, and evaluative centers. Rather than focusing solely on language choice or proficiency, the study explores how language legitimacy, confidence, and self-monitoring emerge through everyday communicative practices in both classroom-facing and technology-mediated contexts [45]–[47], [55]. This interdisciplinary focus provides a more comprehensive understanding of how globalized English norms are experienced, negotiated, and reproduced within teacher education.

Accordingly, this qualitative study examines how eight Indonesian pre-service English teachers describe and provide evidence of their Indonesian–English practices across

everyday settings. Drawing on episode-based narratives and artifact-based reflections, the study asks:

1. How do participants recalibrate language choices across audiences, platforms, and perceived communicative stakes?
2. What social functions do participants attribute to Indonesian–English switching in everyday interaction?
3. How do evaluative regimes (e.g., lecturers' expectations, test benchmarks, and native-like ideals) shape participants' confidence and perceived entitlement to speak?
4. What forms of bilingual control and everyday self-monitoring do participants report and enact in these contexts?

The study contributes theoretically by connecting sociocultural accounts of language legitimacy with psycholinguistic perspectives on bilingual monitoring. Practically, it provides insights for teacher education programs seeking to support multilingual competence, confidence, and critical awareness of language evaluation in increasingly digital learning environments. By examining how globalized English norms are negotiated in everyday life, the study offers an empirically grounded account of issues that future English teachers are likely to encounter, reproduce, and teach within their professional practice.

2. METHOD

Research Design

This study employed a qualitative interpretive design to examine how Indonesian EFL pre-service teachers draw on Indonesian–English linguistic resources in their everyday lives and how circulating notions of “good English” influence confidence, self-monitoring, and willingness to participate. The design incorporated triangulation from the outset rather than as a post hoc validation strategy, allowing the phenomenon to be explored from multiple perspectives and generating a richer understanding of participants' experiences [59]. Specifically, the study combined episode-based narratives with artifact-based recall, gathered accounts from multiple communicative spaces and digital platforms, and interpreted emerging patterns through complementary sociolinguistic and psycholinguistic perspectives. The sociolinguistic perspective focused on legitimacy, audience orientation, and polycentric norms, whereas the psycholinguistic perspective emphasized bilingual control, inhibition, lexical access, and monitoring processes [59].

Research Setting and Time

The study was conducted during the second semester of the 2024/2025 academic year at an Indonesian undergraduate English Education program. Data collection took place over four weeks through online platforms, enabling participants to report naturally occurring language practices across both academic and non-academic contexts.

Participants and Sampling Technique

Participants consisted of eight sixth-semester students enrolled in an English Education undergraduate program (coded S1–S8; aged 20–21 years). Participants were

recruited through an invitation distributed to students who met three inclusion criteria: (1) active enrollment in the sixth semester of the English Education program, (2) regular use of Indonesian and English across digital and face-to-face contexts, and (3) willingness to provide narrative accounts and language-use artifacts. They were selected through purposive sampling as information-rich cases capable of providing detailed accounts of language use across academic and non-academic settings. At this stage of study, participants had already been extensively socialized into university evaluation practices while simultaneously preparing for teaching practicum expectations, making issues of legitimacy, evaluation, and self-monitoring particularly relevant to their experiences.

Table 1. Presents a Brief Profile of Participants

Participant Code	Age	Semester	Frequently Used Digital Platforms	Main Language-Use Contexts
S1	20	Sixth Semester	WhatsApp, Instagram	Academic communication and social interaction
S2	20	Sixth Semester	WhatsApp, TikTok	Peer communication and coursework activities
S3	21	Sixth Semester	Instagram, Telegram	Online learning and social networking
S4	20	Sixth Semester	WhatsApp, Discord	Academic communication and online gaming
S5	21	Sixth Semester	Instagram, WhatsApp	Academic writing and social media engagement
S6	20	Sixth Semester	Telegram, WhatsApp	Classroom interaction and peer communication
S7	21	Sixth Semester	Instagram, TikTok	Content consumption and online interaction
S8	20	Sixth Semester	WhatsApp, Instagram	Academic and everyday communication

Data Sources and Research Instruments

The study utilized primary qualitative data obtained from participants' narrative accounts and self-selected language-use artifacts. Two complementary instruments were employed.

First, participants completed an online narrative questionnaire administered through Google Forms. Rather than eliciting general opinions, the questionnaire invited participants to reconstruct recent episodes of Indonesian–English language use, following the principle that experiences are best understood within their specific contexts [60]. Prompts focused on the audience involved, the platform used, the perceived communicative stakes, emotional responses, and the reasons participants switched—or chose not to switch—between languages in particular situations.

Second, participants submitted at least one artifact, such as a chat screenshot or short written excerpt, accompanied by a brief explanation of the context, intended audience, communicative purpose, and rationale underlying their language choices. This procedure linked participants' reflections to observable traces of actual language use and provided an additional source of contextualized evidence [60].

A total of eight artifacts were collected, with each participant contributing at least one artifact. These artifacts included chat screenshots, social media captions, short written messages, and reflections on voice-based interactions. Participants selected the artifacts themselves to ensure that the materials represented language practices they considered meaningful or representative of their everyday experiences. To protect privacy, participants were instructed to remove or blur personal identifiers, usernames, profile photographs, telephone numbers, and any information that could reveal the identities of third parties before submission.

Trustworthiness

Trustworthiness was established through credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability procedures. Credibility was enhanced through data triangulation between narrative accounts and participant-provided artifacts. Transferability was supported by providing detailed contextual descriptions of participants, communicative settings, and language-use practices. Dependability was strengthened through maintaining an audit trail documenting data collection procedures, coding decisions, theme development, and analytical reflections. Confirmability was addressed through systematic memo writing and reflexive monitoring throughout the analytical process.

Data Analysis Technique

All data were anonymized prior to analysis and examined through an iterative abductive thematic analysis process. The analysis proceeded through five stages. First, all narrative responses and artifacts were read repeatedly to achieve familiarity with the data. Second, within-case memos were developed for each participant to summarize key experiences, communicative contexts, and emerging interpretations. Third, first-cycle coding was conducted to identify meaningful segments related to audience orientation, platform use, communicative stakes, language-switching functions, evaluative pressures, affective responses, and self-regulation strategies. Examples of first-cycle codes included “fear of being judged,” “using English for emphasis,” “audience adaptation,” “withholding English expression,” and “using translation tools.”

Fourth, second-cycle coding clustered conceptually related codes into broader analytical categories. For example, codes such as “fear of being judged,” “avoiding mistakes,” and “hesitation before posting” were grouped under the broader theme of evaluative self-monitoring. In contrast, codes such as “audience adaptation,” “platform-specific language choice,” and “context-dependent switching” contributed to the theme of repertoire recalibration. Fifth, emerging themes were interpreted abductively by moving iteratively between empirical evidence and theoretical concepts drawn from sociolinguistic and psycholinguistic perspectives [59]. This process enabled explanations to be refined continuously as new patterns emerged across cases.

A single researcher conducted coding and interpretation. To minimize potential bias, reflexive memos were maintained throughout the analytical process to document assumptions, emerging interpretations, and decision-making rationales. Analytical consistency was further supported through repeated comparison of codes, themes, and

original data sources, as well as systematic attention to negative or low-fit cases that challenged preliminary interpretations.

Ethical Considerations

Ethical procedures included obtaining informed consent, assigning pseudonyms to all participants, and masking identifying information in reported excerpts to protect confidentiality [59], [60]. Participation was entirely voluntary, and participants were informed that they could withdraw from the study at any stage without penalty. All digital files were stored securely and accessed only for research purposes.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1. Result

Overview of Findings

This section presents the findings derived from participants' narrative accounts and self-selected artifacts. Analysis identified four interconnected themes that directly address the research questions: (1) audience and platform as the primary triggers of language recalibration, (2) code-switching as purposeful social action, (3) polycentric standards of "good English" and their influence on confidence and legitimacy, and (4) bilingual control and everyday self-monitoring. Across cases, participants did not describe English proficiency as a fixed personal attribute. Instead, they portrayed language use as a situated practice shaped by audience expectations, communicative goals, platform norms, and perceived evaluative risks.

Participant Characteristics

The study involved eight sixth-semester Indonesian pre-service English teachers (S1–S8), aged between 20 and 21 years. All participants regularly used both Indonesian and English across academic and digital environments, including WhatsApp, Instagram, Telegram, Discord, and TikTok. Although the frequency and purposes of English use varied, all participants reported experience navigating multiple communicative settings ranging from peer interaction and classroom participation to social media engagement and occasional transnational communication.

Table 2. Summary of Themes, Patterns, and Supporting Evidence

Theme	Key Findings	Representative Participants	Evidence Sources
Audience and platform are the main switches	Language choices were adjusted according to the audience, digital platform, and perceived communicative stakes. Participants reported greater use of mixed Indonesian–English in peer interactions and increased monitoring in formal or evaluative contexts.	S4, S5, S6, S7	Narrative accounts, chat screenshots, platform-use reflections
Code-switching as social action	Indonesian–English switching functioned to express intimacy, create humor, soften messages, add emphasis, and manage audience access. Switching	S1, S2, S5, S7, S8	Narrative accounts, chat excerpts, artifact reflections

4320

<https://doi.org/10.58421/gehu.v5i3.1761>

Theme	Key Findings	Representative Participants	Evidence Sources
	was described as a purposeful communicative strategy rather than random language alternation.		
Polycentric standards of “good English”	Participants were oriented to multiple evaluative standards, including lecturers’ expectations, TOEFL/IELTS benchmarks, and native-like ideals. These standards influenced confidence, willingness to speak, and perceptions of linguistic legitimacy.	S2, S3, S5, S6	Narrative accounts, reflections on correction and evaluation experiences
Bilingual control and self-monitoring	Participants engaged in inhibition, lexical substitution, private rehearsal, and tool-assisted language management to reduce perceived communication risks and maintain appropriateness across contexts.	S1, S5, S6, S7	Narrative accounts, participant artifacts, tool-use reflections

Before discussing the four themes, one point is worth emphasizing. Participants consistently described language use not as a stable “level of English” but as situated management of a bilingual repertoire. The same participant could appear confident and expressive in one context yet highly cautious in another because the audience, platform, and perceived consequences differed. Across cases, platform routines, institutional expectations, and circulating benchmarks such as TOEFL/IELTS and native-like ideals remained present as background reference points influencing what participants considered legitimate language use.

3.1.1 Audience and Platform as the Main “Switch”: Moving Across Interactional Scales

Language choice consistently depended on three situational considerations: who was involved, where the interaction occurred, and what consequences might result from a particular language choice. In low-stakes peer interaction, English tended to appear as casual mixing rather than sustained use of full English, often associated with friendship, humor, familiarity, and shared communicative routines. In contrast, higher-stakes settings involving lecturers, interviews, formal events, or non-Indonesian interlocutors encouraged greater monitoring and stronger orientation toward either more standard English or more formal Indonesian.

S5 provided the clearest explanation of this audience-sensitive recalibration. They explained that Indonesian–English mixing felt natural when communicating with friends, particularly when discussing personal feelings. However, interactions with lecturers prompted greater use of formal Indonesian, while communication with non-Indonesian interlocutors encouraged more grammatical and carefully structured English. As S5 noted, changing the audience required adjusting the “level of formality and word choice.” Similar patterns appeared in other participants’ accounts. Several participants reported feeling confident in one setting but hesitant in another, suggesting that language behavior was influenced less by competence itself than by anticipated evaluation.

Platform characteristics further shaped language choices. S4 described frequent participation in Discord communities focused on science fiction and gaming, including

voice-chat interactions with users from different countries. In these spaces, English functioned primarily as a practical communication resource rather than as a performance to be evaluated. According to S4, English became “the normal language for interaction” because it enabled efficient participation within the community. Similarly, S5 described using English through Hoop to communicate with a contact from the Philippines about everyday topics and women’s empowerment content. These examples illustrate how transnational interaction has become embedded within ordinary digital routines.

Even participants who reported limited interpersonal English use remained connected to English through digital exposure. S6 explained that although they had not recently used English in direct communication, they regularly listened to English-language podcasts and practiced reading scripts aloud. S7 reported recording English-speaking videos to monitor pronunciation and speaking progress. These practices indicate that English remained present across participants’ everyday lives, even when direct interaction was limited.

An artifact submitted by S5 further illustrates this pattern. In a message sent to a close friend, S5 wrote:

“It’s okay, aku ngerti kok. Maybe kamu lagi banyak pikiran sekarang.”

In the accompanying reflection, S5 explained that expressions such as *it’s okay* and *maybe* felt more comforting and less formal than equivalent Indonesian expressions. The language choice, therefore, reflected audience awareness and emotional considerations rather than linguistic necessity.

Taken together, these findings demonstrate that participants recalibrated Indonesian–English choices primarily in response to audience, platform, and perceived communicative stakes. Language use was consistently treated as situational risk management rather than a stable personal characteristic.

3.1.2 Code-Switching as Social Action: Intimacy, Humor, Emphasis, and Selective Visibility

Participants consistently described code-switching as a meaningful communicative resource rather than a random alternation between languages. English segments frequently served interpersonal functions, including softening messages, expressing emotions, creating humor, signaling closeness, and emphasizing particular meanings.

S5’s account clearly illustrates this pattern. When responding to a close friend who felt neglected, S5 intentionally mixed Indonesian and English to create a supportive tone. They explained:

“Kalau pakai bahasa Inggris rasanya lebih nyaman untuk menyampaikan perasaan dan tidak terlalu cringe.”

The accompanying artifact reflection indicated that English expressions sounded *“lebih santai, menenangkan, dan ekspresif,”* making emotionally sensitive communication easier to manage.

Humor and playfulness also emerged as recurring functions of code-switching. S8 described using mixed-language expressions to create a relaxed atmosphere during conversations with friends. One example included the expression:

“I don't know, gua juga bingung.”

According to S8, such expressions made conversations feel *“lebih lucu dan santai.”* Similarly, S7 characterized mixed-language interaction among friends as:

“lebih seru, lucu, dan terasa lebih dekat karena memang sudah terbiasa begitu.”

These accounts suggest that English phrases often functioned as stylistic resources that shaped the emotional tone of interaction.

Another important function involved selective visibility and audience management. S1 and S4 reported using English when they did not necessarily want everyone present to understand a message fully. For example, S1 explained that expressions such as “I am confused” and “I’m questioning” allowed communication to remain partially accessible only to those sharing a similar bilingual repertoire. In this sense, code-switching influenced not only meaning but also participation and audience boundaries.

Participants also differed in the degree of conscious planning involved in switching. S2 reported that English frequently appeared “automatically” when interacting with close friends. However, this spontaneity occurred primarily in comfortable environments where evaluation risks were perceived as low. In more formal settings, language choices became more deliberate and carefully monitored.

Overall, the findings indicate that code-switching functioned as a purposeful social action used to manage intimacy, humor, emotional expression, emphasis, and audience access.

3.1.3 Polycentric Standards of “Good English”: Lecturers, Tests, and Native-Like Ideals

A recurring theme across participant accounts was the presence of multiple evaluative standards regarding what counts as “good English.” Lecturers, university assessment practices, TOEFL/IELTS benchmarks, and native-like ideals emerged as important reference points shaping confidence and willingness to participate.

Participants frequently associated lecturers and classroom contexts with evaluation and correction. However, correction was not always experienced negatively. S5 described pronunciation feedback as beneficial because it encouraged further learning and improvement. Similarly, S6 explained that repeated reminders about pronunciation increased motivation to improve despite occasional embarrassment.

Other participants distinguished between constructive correction and personal judgment. S3 explicitly stated that correction was acceptable when it identified mistakes and provided guidance for improvement. However, criticism perceived as judgment of ability had a different effect:

“Kalau dikoreksi saya tidak masalah, tapi kalau dinilai tidak bisa, itu mempengaruhi mental saya.”

S2 reported a similar experience, explaining that being told their English was *“masih kurang”* sometimes reduced self-confidence and willingness to speak.

These findings suggest that confidence was influenced not only by linguistic ability but also by how the evaluation was experienced. Across cases, participants oriented simultaneously toward multiple centers of authority, including lecturers, testing systems, and

native-like standards. Consequently, the same linguistic performance could be perceived differently depending on the context in which it occurred.

The contrast between institutional and informal environments was particularly notable. In digital communities such as Discord, English primarily functioned as a practical resource for participation and belonging. In university-related contexts, however, English frequently became an object of assessment where mistakes carried greater social consequences. Participants, therefore, navigated multiple and sometimes competing standards of legitimacy.

Overall, evaluative regimes shaped confidence and perceived entitlement to speak by transforming some contexts into relatively safe spaces and others into high-risk environments characterized by greater scrutiny.

3.1.4 Bilingual Control and Self-Monitoring: Holding Back, Substituting, Rehearsing, and Using Tools

Alongside external evaluation, participants described substantial self-regulatory activity when managing their bilingual repertoires. Self-monitoring frequently involved withholding English expressions, substituting alternative words, rehearsing language privately, and using technological tools to reduce perceived risks.

S5 provided a clear example of inhibition and substitution. While talking with long-time friends who rarely used English expressions, S5 wanted to say:

“That’s kinda weird tho.”

However, they ultimately replaced the expression with:

“Aneh juga ya.”

According to S5, using English in that context risked being interpreted as showing off or disrupting the group’s preferred communication style. English remained available as a linguistic resource, but social considerations encouraged inhibition.

S6 described a different form of self-monitoring linked to formality and language ideology. During an interview, S6 consciously avoided mixing Indonesian and English and actively searched for Indonesian equivalents of commonly used English loanwords. They explained that maintaining linguistic consistency felt more appropriate in a formal setting where language purity and professionalism were expected.

Other participants used switching strategically to address lexical retrieval challenges. S1 reported occasionally using English when Indonesian words were difficult to recall, allowing communication to continue smoothly. S7 similarly explained that English sometimes emerged spontaneously when Indonesian vocabulary was temporarily inaccessible.

Private rehearsal practices also appeared across cases. S7 regularly recorded English-speaking videos to identify pronunciation difficulties and monitor improvement over time. S6 practiced reading scripts aloud and listening to podcasts as a way of maintaining English exposure outside direct interaction.

Participants additionally reported using digital tools to support language production. S5 and S7 mentioned using Grammarly, spell-check functions, and DeepL to improve grammatical accuracy before sharing written messages. These tools were not viewed as

substitutes for language competence but as resources for reducing uncertainty and minimizing the risk of publicly visible errors.

Collectively, these findings indicate that bilingual control operated as a routine process involving inhibition, substitution, rehearsal, and tool-assisted monitoring. Participants continuously adjusted language choices in response to anticipated evaluation and communicative goals.

Cross-Case Summary

Despite differences in communication habits, platform preferences, and confidence levels, all participants demonstrated audience-sensitive language behavior. Participants who engaged more frequently in transnational digital communication, such as S4 and S5, generally reported greater comfort using English as an interactional resource. In contrast, participants with less frequent interpersonal English use, such as S6, relied more heavily on receptive exposure and rehearsal activities. Nevertheless, both groups reported increased monitoring and caution in contexts involving formal evaluation.

Across cases, audience expectations, platform norms, and perceptions of legitimacy consistently emerged as the strongest influences on language choice. Participants navigated these influences by continuously adjusting their bilingual repertoires according to situational demands.

Summary of Findings

The four themes point to a common pattern. English functioned simultaneously as a resource for participation, expression, and social connection and as a site of evaluation and scrutiny. Participants responded by continually recalibrating their Indonesian–English repertoires across audiences, platforms, and communicative settings. Code-switching served important interpersonal and interactional functions, while evaluative regimes shaped confidence and perceived legitimacy. These pressures, in turn, triggered various forms of self-monitoring, including inhibition, substitution, rehearsal, and technology-assisted language management. Together, these findings illustrate how language legitimacy, digital communication, and bilingual control intersect in the everyday experiences of Indonesian pre-service English teachers.

3.2. Discussion

The findings indicate that Indonesian pre-service English teachers continuously recalibrate their Indonesian–English repertoires across audiences, platforms, and communicative situations. Language choices were shaped not only by communicative goals but also by perceptions of legitimacy, evaluation, and risk. Four interconnected patterns emerged. First, the audience and platform strongly influenced language selection and style. Second, code-switching functioned as a purposeful social action rather than a random alternation. Third, participants were oriented to multiple standards of “good English,” including lecturers’ expectations, standardized tests, and native-like ideals. Fourth, bilingual language use involved ongoing self-monitoring through inhibition, substitution, rehearsal, and strategic use of digital tools.

A central finding is that participants did not treat English as a fixed competence that could be displayed uniformly across contexts. Instead, they adjusted their language practices according to audience expectations and perceived communicative consequences. This finding supports previous research showing that multilingual language use is shaped by contextual demands and interactional goals rather than by stable proficiency levels alone [38]–[40], [43], [44]. Similar patterns have been documented in Indonesian studies of translanguaging, digital communication, and multilingual identity construction, where language practices shift across social domains and communicative settings [45]–[49]. The present study extends this literature by showing how such adjustments occur not only between languages but also between different forms of legitimacy. Participants were not simply deciding whether to use English; they were deciding which form of English felt appropriate, acceptable, and safe in a particular context.

The findings further demonstrate that code-switching served important interpersonal functions. Participants consistently described switching as a way to manage emotional tone, create humor, express solidarity, emphasize meanings, and regulate audience access. These findings support interactional sociolinguistic perspectives that view language alternation as a communicative resource for stance-taking and participation management rather than as a sign of linguistic deficiency [38]–[40]. They are also consistent with studies of translanguaging that conceptualize multilingual repertoires as flexible resources used to accomplish social and communicative goals [45], [54]. However, the present study adds a dimension that has received less attention in Indonesian EFL research. Participants frequently described English expressions as feeling less embarrassing, less emotionally intense, or more comfortable than equivalent Indonesian expressions. This suggests that language choice may be shaped not only by communicative efficiency but also by affective considerations and identity positioning in everyday interaction.

Another important finding concerns participants' orientation toward multiple evaluative standards. Previous research has shown that lecturers, tests, and native-speakerist ideologies influence perceptions of language competence and professional identity [16], [17]. The present findings support this argument but also demonstrate how these standards operate simultaneously. Participants did not orient to a single benchmark of correctness. Instead, they navigated multiple and sometimes competing expectations emerging from classrooms, testing systems, digital spaces, and broader social discourses. This finding extends previous research on legitimacy and language ideology by showing how these pressures are experienced in routine communication rather than only in formal educational settings. The findings therefore support arguments that linguistic legitimacy is polycentric and negotiated across multiple sites of authority [10], [12].

The study also contributes theoretically by integrating sociolinguistic and psycholinguistic perspectives that are often examined separately. Research on translanguaging and language ideology typically focuses on social meanings, identities, and power relations, whereas psycholinguistic studies emphasize monitoring, inhibition, and bilingual control [30], [58]. The findings suggest that these processes are closely interconnected. Participants often inhibited English expressions not because they lacked linguistic knowledge but because they anticipated social consequences. Similarly, language

monitoring was frequently triggered by concerns about legitimacy rather than by linguistic difficulty alone. This observation extends psycholinguistic accounts of bilingual control by highlighting the role of social evaluation in shaping when and why monitoring occurs. Self-regulation, therefore, appears to emerge through the interaction of cognitive processes and socially circulating norms.

A further contribution of the study concerns the role of digital environments in shaping multilingual practices. Previous Indonesian research has documented online translanguaging, social media identity construction, and technology-assisted language learning [7], [8], [46], [47], [49]. The present findings extend this work by demonstrating that digital platforms function not merely as communication channels but also as evaluative environments. Platform visibility, persistence, and audience uncertainty increased participants' awareness of how others might interpret language choices. Consequently, English became both a resource for participation and a site of potential scrutiny. This helps explain why some participants simultaneously sought opportunities to use English while also carefully monitoring how and when they used it.

An issue that deserves particular attention is the relationship between self-monitoring and participation. Moderate self-monitoring can support accuracy, appropriateness, and audience awareness. However, the findings suggest that excessive monitoring may produce unintended consequences. Several participants reported withholding English expressions, avoiding contributions, or simplifying their language because they feared negative judgment. Although these strategies protected social relationships and reduced immediate risks, they may also limit opportunities for language development and participation. This finding highlights a potential danger of legitimacy pressures: when speakers become overly concerned with avoiding mistakes, silence may become safer than participation. Such outcomes are especially relevant in teacher education because future teachers who experience excessive evaluative pressure may later reproduce similar classroom cultures for their own students.

The findings have several practical implications for teacher education. First, teacher education programs can help pre-service teachers understand that English norms are context-dependent rather than universally fixed. Discussions of audience, register, and communicative purpose may help future teachers distinguish between appropriateness and the pursuit of an unattainable ideal of perfect English. Second, lecturer training can emphasize supportive feedback practices that focus on improvement and revision rather than person-centered judgment. Participants consistently responded positively to corrective feedback when it was perceived as constructive and instructional. Third, translanguaging can be discussed explicitly as a pedagogical resource that supports meaning-making, participation, and classroom interaction rather than as evidence of language failure [45], [54]. Fourth, teacher education programs can incorporate reflective digital communication tasks that encourage students to analyze audience expectations, platform norms, and language choices across online environments. Such activities may help future teachers develop critical awareness of how digital communication shapes language use. Finally, reducing excessive native-speakerist pressure may help create learning environments in

which multilingual competence and communicative effectiveness are valued alongside linguistic accuracy [16], [17].

These implications also extend to classroom practice. Teachers can design activities that allow students to experiment with multiple language resources while reflecting on audience, purpose, and communicative effects. Feedback can focus on communicative success and revision strategies rather than exclusively on error identification. Classroom discussions about language variation, multilingualism, and digital communication may further help students understand that language use involves strategic adaptation rather than simple adherence to a single standard. Such approaches may encourage greater participation while maintaining opportunities for language development.

Several limitations should be acknowledged. The study involved only eight participants from a single English Education program, limiting the transferability of findings to other institutional and regional contexts. In addition, the analysis relied primarily on self-reported narratives supported by a relatively small set of participant-selected artifacts. Although triangulation enhanced credibility and consistent patterns emerged across cases, naturally occurring interactional data were not systematically collected. The findings, therefore, reflect participants' interpretations of their experiences rather than direct observation of all communicative events.

Suggestions for Future Research

Future studies could involve larger and more diverse participant groups from multiple institutions to explore whether similar patterns emerge across different educational contexts. Longitudinal research may also examine how legitimacy concerns and language practices evolve throughout teacher preparation and teaching practicum experiences. Researchers could additionally incorporate naturally occurring interactional data, such as consented chat logs, classroom recordings, or digital communication archives, to complement self-reported accounts. Further investigation is needed into how experiences of evaluation and legitimacy influence later classroom practices, particularly whether pre-service teachers reproduce gatekeeping approaches or develop more inclusive multilingual pedagogies [16], [17], [39], [40].

Overall, the findings suggest that Indonesian pre-service English teachers navigate English not simply as a language to be mastered but as a resource whose value depends on audience, context, and legitimacy. Their everyday decisions to switch, maintain, suppress, or monitor language use reveal how multilingual communication emerges at the intersection of digital participation, social evaluation, and bilingual control. These findings contribute to ongoing discussions of translanguaging, language legitimacy, and teacher education by demonstrating how globalized English norms become lived experiences within everyday communicative practice.

4. CONCLUSION

This study examined how Indonesian pre-service English teachers use Indonesian–English linguistic resources in everyday communication and how perceptions of legitimate English shape their confidence, language choices, and self-monitoring practices. The

findings indicate that participants continuously recalibrated their language use according to audience, platform, and perceived communicative stakes, with code-switching functioning as a purposeful resource for managing intimacy, humor, emphasis, and audience boundaries rather than as random alternation. Participants also navigated multiple evaluative standards, including lecturers' expectations, standardized tests, and native-like ideals, which influenced their confidence and willingness to speak while encouraging various forms of bilingual self-regulation such as inhibition, substitution, rehearsal, and technology-assisted monitoring. This study contributes to EFL teacher education by showing that pre-service teachers' English use is shaped not only by proficiency but also by legitimacy, audience awareness, digital visibility, and self-monitoring. The findings extend research on translanguaging and multilingual communication by highlighting how language practices are negotiated across everyday digital and educational contexts under multiple evaluative pressures. Practically, the study underscores the importance of supportive feedback practices, greater awareness of context-specific English norms, critical engagement with digital communication, recognition of translanguaging as a pedagogical resource, and efforts to reduce excessive native-speakerist pressure in teacher education. Although limited by a small sample and reliance on self-reported narratives supported by participant-selected artifacts, the study provides a foundation for future research involving larger and more diverse participant groups, naturally occurring interactional data, and longitudinal investigation of how legitimacy experiences influence teaching practices. Ultimately, the findings emphasize the need for supportive, inclusive, and context-sensitive English teacher education that encourages participation while recognizing the realities of multilingual communication in contemporary digital environments.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Appadurai, "Disjuncture and difference in the global cultural economy," *Theory, Culture & Society*, vol. 7, no. 2–3, pp. 295–310, 1990, doi: 10.1177/026327690007002017.
- [2] A. Appadurai, *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. Minneapolis, MN, USA: University of Minnesota Press, 1996.
- [3] M. Castells, *The Power of Identity*. Oxford, U.K.: Wiley, 2011.
- [4] M. Castells, *The Rise of the Network Society*. Oxford, U.K.: Wiley, 2011.
- [5] N. S. Baron, "Letters by phone or speech by other means: The linguistics of email," *Language & Communication*, vol. 18, no. 2, pp. 133–170, 1998, doi: 10.1016/S0271-5309(98)00005-6.
- [6] S. Vertovec, "Centre on Migration, Policy and Society," COMPAS Working Paper No. 25, University of Oxford, Oxford, U.K., 2006.
- [7] J. B. T. Pasaribu and C. Manara, "Indonesian EFL students' use of technologies for self-directed learning in accomplishing academic English writing tasks," *Journal of English Language and Culture*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 1–15, 2024, doi: 10.30813/jelc.v15i1.5623.
- [8] B. R. Sugiarto and C. Manara, "Digital multilingual identity: Insights from Indonesian multilingual EFL students' identity construction on Instagram," *International Journal of Multilingualism*, pp. 1–22, 2025, doi: 10.1080/14790718.2025.2508867.
- [9] D. Susanto, R. Engliana, R. Saraswati, and R. Astuti, "Self-efficacy among Indonesian EFL undergraduates in speaking classes," *SCOPE: Journal of English Language Teaching*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 133–142, 2024, doi: 10.30998/scope.v9i1.21159.
- [10] J. Blommaert, *The Sociolinguistics of Globalization*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 2010, doi: 10.1017/CBO9780511845307.
- [11] P. Bourdieu, *Language and Symbolic Power*. Cambridge, MA, USA: Harvard University Press, 1993.
- [12] J. Blommaert, J. Collins, and S. Slembrouck, "Polycentricity and interactional regimes in 'global neighborhoods,'" *Ethnography*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 205–235, 2005, doi: 10.1177/1466138105057557.
- [13] N. Fairclough, *Language and Globalization*. London, U.K.: Routledge, 2007.

- [14] A. Pennycook, *Global Englishes and Transcultural Flows*. London, U.K.: Routledge, 2006, doi: 10.4324/9780203088807.
- [15] R. Phillipson, *Linguistic Imperialism*. Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press, 1992.
- [16] H. G. R. Harsanti and C. Manara, "I have to teach the 'English' English": Native-speakerism ideology among English teachers," *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 330–340, 2021, doi: 10.17509/ijal.v11i2.26379.
- [17] M. P. Nue and C. Manara, "Pre-service teachers' investments in English and construction of professional identity in the Indonesian context," *Studies in English Language and Education*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 462–482, 2022, doi: 10.24815/SIELE.V9I2.22557.
- [18] N. Coupland, "Introduction: Sociolinguistics and globalization," *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, vol. 7, no. 4, pp. 465–472, 2003, doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9841.2003.00237.x.
- [19] J. Blommaert, L. Creve, and E. Willaert, "On being declared illiterate: Language-ideological disqualification in Dutch classes for immigrants in Belgium," *Language & Communication*, vol. 26, no. 1, pp. 34–54, 2006, doi: 10.1016/j.langcom.2005.03.004.
- [20] D. Indarti and C. Manara, "Attitudes toward language and language choice in regional intermarriage families: A case study in Tangerang, Banten," *Studies in English Language and Education*, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 426–441, 2025, doi: 10.24815/siele.v12i1.36436.
- [21] I. S. Lubis, B. U. Siregar, and C. Manara, "Balancing local and foreign languages: Family language policy in multicultural Samarinda," *Studies in English Language and Education*, vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 1527–1545, 2025, doi: 10.24815/siele.v12i3.38805.
- [22] V. Nurlia, D. Indarti, and C. Manara, "Language attitudes and valorization among Indonesian engineering students," *Journal of Languages and Language Teaching*, vol. 13, no. 1, p. 268, 2025, doi: 10.33394/joltt.v13i1.13290.
- [23] A. Agha, "The social life of cultural value," *Language & Communication*, vol. 23, no. 3, pp. 231–273, 2003, doi: 10.1016/S0271-5309(03)00012-0.
- [24] A. Agha, "Voice, footing, enregisterment," *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 38–59, 2005, doi: 10.1525/jlin.2005.15.1.38.
- [25] A. Agha, *Language and Social Relations*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 2006, doi: 10.1017/CBO9780511618284.
- [26] M. Silverstein, "Indexical order and the dialectics of sociolinguistic life," *Language & Communication*, vol. 23, no. 3, pp. 193–229, 2003, doi: 10.1016/S0271-5309(03)00013-2.
- [27] T. P. Bonfiglio, *Race and the Rise of Standard American*. Berlin, Germany: Walter de Gruyter, 2002.
- [28] J. Milroy and L. Milroy, *Authority in Language: Investigating Standard English*. London, U.K.: Routledge, 1999.
- [29] M. Silverstein, "Monoglot 'standard' in America: Standardization and metaphors of linguistic hegemony," in *The Matrix of Language: Contemporary Linguistic Anthropology*, D. Brenneis, Ed. London, U.K.: Routledge, 1998.
- [30] J. Irvine and S. Gal, "Language ideology and linguistic differentiation," in *Regimes of Language: Ideologies, Politics, and Identities*, P. V. Kroskrity, Ed. Santa Fe, NM, USA: School of American Research Press, 2000.
- [31] P. V. Kroskrity, *Regimes of Language: Ideologies, Politics, and Identities*. Santa Fe, NM, USA: University of New Mexico Press, 2000.
- [32] M. Heller, "Globalization, the new economy, and the commodification of language and identity," *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, vol. 7, no. 4, pp. 473–492, 2003, doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9841.2003.00238.x.
- [33] E. Ekarina and E. Engliana, "Exploring reflective learning for a design thinking class," *Journal of English Language Teaching and Linguistics*, vol. 10, no. 1, p. 61, 2025, doi: 10.21462/jeltl.v10i1.1515.
- [34] C. Manara and Yanti, "Exploring the English language needs of a community-based tourist village in an Indonesian context," *SCOPE: Journal of English Language Teaching*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 85–93, 2024, doi: 10.30998/scope.v9i1.23047.
- [35] M. Foucault, *The Archaeology of Knowledge and the Discourse on Language*. London, U.K.: Tavistock, 1972.
- [36] M. Foucault, "The order of discourse," in *Language and Politics*, M. Shapiro, Ed. Oxford, U.K.: Basil Blackwell, 1984, pp. 108–138.
- [37] H. V. Verusha Ali, S. Sugiharto, and C. Manara, "Navigating identity and agency through English education: Narrative inquiry of an Indonesian migrant worker in Kuwait's Kafala system," *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, vol. 12, Art. no. 101816, 2025, doi: 10.1016/j.ssaho.2025.101816.
- [38] E. Goffman, *Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience*. New York, NY, USA: Harper & Row, 1974.
- [39] E. Goffman, *Forms of Talk*. Philadelphia, PA, USA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1981.

- [40] J. J. Gumperz, *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- [41] M. M. Bakhtin, *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*, C. Emerson and M. Holquist, Eds. Austin, TX, USA: University of Texas Press, 2010.
- [42] V. N. Voloshinov, *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge, MA, USA: Harvard University Press, 1986.
- [43] B. Rampton, *Language in Late Modernity: Interaction in an Urban School*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 2006, doi: 10.1017/CBO9780511486722.
- [44] R. Wardhaugh and J. M. Fuller, *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*, 7th ed. Malden, MA, USA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2014.
- [45] A. D. Cahyanti and Y. Y. Dharmawan, "Reframing EFL classrooms: Students' perspectives on translanguaging as a pedagogical strategy in Indonesian senior high school," *Indonesian Journal of Teaching and Learning (INTEL)*, vol. 4, no. 3, pp. 197–206, 2025, doi: 10.56855/intel.v4i3.1673.
- [46] Y. Y. Dharmawan, H. V. Ali, B. A. Prasatyo, and A. Amaliah, "Comparing the argumentative essay formats of Indonesian and Korean students using the Toulmin model," *Jurnal Onoma: Pendidikan, Bahasa, dan Sastra*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 1099–1114, 2023, doi: 10.30605/onoma.v9i2.2922.
- [47] E. D. Kusuma, Y. Y. Dharmawan, A. I. Oktariani S., and S. C. Mawuntu, "Analysis of translingual practices: A case study of Indonesian teenagers' Instagram users," *Dialectical Literature and Educational Journal*, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 45–57, 2023, doi: 10.51714/dlejpantasakti.v8i2.101.
- [48] B. R. Sugiarto and C. Manara, "Digital multilingual identity: Insights from Indonesian multilingual EFL students' identity construction on Instagram," *International Journal of Multilingualism*, pp. 1–22, 2025, doi: 10.1080/14790718.2025.2508867.
- [49] A. H. Umam, S. Sugiharto, and C. Manara, "Translingual practice in remote EFL tertiary education: How multilingual speakers create translanguaging spaces," *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, vol. 13, no. 2, pp. 258–269, 2023, doi: 10.17509/ijal.v13i2.63065.
- [50] D. Barton, *Literacy: An Introduction to the Ecology of Written Language*. Oxford, U.K.: Blackwell, 1994.
- [51] D. Barton and M. Hamilton, *Local Literacies: Reading and Writing in One Community*. London, U.K.: Routledge, 2012.
- [52] B. V. Street, *Social Literacies: Critical Approaches to Literacy in Development, Ethnography, and Education*. London, U.K.: Longman, 1995.
- [53] M. Jacquemet, "Transidiomatic practices: Language and power in the age of globalization," *Language & Communication*, vol. 25, no. 3, pp. 257–277, 2005, doi: 10.1016/j.langcom.2005.05.001.
- [54] D. Hidayati, Y. Y. Dharmawan, B. A. Prasatyo, and Luciana, "Exploring how translanguaging and multimodal learning improve EFL students' enjoyment and proficiency," *Journal on English as a Foreign Language*, vol. 14, no. 2, pp. 446–475, 2024, doi: 10.23971/jeffl.v14i2.8012.
- [55] A. Wahyudi, F. Sari, Amaliah, A. Pamuji, and Y. Y. Dharmawan, "From critique to insight: Student voices on English writing feedback," *Veles Journal*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 282–292, 2024, doi: 10.29408/veles.v8i1.25659.
- [56] E. Alfiani, H. Anggia, H. Harpain, Y. Y. Dharmawan, D. M. Sidabalok, and K. Lakatos, "Affective and cognitive correlates of reading comprehension: A structural analysis," *JEES (Journal of English Educators Society)*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 144–153, 2024, doi: 10.21070/jees.v9i2.1900.
- [57] H. V. Ali, B. A. Prasatyo, and Y. Y. Dharmawan, "Navigating language barriers: Translingual discrimination and resilience among Indonesian migrant workers in Kuwait," *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, vol. 14, no. 3, pp. 496–511, 2025, doi: 10.17509/ijal.v14i3.73641.
- [58] E. M. Fernández and H. S. Cairns, *Fundamentals of Psycholinguistics*. Oxford, U.K.: Wiley, 2010.
- [59] U. Flick, *An Introduction to Qualitative Research*, 5th ed. London, U.K.: SAGE Publications, 2014.
- [60] I. Seidman, *Interviewing as Qualitative Research: A Guide for Researchers in Education and the Social Sciences*, 3rd ed. New York, NY, USA: Teachers College Press, 2006.