





## Critical Thinking in Language Planning for Local Languages Maintenance: Evidence from Banjarese, Indonesia

Moh. Yamin<sup>1</sup> , Slamet Setiawan<sup>2</sup> , Syafi'ul Anam<sup>3</sup> , &  
Fabiola Dharmawanti Kurnia<sup>4</sup> 

### Abstract

The fact that many indigenous languages in Indonesia have been dying out as a result of the ineffective way of language planning. This study aims to construct critical thinking indicators and to describe the strategies used for enhancing critical thinking in language planning (LP) concerning local language maintenance, particularly Banjarese language. The qualitative method was employed in which all data were elaborated in a descriptive manner by employing an interview and documentation to collect the data. The former was performed by interviewing the two older native Banjarese persons: The one is a researcher focusing on native languages as well as on Banjarese maintenance; and the other is the main official person in charge of history and tradition maintenance of the Education and Culture Service of South Kalimantan. The latter was done by taking articles concerning Banjarese maintenance and its teaching, and policy documents issued by the government. The data were analyzed through content analysis. The result shows that there is no curriculum design to maintain Banjarese at schools. The local government's support in maintaining Banjarese does neither run well nor seems to be serious. The existence of local government regulation No. 7/2009 about the local language maintenance does not continue to practical procedures on how local language should be designed and taught at schools. Therefore, the issues of Banjarese should be the main indicator to map needs analysis in local language maintenance and strategies for language planning dealing with the classroom as the way of teaching Banjarese

**Keywords:** appraisal framework, rhetorical moves, lexicogrammatical resources, dialogic and monologic settings

1. Doctoral Candidate, English Education and Literature, Universitas Negeri Surabaya, Indonesia; and Senior lecturer, English Department, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Lambung Mangkurat, Indonesia; ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5522-762X>
2. Corresponding author: Associate Professor, English Department, Faculty of Languages and Arts, Universitas Negeri Surabaya, Indonesia; Email: [slametsetiawan@unesa.ac.id](mailto:slametsetiawan@unesa.ac.id); ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4143-8757>
3. Senior Lecturer, English Department, Faculty of Languages and Arts, Universitas Negeri Surabaya, Indonesia; ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4687-856X>
4. Emeritus Professor, English Education and Literature, Postgraduate School, Universitas Negeri Surabaya, Indonesia; ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0123-8734>

Received: 11 July 2020  
Received in revised form: 7 August 2020  
Accepted: 27 September 2020

## 1. Introduction

A language in all conditions and situations determines how its users of language can communicate and share messages. Language is the reflection on how people behave, think, and act; it is the civilization of people. Society or people exist because of language (Asemota, 2015). Therefore, it is necessary to save language so that it is living. Teaching people to maintain their local language is a must (Hermes et al., 2012). The role of language in society is central to culture tier because it bridges the messages to communicate in society. Every language is the norm, and the norm itself is born from social life. A language has core values, such as religious beliefs, family cohesion, and specific cultural traditions. This language core should be noticed as a prerequisite to maintain language existence. The language in society is the tool in which how the people interact and give meanings in each of their interactions (Kirkness, 2000; Pauwels, 2016). The global challenge in which major language takes the role of global communication is the potential to kill minor languages used by a part of the country or community; the minor language is marginalized and does not have the positioning role. Consequently, society in the community trends to leave and neglect the language. It commonly happens in local languages or indigenous languages (Chivhanga, 2013).

A study by Lindström (2007) discovers that Kuot is a language in a critical situation. Most adults of lower middle age and older are full speakers, but children are not learning it. In other words, it will become extinct in a few decades if nothing is done, but it is necessary if the community decides to turn it around and do so fast. The reason why Kuot undergoes extinction is that its older people speak Kuot for their interest, not the generation's interest. As a result, the young generation takes another role by speaking Tok Pisin, an English-lexified pidgin known in Papua New Guinea (PNG). Dealing with the description of Kuot in PNG, adults of about 35 years of age and older, who played in Kuot when they were children, are fluent in Kuot. People of intermediate ages have varying competence depending on their particular personal history. Tok Pisin is used by children even in families where both parents are natives in Kuot, and it has become the first (and only) language of the majority of Kuot children, starting with the generation now aged approximately 18. Children are often passive bilinguals and understand Kuot reasonably well but for the most part, are not able to speak it.

A similar study was also conducted by Chivhanga (2013), based on which there had been downgrading and marginalizing the use of the African language. It endangers the position of the indigenous language that is threatened to die. Although the Government of Zimbabwe has its language policy through the Education Act of 1987 (revised in 1996), it fails to enforce the use of African languages as media of instruction. It indicates that the discussion concerning the death of indigenous languages should be responded to as an effort to save and maintain existence.

In Indonesia, there are 742 languages and 737 languages are still alive or are still used by speakers. Some of the languages that are still alive are considered to be on the verge of extinction. Sadly enough, 11 indigenous languages in the Western Indonesia (Papua and Maluku) have died out during 2011-2019<sup>1</sup>. This happens because of the number of native speakers. There are also some languages that are pressured by the influence of other more dominant regional languages. In addition, the conditions of Indonesian people who are multi-ethnic with their respective languages and cultures open up opportunities for contact through communication and interaction between different ethnicities of languages and cultures. The conditions of multi-ethnic societies that are followed by inter-ethnic contact including language contact can cause various linguistic phenomena such as bilingualism (or even multilingualism). This often occurs in minority language groups (Tondo, 2009). Such language contact can also result in a language shift. It is a permanent change in the choice of a person's language for everyday needs, especially as a result of migration or a change in language (language change), i.e., changes in the language during a period (Kridalaksana, 1993; Mbete, 2010). Setiawan (2001 & 2020) states that the domination of major language determines the future of local language maintenance regarding whether it still exists as the culture tier.

From more than a hundred local languages, Banjarese is one of the languages existing with a thousand speakers mainly used by Banjarese people in south Kalimantan in 13 regions, such as Balangan, Banjar, Barito Kuala, Hulu Sungai Selatan, Hulu Sungai Tengah, Hulu Sungai Utara, Kotabaru, Tabalong, Tanah

1. <https://www.cnnindonesia.com/nasional/20200221144218-20-476834/kemendikbud-11-bahasa-daerah-punah-25-terancam-menyusul> and <https://edukasi.kompas.com/read/2020/02/21/17464191/data-kemendikbud-2011-2019-11-bahasa-daerah-di-indonesia-punah?page=all>

Bumbu, Tanah Laut, Tapin, Banjarbaru, and Banjarmasin. Commonly, all schools use Banjarese as the media of communication and teaching subjects besides Indonesian (Farid, 2012). This language can survive. However, survival is not backed with supporting resources such as teaching Banjarese at school and the existence of Banjarese scholars caring for Banjarese maintenance. In addition, there is not a policy from the local government in maintaining and researching Banjarese in several aspects to enrich and give more values to Banjarese maintenance. It is the potential to downgrade Banjarese position in the next generation if it is not anticipated. Noortyani (2011) has started to propose the idea concerning the importance of the local government in putting some efforts to make Banjarese language an important part of the local content taught at schools. Maintaining Banjarese should be the attitude and action of all language users. If the language users are aware, the positive attitude towards a language can be elaborated into language loyalty, language pride, and language awareness. This view is supported by Komalasasi and Rusdiana (2017), asserting that language maintenance is necessary to conduct as an effort to keep the local founding father's values. Fauzi (2008) states that the dominant trigger to Banjarese maintenance is Banjarese people's loyalty toward the use of Banjarese itself regarding whether it is in religious, educational, and cultural rituality.

Based on the previous studies, it seems that Banjarese position and its destiny should be saved to make the language alive for the speakers. Language planning in designing Banjarese to be the language communicated and learned is necessary to conduct. Through language planning, Banjarese can be taught at schools in an effort to maintain the language. Therefore, this article aims to construct critical thinking indicators and to describe the strategies used for enhancing critical thinking in language planning concerning local language maintenance. The importance of this research is based on the effort to maintain Banjarese as an indigenous language in South Kalimantan. For the significance of the study, it is intended to be the ideal proposal for local government in designing language policy through critical thinking to liven Banjarese as a subject at school and to trigger Banjarese people to love their indigenous language. Finding out critical thinking indicators in language planning concerning Banjarese maintenance will guide local government in producing policy in Banjarese maintenance, and schools have a clear framework in teaching Banjarese to students. In addition, strategies found used for enhancing critical thinking in language planning concerning Banjarese maintenance are helpful for schools and Banjarese teachers

in implementing their duties in local language maintenance.

## 2. Literature Review

### 2.1 Local Language Maintenance through Education

Schools can only have a limited role in keeping indigenous languages alive. Having dealt with language maintenance via schooling, it is necessary to affirm the existence of schools to keep the local language. The intergenerational transmission of language in the home from parents to young children is the key to keeping indigenous languages alive; however, schools can play either a positive or negative role in supporting the efforts of indigenous parents and communities (Reyhner, 1999). Hinton (1994, p. 3) proposes eight steps to be used by either teachers or students to maintain the local language as presented in Table 1.

**Table 1**  
*Steps to Maintain Local Languages* (Hinton 1994, p. 3)

Teachers	Apprentices
1. Be an active teacher. Find things to talk about. Create situations or find something in any situation to talk about. Tell stories. Use the language to tell the apprentice to do things. Encourage conversation.	1. Be an active learner. Ask about things. Create situations, bring things to ask your teacher to tell you about; find things in the environment to ask about; ask him/her to tell you stories.
2. Don't use English, not even to translate.	2. Don't use English, even when you can't say it in the language. Find other ways to communicate what you want to say.
3. Use gestures, context, objects, actions to help the apprentice understand what you are saying.	3. Use gestures, context, objects, actions to help in your communication when you don't know the words.
4. Rephrase for successful communication. Rephrase things the apprentice doesn't understand, using simpler ways to say them.	4. Practice. Use new words and new sentences and grammar as much as possible, to yourself, to your teacher, to other people.
5. Rephrase for added learning. Rephrase things the apprentice says to show him correct forms or extend his knowledge to more complex forms. Encourage communication in the language, even with errors.	5. Don't be afraid of mistakes. If you don't know how to say something right, say it wrong. Use whatever words you know; use gestures, etc. for the rest.
6. Be willing to play with language. Fantasize together; make up plays, poems, and word games together.	6. Be willing to play with language as children do. Name things you see, count them, talk about what color they are. Make up stories.
7. Understanding precedes speaking. Use various ways to increase and test understanding. Give the apprentice commands to follow. Ask him/her questions.	7. Understanding precedes speaking. You may recognize and understand many things you cannot say. Focus on understanding; that is the most important step toward language learning. After you understand an utterance fully, learning to

Teachers	Apprentices
It is not necessary to focus on speaking each new word right away; that will come naturally. 8.Be patient. An apprentice won't learn something in one lesson. Repeat words and phrases often, in as many different situations and conversations as possible.	speak it will not take long. 8.Be patient with yourself. It takes a long time to learn a language well. You are doing a heroic task; forgive mistakes.

What should be noticed in this context is that in spite of being faced with the majority language, English, it is an obligation to maintain the local language. The way to achieve this is through the home environment in which the parents should be habituated to speak through the indigenous language with their children as an effort to connect the old tradition from the old generation to the young generation. The more practice it is conducted, the more meaningful the local language maintenance is. Besides, the school presence is a continuation of the home habit. It seems that Banjarese subject should be taught at school as an effort to make students know more about Banjarese (Noortyani, 2011). It does not mean that the national language, Indonesian is not used at school. In a formal situation, when the classroom interaction takes place, national language or English is needed because of the subject and it is the must to use. However, outside the classroom interaction, speaking in the local language is required. It is the loyalty and appreciation of the local language as an effort to maintain the local language (Hatano, 2013).

## 2.2 Language Planning

To support the effort toward Banjarese maintenance, it is important to language planning. It is made to urge Banjarese obliged to use for communication. Kennedy (1982) and Ferguson (2006) state that language planning is a government-authorized, long-term, sustained, and conscious effort to alter a language's function in society to solve communication problems. The presence of a state, especially local government in ruling a local language to exist, is needed. Besides, it should consider ideological aspects to liven local languages (Mahayanti & Madya, 2020). Its goal is to respect and cultivate regional languages as a national cultural treasure. Maintaining the local languages could, in many ways, be counter-productive with respect to foreign language learning. This is the intricate part of the language policy implementation (Hamied & Musthafa, 2019).

Language policy in maintaining local languages is intended to create a participation function. As a result, the local languages live with their own culture (Paauw, 2009).

In language planning (LP), some steps should be taken into account. Stage one involves the gathering of facts about the situation, identifying problems, and isolating potential constraints. Stage two is the planning stage when goals are set, strategies are conceived, and outcomes are predicted. The plan is then implemented in stage three, and feedback on the success or failure of the plan takes place in stage four. As a result of the feedback, changes may be made to the program at any of the stages, as in Table 2.

**Table 2**  
*Macro-LP vs. Micro-LP*

	Level
Macro-LP	Government
	Ministry
	Regional authority
	Institution
	Department
Micro-LP	Classroom

Macro language planning is large scale and systematic, involving specific actions that are planned and carried out to promulgate language policies and to obtain certain results. It is stated by the authority, either central or regional government. Conversely, micro language planning focuses on the finer mechanisms of the implementation process on how language teaching is conducted, starting from teaching material preparation, syllabus, and the other supporting details to gaining teaching-learning achievement (Kheng & Baldauf, 2011).

### 2.3 Critical Thinking in LP

Language maintenance in language planning should be viewed as the efforts to save the local language alive. The efforts of language maintenance in language planning are interpreted in policy, curriculum, and teaching practice. It means that the practice of language maintenance can be conducted through language

planning. Designing language planning should be conducted carefully and correctly based on the goal of language planning itself. If it concerns language planning for local language maintenance on how the local language should be maintained through education, any supporting details to get the success of language planning implementation, such as assessing language resources, assigning preferences and functions to one or more languages, and developing their use according to previously determined objectives are necessary (Kennedy, 1982; Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; Ferguson, 2006). Therefore, critical thinking in language planning is viewed as the ability of individuals to understand and make sense of the world and events and situations around them (Al-qahtani, 2019). It is based on criteria, self-correcting, and sensitivity to context. It is the way to encompass the mental processes, strategies, and representations people use to solve problems, make decisions, and learn new concepts (Bećirović et al., 2019). Ab Kadir (2016) views critical thinking as the process of judging and assessing involving the ability to recognize or develop an argument, use evidence in support of that argument, draw reasoned conclusions, and use the information to solve problems. Through critical thinking, it afforded students the opportunity to construct new knowledge and develop a sense of critical consciousness (Kaemanje et al., 2017). Critical thinking can be built through exploring the experiences, discussing them, and giving critics toward the messages of experience. As a result, critical thinking formation is constructed by making interaction among students dealing with the topic shared and discussed (VanderLind, 2018).

It is to be noted that LP for maintaining local language should consider the crucial ones supporting the success of the local language implementation. Viewed from micro-LP, the supporting environment, school curriculum, and teachers teaching the local language should be facilitated. Those are the main parts to achieve the goal of empowering local language maintenance (Taylor-Leech & Benson, 2017). The studies conducted by Nyati-Saleshando (2019) and Hodges and Prys (2019) state that it is necessary to employ the holistic human rights-based approach to create fertile ground for social change in language ethos, power structures, and language revitalization. Through this, it is the path for strengthening language existence. The presence of the role of individuals, families, communities, and society is required. Community activities ranging from formal government-funded activities to more ad-hoc and naturally-occurring language activities. Therefore, in LP through critical thinking, it is important to



declare what programs should be implemented for language success. Besides, Liddicoat and Taylor-Leech (2014) also assert the importance of broad contexts of language planning activity in which local agents work. Zein (2017), through Baldauf and Kaplan's framework of language-in-education policy, views LP as the way to analyze policy, and make recommendations on access, community, resourcing, curriculum, methodology, and material, personnel, and evaluation policies. Those are called critical thinking in language planning.

### **3. Methods**

This section describes the research design, the participant, instruments, techniques of data collection, and data analysis techniques.

#### **3.1. Research Design**

The research design used in this research is qualitative in which the research was conducted based on descriptive data. In the qualitative approach, the research was conducted to find out and describe the data whether documentation or interview are intended to be able to answer the research problems, namely to construct critical thinking indicators and to describe the strategies used for enhancing critical thinking in language planning (LP) concerning local language maintenance. The variables researched are critical thinking indicators and strategies in language planning concerning local language maintenance. The setting of the research was in South Kalimantan by using documentation and interview to collect the data.

#### **3.2. Participant**

The participants of this research are the older generation of the native language having research activities focusing on Banjarese maintenance and the main official person in charge of history and tradition maintenance of the Education and Culture Service of South Kalimantan. In interviewing both of them, the questions dealt with their comprehension, experiences, and knowledge about Banjarese in line with the research problems proposed. Besides, this research data are based on articles coping with Banjarese language maintenance and its teaching, and policy

document generated by the government as the main source of data in answering the research questions.

### **3.3. Instrument and Data Collection**

The data collection is conducted through documentation consisting of articles talking about Banjarese language maintenance and its teaching, policy document generated by the government. The other technique in data collection was also through an interview with the older generation of the native language having research activities focusing on Banjarese maintenance and the main official person in charge of history and tradition maintenance of Education and Culture Service of South Kalimantan.

The trustworthiness of documentation is assessed based on conformity toward the research problem scope. The interview guide's trustworthiness is based on coverage of the research problems proposed. Dealing with the interview process and duration, it was conducted based on the number of questions in the interview guide. Every respondent needed 25 minutes that was done by calling the phone and Whatsapp. The consideration is to prevent the spread of Covid-19.

### **3.4. Data Analysis**

The data were analyzed through content analysis (Krippendorff, 2004) based on macro-LP and micro-LP. Macro-LP is viewed from the local government in guiding Banjarese maintenance as the local language and whether there is a clear and measurable formulation in maintaining Banjarese; micro-LP is the implementation of the policy, supporting environment towards the success of language communication and school environment for the learners to learn Banjarese to check its effectiveness. The analysis was implemented through analyzing each article, identifying the way of language maintenance and its teaching, and synthesizing it. Concerning policy documents, they were analyzed by identifying and finding out whether it is on behalf of language maintenance and its teaching or not. The final analysis is through the data in documentation or interview are aimed to construct critical thinking indicators and to describe the strategies used for enhancing critical thinking in language planning (LP) concerning local language maintenance.

#### 4. Results

Critical thinking indicators in language planning (LP) concerning Banjarese maintenance can be found from Fauzi's (2008) study in which he said that Banjarese is one of the mother tongues used by Banjarese people in Kalimantan island, Indonesia. Banjarese can be considered as a connecting language (*lingua franca*), mainly in three provinces: South Kalimantan, East Kalimantan, and Central Kalimantan. The way of maintaining Banjarese done by Banjarese people is constructed through high loyalty to their language in such a way that in daily communication they use Banjarese all the time. The presence of a major language, Indonesian does not influence them to do code-switching in daily communication. Also, commonly Banjarese people tend to gather in one community to maintain Banjarese (Komalasasi & Rusdiana, 2017).

The consciousness to respect and loyalty as well as to gather in their community is included in critical thinking of language planning. On one side, they are able to maintain their language existence; however, it is also a problem when they do not interact outside their community. It is necessary to bridge the gap. As a result, Banjarese maintenance takes place, and interaction outside their community also runs well.

Based on the study conducted by Farid (2012), it is found that Banjarese is not only used by natives, but also those who are not natives. The spread of Banjarese to non-native is considered as an effort to maintain the local language. More people either natives or non-natives use Banjarese, so it indicates that Banjarese has been the local language open to comers from other places outside Kalimantan. Banjarese speaking community does not only come from natives but also non-natives.

Dealing with the strategies used for enhancing critical thinking in language planning (LP) concerning Banjarese maintenance, Noortyani (2011), in her study, affirms the important efforts to produce Banjarese dictionaries, grammar, and research on Banjarese that achieve to maintain Banjarese maintenance. Although Banjarese is alive at present, it does not guarantee that the next time Banjarese will be alive if there is not a planned and well-organized effort to save Banjarese. The global challenge in the future is more formidable than at present. The school presence in maintaining Banjarese is required to teach students Banjarese as a

local subject; Banjarese teachers are needed to teach them.

What the scholars found in their research is the base about the importance of Banjarese maintenance; the provincial government of South Kalimantan dealing with local government regulation No. 7/2009 about maintaining the local language is also the base<sup>1</sup>. It is stated that to maintain Banjarese, the Banjarese curriculum should be made; the Banjarese life as the way of communication and interaction should be created; there must be appreciation and awareness towards Banjarese, also Banjarese people's effort and participation in maintaining Banjarese. Therefore, three of them are designing elementary and secondary education curriculum for Banjarese, providing Banjarese teachers with teaching materials, and facilitating supporting details for the success of Banjarese teaching-learning implementation (Gubernur Provinsi Kalimantan Selatan, 2009).

Based on the interview with the older generation of native language having research activities focusing on Banjarese maintenance, she said that

*Pemertahanan bahasa Banjar dapat dilakukan melalui program sekolah dimana menjadi ruang belajar karena kehadiran sekolah berperan sentral dalam merawat kebudayaan nasional. Siswa yang mempelajari bahasa Banjar akan memiliki perasaan memiliki terhadap bahasa Banjar sebagai bahasa ibu mereka. Lingkungan sekolah pun perlu diciptakan dan didesain tanpa mengurangi penggunaan bahasa Indonesia sebagai bahasa formal di sekolah. Hal demikian perlu diatur dengan sedemikian rupa ketika bahasa Indonesia dan bahasa Banjar sama-sama saling digunakan di sekolah.*

(Banjarese maintenance can be conducted through a school program in which it is taught. It is because of having a central position to preserve national culture. Students who learn it will have a sense of belonging towards Banjarese as their mother tongue. The school environment should be created and designed without reducing the use of the national language as the formal language at school. It should be set when Banjarese and Indonesian as a national language are used interchangeably)<sup>2</sup> (Komalasari, Personal Communication, 2020).

Arbain as the main official person in charge of history and tradition maintenance of Education and Culture Service of South Kalimantan also states that

1. Gubernur Provinsi Kalimantan Selatan. (2009). Peraturan pemerintah provinsi Kalimantan Selatan No. 7 tahun 2009 tentang pemeliharaan bahasa dan sastra daerah.
2. Komalasari, I. (2020). Strategi pemertahanan bahasa di sekolah. Personal communication, 23 June 2020.

*Menjadi penting untuk memasukkan bahasa Banjar dalam kesenian tradisional di kegiatan ekstrakurikuler sekolah seperti Mamadan, Bapandung, Bakisah, dan lain sejenisnya untuk kepentingan pemertahanan bahasa daerah. Selain itu, bahasa Banjar seharusnya didesain dalam kurikulum supaya dapat diajarkan di sekolah.*

(It is important to include Banjarese in traditional arts as extracurricular school programs such as *Mamanda, Bapandung, Bakisah*, and the like for local language maintenance. Besides that, Banjarese should be designed and taught at school)<sup>1</sup> (Arbain, Personal Communication, 2020).

## 5. Discussion

The findings concerning maintaining Banjarese exposed by the scholars Banjarese should be saved from one generation to the next should be viewed the importance of local languages for the survival of the nation. Robinson et al. (2019) hold that the loss of local language use in its community means the death of the language itself. All scholars found that there is no well-planned on how Banjarese should be taught to the young generation. Again, it should be noted that Banjarese, as an indigenous language, is a reflection of the Banjarese people think, behave, and act. It is with a high culture that is produced and maintained by the ancestors. Therefore, when Banjarese is only kept by maintaining the strength of the community in which each Banjarese person speaks in Banjarese, the language commonly will die when the number of speakers decreases. This indicator is seen from the Banjarese people who will not use Banjarese because of the effect of majority languages, such as Indonesian, English, or other dominant languages in a global context. It is stated by Extra and Yağmur (2006) that processes of L1 erosion may occur, leading to a reduction of stylistic variation or overextension of morphosyntactic rules because of the majority language effect.

The presence of local government regulation No. 7/2009 about maintaining the local language is the hope for Banjarese people that education has a central role in maintaining the local language. However, there is no implementation of this regulation, and this does not affect empowering local language maintenance. The

---

1. Arbain. (2020). Upaya pemertahanan bahasa Banjar di sekolah. Personal communication, 1 July 2020.

weakness in language planning implemented by the local government, viewed from Macro-LP, is the trigger causing the weakness of local language maintenance when it is based on Micro-LP. Although Banjarese children speak in Banjarese, they speak because of community gathering, and it does not guarantee when they move to other places not speaking in Banjarese, the children will use Banjarese as the media of communication (Noortyani, 2011). Therefore, there should be a connecting tie between Macro-LP and Micro-LP to have the same goal in local language maintenance.

Viewed from Macro-LP, the local government should be clear and firm in preparing and providing the supporting apparatuses in local language maintenance. The supporting apparatuses are curriculum and Banjarese teachers. It is the entry point that should be conducted when all Banjarese people have the same dream to maintain Banjarese from extinction one day. Macro-LP for language maintenance is the policy effort that is conducted to produce the policy apparatus to achieve the language maintenance goal.

From the perspective of Micro-LP in which all resources should collaborate to be able to liven the education environment as the effort to maintain the local language, it is necessary to provide the learning situation that supports the goal of local language maintenance. All resources are about teaching practice, learning environment, and teaching material. Micro-LP views the three resources that have an important role in the success of local language maintenance.

Dealing with critical thinking indicators used in language planning concerning Banjarese maintenance, it should be based on the point that in which condition and situation Banjarese is endangered and should be strengthened to save Banjarese language. From the findings displayed by the scholars, Banjarese is not treated in the education environment at school where the schools do not facilitate the teaching of Banjarese to students as an effort to maintain local language although there has been local government regulation No. 7/2009 about maintaining the local language. Viewed from analysis of macro and micro LP, it is the problem causing the implementation of Banjarese maintenance not run well and it is called the entry point to come into language planning of Banjarese through critical thinking. Therefore, language planning for Banjarese maintenance should be revitalized by inviting all stakeholders in local government on behalf of local language maintenance. The discussion should deal with urgent issues of Banjarese and factors that make local language maintenance difficult to

implement.

Urgent issues of Banjarese concern the presence or interference of major languages, such as Indonesian or English to the Banjarese people, and those are potential to threaten Banjarese maintenance. This current issue happens to the young generation who tend to combine local language and major language in communication. It is aimed to break and disturb local language maintenance. Also, other factors as the barriers towards local language maintenance should be anticipated. However, Banjarese people have high loyalty to their mother tongue, and it is the opportunity and strength in local language maintenance. To maintain it, the school's presence is required.

Concerning strategies used for enhancing critical thinking in language planning concerning Banjarese maintenance, it relates to language-in-education planning. It deals with access, personnel, curriculum, methodology and materials, resourcing, community, and evaluation policies. Access policy means when and who learn what language. Personnel policy refers to the in-service and pre-service training of teachers. Curriculum policy means specific teaching goals. Methodology and materials policy involves the teaching methods and teaching materials adopted in a particular period. The resourcing policy is language education finance. Community policy contains parental attitudes, funding sources, and recruiting teachers and students. Evaluation policy involves evaluation of curriculum, student success, teacher success, interest, cost-effectiveness, societal change, and basic policy (Baldauf & Kaplan, 2005; Kaplan, 2005; Kaplan & Baldauf, 2005 as cited in Yang & Yuen, 2014). It is seen from macro and micro-LP. Therefore, viewing the needs analysis in maintaining Banjarese from extinction should be conducted comprehensively. Banjarese language is not only for communication but also for saving values and norms from the ancestors, and it is very important to consider as the effort to maintain local language from extinction. It should be included in local material as a subject at school. The attendance of Banjarese subject at school colorizes the students' view of life for the interest of a sense of belonging. Its purpose is to meet the goals of language learners and their communities (Hinton, 2011).

## **6. Conclusion**

Critical thinking indicators in language planning concerning Banjarese maintenance are defined through consciousness to respect and loyalty as well as to gathering in community. In order to enhance critical thinking in language planning concerning Banjarese maintenance, it is necessary to start from the upper and bottom-up. Macro-LP and Micro-LP are the starting points to discuss the strategic issues to determine indicators in designing language planning and its strategies used in implementing language planning based on the current issues taking place in the society about the condition of Banjarese language. Language planning to maintain Banjarese should be well designed so that the teaching goals are achieved. Language planners with the local government in South Kalimantan Indonesia are required to work collectively to produce teaching design, the content of Banjarese subject, and the goals that respond to the local needs to enhance Banjarese young generation towards their own mother tongue. Thus, the implication of this study does not only suit to language situation in South Kalimantan but also to all regions across Indonesia archipelago to keep the ethnic languages are maintained and spoken by the younger and future generation of the respective language.

## **Acknowledgments**

I, as the first author, express gratitude to Lembaga Pengelola Dana Pendidikan (LPDP), the Ministry of the Monetary Republic of Indonesia that facilitates me a scholarship for the Doctoral Program. My thankfulness also goes to Universitas Negeri Surabaya the venue of my study to present this research.

## **Disclosure statement**

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.



**References**

- Ab Kadir, M. A. (2016). Critical thinking and learner diversity in the Australian curriculum: Implications and epistemological tensions. *International Journal of Pedagogies and Learning*, 11(3), 225-237.
- Al-qahtani, E. M. (2019). Critical thinking pedagogy: using textbooks evaluation and content analysis techniques for Saudi University students. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Translation (IJLLT)*, 2(5), 239-244.
- Asemota, H. E. (2015). Language, the individual, society and culture constitute: A unique approach, congenial for language teachers. *British Journal of English Linguistics*, 3(3), 14-22.
- Baldauf, R. B. J., & Kaplan, R. B. (2005). Language-in-education policy and planning. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 1-1169). Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Bećirović, S., Hodžić, F., & Brdarević-Čeljo, A. (2019). Critical thinking development in the milieu of high school education. *European Journal of Contemporary Education*, 8(3), 469-482.
- Chivhanga, E. (2013). Language planning In Zimbabwe: The use of indigenous languages (Shona) as a medium of instruction in primary schools. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 12(5), 58-65.
- Extra, G., & Yağmur, K. (2006). Migration and language planning. *Encyclopedia of Language & Linguistics*, (1994), 133-137.
- Farid, R. N. (2012). Bahasa Banjar: Its varieties and characteristics: A conceptual description of bahasa Banjar in sociolinguistic point of view. In A. Suyanto, Mualimin, & Prihantoro (Eds.), *Language Maintenance and Shift II*.
- Fauzi, I. (2008). Pemertahanan bahasa Banjar. In *Seminar antar bangsa: Dialek-dialek Austronesia di nusantara III* (pp. 435-447).
- Ferguson, G. (2006). *Language planning and education*. Language planning and education. Edinburgh University Press Ltd.
- Hamied, F. A., & Musthafa, B. (2019). Policies on language education in Indonesia. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 9(2), 308-315.

- Hatano, K. (2013). Makiguchian perspectives in language policy and planning. *Journal of Language, Identity and Education*, 12(1), 50-60.
- Hermes, M., Bang, M., & Marin, A. (2012). Designing indigenous language revitalization. *Harvard Educational Review*, 82(3), 381-438.
- Hinton, L. (1994). *Flutes of fire: Essays on California Indian languages*. Heyday Books.
- Hinton, L. (2011). Language revitalization and language pedagogy: New teaching and learning strategies. *Language and Education*, 25(4), 307-318.
- Hodges, R., & Prys, C. (2019). The community as a language planning crossroads: Macro and micro language planning in communities in Wales. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 20(3), 207-225.
- Kaemanje, E. L., Thomas, K., Shaddai, J., & Hernen, T. (2017). Measuring the effectiveness of critical literacy as an instructional method. *Journal of College Literacy and Learning*, 43, 36-54.
- Kaplan, R. B. (2005). Is language-in-education policy possible? In D. Cunningham & A. Hatoss (Eds.), *An international perspective on language policies, practices and proficiencies* (Vol. 37, pp. 1-420). Fédération Internationale des Professeurs de Langues Vivantes (FIPLV).
- Kaplan, R. B., & Baldauf, R. B. (1997). *Language planning: From practice to theory*. Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Kennedy, C. (1982). Language planning. *Language Teaching*, 15(4), 264-284.
- Kheng, C. C. S., & Baldauf, R. B. (2011). Micro language planning. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (Vol. II, pp. 936-951). Routledge.
- Kirkness, V. (2000). The preservation and use of our languages: Respecting the natural order of the creator. In *Proceedings of the annual Conference on Stabilizing Indigenous Languages* (pp. 17-23). Retrieved from [http://jan.ucc.nau.edu/~jar/ILAC/ILAC\\_2.pdf](http://jan.ucc.nau.edu/~jar/ILAC/ILAC_2.pdf)
- Komalasasi, I., & Rusdiana, I. (2017). Upaya pemertahanan bahasa. In *2nd NEDS Proceedings* (pp. 105-112).
- Kridalaksana, H. (1993). *Kamus linguistik*. Gramedia Pustaka Utama.

- Krippendorff, K. (2004). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology* (2nd ed.). Sage Publications, Inc.
- Liddicoat, A. J., & Taylor-Leech, K. (2014). Micro language planning for multilingual education: Agency in local contexts. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 15(3), 237-244.
- Lindström, E. (2007). Language planning and policy: Issues in language planning and literacy. In A. J. Liddicoat (Ed.), *Language Planning and Policy: Issues in Language Planning and Literacy*. Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Mahayanti, N. W. S., & Madya, S. (2020). The development of language policy and language education in Indonesia. *The Asian EFL Journal*, 27(2.2), 5-30.
- Mbete, A. M. (2010). Strategi pemertahanan bahasa-bahasa nusantara. In *Seminar nasional pemertahanan bahasa nusantara* (pp. 1-11).
- Noortyani, R. (2011). Sikap positif masyarakat Banjar terhadap bahasa Banjar di Kalimantan Selatan. In *Bahasa dan & sastra Indonesia: Konservasi dan pendidikan karakter* (pp. 231-217).
- Nyati-Saleshando, L. (2019). Shiyeyi language planning in Botswana: International connections and local imperatives. *Journal of Language, Identity and Education*, 18(3), 176-189.
- Paauw, S. (2009). One land, one nation, one language: An analysis of Indonesia's national language policy, 1, 2-16.
- Pauwels, A. (2016). *Language maintenance and shift*. Cambridge University Press.
- Reyhner, J. (1999). Some basics of indigenous language revitalization. In *The 5th Annual Stabilizing Indigenous Languages Symposium* (pp. V-XX). Retrieved from [http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED428923.pdf%0Ahttp://jan.ucc.nau.edu/~jar/RIL\\_Contents.html](http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED428923.pdf%0Ahttp://jan.ucc.nau.edu/~jar/RIL_Contents.html)
- Robinson, C., Anh, T., & Vu, T. (2019). Literacy, languages and development in Africa: A policy perspective. *International Review of Education*, 65(3), 443-470.
- Setiawan, S. (2001). *Language shift in a bilingual community: The case of*

*Javanese in Surabaya, East Java.* Auckland University.

Setiawan, S. (2020). Shifting from ethnic language among younger generation in a metropolitan city in Indonesia. *The Asian ESP Journal*, 16(2.1), 110-129.

Taylor-Leech, K., & Benson, C. (2017). Language planning and development aid the (in)visibility of language in development aid discourse. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 18(4), 339-355.

Tondo, F. H. (2009). Kepunahan bahasa-bahasa daerah: Faktor penyebab dan implikasi etnolinguistik. *Jurnal Masyarakat & Budaya*, 11(10), 277-296.

VanderLind, R. (2018). A sociocultural, semiotic, and cognitive model of postsecondary literacy. *Journal of College Literacy and Learning*, 44, 62-77.

Yang, J., & Yuen, C. K. (2014). College English teaching methodology and language planning: A pilot study in Hefei, China. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 118, 495-502.

Zein, S. (2017). Language in education policy on primary EFL: The case of Indonesia. *International Journal of Pedagogies and Learning*, 12(2), 133-146.

**About the Authors**

<sup>1</sup> **Moh. Yamin** is a senior lecturer in English Department, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Lambung Mangkurat, Banjarmasin, Indonesia. He has been teaching TEFL Methods, Materials Development and Writing. His research interest is on academic writing and TEFL issues in Indonesian context. He is currently taking a doctoral program majoring in English Education and Literature in Universitas Negeri Surabaya, Indonesia.

<sup>2</sup> **Slamet Setiawan** is an Associate Professor in the English Department of Universitas Negeri Surabaya. He obtained his B.A. in English Language Teaching at Universitas Negeri Surabaya. He completed his MA at the University of Auckland, New Zealand, and his Ph.D. at the University of Western Australia (both in Linguistics). He has been teaching Research Methods in Linguistics, Paper Writing and Language in Society. His educational background leads him to be interested in Linguistics and Applied Linguistics (English Language Teaching). He can be reached at [slametsetiawan@unesa.ac.id](mailto:slametsetiawan@unesa.ac.id).

<sup>3</sup> **Syafi'ul Anam** is a senior lecturer in the English Department of Universitas Negeri Surabaya. He has been teaching courses in Academic Writing, Language Assessment, and Material Development. His primary research interests include self-regulated learning, self-efficacy beliefs, and assessment in EFL contexts.

<sup>4</sup> **Fabiola Dharmawanti Kurnia**, Emeritus Professor in Literature, has been teaching Language & Literacy Planning, and Philosophy of Language Literature Pedagogy at Postgraduate School, Universitas Negeri Surabaya. Her study focuses on pedagogical knowledge of language and literature criticism of English literary works.