

Reconstructing POAC Functions in a Bilingual Vocational High School Program: Pedagogical Adaptation and Institutional Sustainability

¹Rita Asmarani, ²Ani Susanti, ³Enung Hasanah

Email : ¹ 2576046080@uad.ac.id, ² ani.susanti@pbi.uad.ac.id, ³ enung.hasanah@mp.uad.ac.id

^{1, 2, 3} Universitas Ahmad Dahlan

*Corresponding author

ARTICLE INFO

Article history

Received: 1 July 2026

Revised: 22 September 2026

Accepted: 28 September 2026

Keywords

Bilingual education

Institutional sustainability

POAC management

Translanguaging

Vocational education

ABSTRACT

The increasing demand for English proficiency in vocational contexts has encouraged schools to develop bilingual programs, whose continuity depends on both teaching practices and institutional management. This study examines a bilingual class program +at SMK Negeri 2 Balikpapan through planning, organizing, actuating, and controlling (POAC). An instrumental qualitative case study drew on interviews with five adult informants, two classroom observations, and school documents. Student participation was documented through classroom observations rather than student interviews documents. Data were analyzed through condensation, display, and conclusion drawing and verification. Planning combined school initiative with education-office encouragement and subsequent formalization. Organizing involved an appointed team and teacher mentoring, although scheduling difficulties constrained collaboration. Classroom observations showed the use of English terminology, Indonesian explanations, and scaffolding as pedagogical strategies supporting participation in mathematics and accounting. Controlling combined general school supervision and informal reflection, but bilingual-specific rubrics and documented follow-up were unavailable in the reviewed evidence. The school decree nevertheless assigned an evaluation team and required evaluation at the end of each semester, revealing a gap between formal responsibilities and operational routines. This tension is interpreted as a case-specific agility–vulnerability paradox: local flexibility sustained activities while dependence on the coordinator created continuity risks. The findings support protected coordination time, shared monitoring responsibilities, and assessment that integrates language and subject objectives. They may offer transferable insights for schools facing similar conditions; they do not establish causal learning gains or a universally replicable governance model.

This is an open access article under the [CC-BY-SA](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/) license.



Introduction

Globalization and international economic integration have increased attention to communication skills within vocational education. Graduates may need to interpret technical terminology and communicate in English alongside their occupational expertise. Bilingual education offers one approach to connecting language development with subject learning, although its purposes and forms vary across institutional settings (Garcia, 2013; Wright & Baker, 2025). For vocational high schools, this raises a managerial question: how can language-rich learning be sustained within existing curricula, staffing arrangements, and assessment systems?

Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) brings content learning and language development into a shared instructional setting. Its implementation requires attention to subject knowledge and the language through which learners encounter and express that knowledge (Dalton-Puffer, 2011). Scaffolding can help teachers make content accessible in CLIL classrooms (Mahan, 2022). Translanguaging provides a related perspective on the purposeful use of learners' linguistic resources. Nguyen et al. (2025), studying Vietnamese CLIL teachers, found that multilingual strategies were not always planned systematically and identified a need for professional development. The use of Indonesian alongside English therefore does not, by itself, indicate that CLIL has failed.

Previous research addresses different parts of this problem. Mearns et al. (2020) examined learner motivation in bilingual education in the Netherlands. Kamumu et al. (2022) discussed CLIL within an international-school curriculum, rather than vocational learning outcomes. In Indonesian vocational education, Rahmiani & Marwandi (2022) described a bilingual learning ecosystem involving collaboration between English and non-English teaching. These studies establish the relevance of pedagogy, learner engagement, and collaboration. They also leave room for a context-specific examination of how formal program responsibilities connect with everyday coordination and monitoring.

The present study uses planning, organizing, actuating, and controlling (POAC) as its primary analytical framework. In educational management, these functions connect program objectives, resource allocation, implementation, and evaluation (Mariyah et al., 2021). Planning concerns the program's rationale and development priorities; organizing concerns responsibilities and coordination; actuating concerns teaching and supporting activities; and controlling concerns supervision, assessment, and follow-up. POAC is used to examine relationships among these functions, rather than to assume that they operate as a fixed administrative sequence.

Two complementary perspectives guide interpretation. Distributed leadership directs attention to how responsibility and expertise are shared in relation to teaching innovation (O'Shea, 2021). Institutional decoupling concerns the possible separation of formal organizational arrangements from ongoing activities (Meyer & Rowan, 1977). Here, decoupling is a sensitizing concept for comparing school documents with interview and observation evidence. A discrepancy between a written assignment and reported practice does not establish that school leaders deliberately created a symbolic structure or sought only reputational benefits.

Within this framework, structural detachment denotes a case-specific gap between assigned supervisory responsibilities and their operational enactment. The agility-vulnerability paradox denotes the coexistence of flexible local responses and dependence on a small number of staff when coordination and monitoring are weakly institutionalized. These expressions summarize an interpretation of this case; they are not presented as established theories or independently validated constructs. They focus attention on whether flexibility is supported by routines that allow responsibilities to be shared and sustained.

This study analyzes how the four POAC functions operate in the bilingual program at SMK Negeri 2 Balikpapan and how their interaction supports or constrains continuity. Its contribution is an evidence-based account connecting classroom language practices with the organization and oversight of a vocational bilingual program. It asks how the program is planned, organized, implemented, and monitored, and where formal arrangements and operational practice converge or diverge. The findings may offer transferable insights for schools facing similar conditions, while the single-case design limits broader generalization.

Method

This study employed an instrumental qualitative case study design to examine bilingual program management in its school context. Qualitative inquiry supports an examination of participants' interpretations, while case study research enables the use of multiple sources of contextual evidence (Creswell & Poth, 2018; Yin, 2018). SMK Negeri 2 Balikpapan was selected because it operated a developing bilingual program within an industry-oriented vocational school. The overall research process, including preparation, data collection, analysis, and reporting, lasted six months.

Five adult informants were selected purposively because of their involvement in program policy, coordination, teaching, or school-industry relations. They comprised the program coordinator (N1-PIC), principal (N2-KS), vice principal for curriculum (N3-WKKUR), vice principal for public and industry relations (N4-WKHUM), and an English

teacher (N5-GRBING). The teacher's account provides a practitioner perspective alongside the managerial accounts. Students' classroom participation was observed, but student interview transcripts are not part of the interview dataset reported in this article. Accordingly, references to students below identify observed behavior, not student testimony or independently elicited perceptions.

Semi-structured interviews explored the program's development, staff responsibilities, language support, coordination constraints, supervision, and evaluation. The researcher served as the primary instrument, supported by POAC-based interview and observation guides and a document-review form. Two lessons were observed without the researcher teaching: mathematics in class XI AK-1 on May 8, 2026 (O1), and accounting in class X AK-2 on May 12, 2026 (O2). Observation records included indicator sheets and descriptive field notes on language use, scaffolding, teacher-student interaction, participation, and any visible supervisory activity.

Documentary evidence comprised the principal's decree on bilingual teaching duties for 2025/2026, numbered 400.3.8/740.a/SMKN2 and dated February 10, 2026 (D1); the document-review checklist dated May 18, 2026 (D2); compiled program reports covering July–August 2024, September–December 2024, and January–June 2025 (D3); the school's 2025/2026 academic handbook (D4); and documentation of training for non-English teachers on December 8, 2025 (D5). The historical reports provide evidence of recorded activities, not a contemporaneous measurement of the lessons observed in May 2026. No pre-post comparison of English proficiency or occupational performance was conducted.

Source triangulation compared the five adult accounts, including the teacher's perspective. Method triangulation compared interviews with the classroom records and documents, retaining discrepancies where the sources differed. Member checking involved checking interview transcriptions and initial interpretations with key informants. It was used to examine accuracy and meaning, rather than to treat agreement as proof of a single objective account (Birt et al., 2016). The limited observation window and the predominantly staff-based interview sample remain relevant constraints.

Data analysis followed the procedures described (Miles et al., 2014): data condensation, data display, and conclusion drawing and verification. Interview material was organized with ATLAS.ti 9 and grouped under the POAC functions, while recurrent issues such as scheduling, language support, coordinator dependence, and monitoring gaps informed the thematic interpretation. The displays make explicit which evidence supports each claim and distinguish a document's stated requirement from its reported implementation. Quotations below are English translations of the Indonesian source excerpts. Informant codes identify

the interview sources; observation codes and document codes distinguish the other forms of evidence.

Table 1. Coding scheme and evidence sources for the POAC functions

POAC function	Analytical focus	Supporting evidence
Planning	Local initiative, external encouragement, and formalization	N1-PIC; N2-KS; N5-GRBING; D1; D3
Organizing	Assigned roles, mentoring, and scheduling constraints	N1-PIC; N3-WKKUR; N5-GRBING; D1; D2; D5
Actuating	Bilingual explanation, scaffolding, and classroom participation	N1-PIC; N5-GRBING; O1; O2; D3
Controlling	General supervision, informal review, and gaps in specific instruments	N1-PIC; N2-KS; N3-WKKUR; N4-WKHUM; N5-GRBING; D1; D2; D4; O1; O2

Note. N = interview informant; O = classroom observation; D = documentary source. Codes are defined in the Method section.

Findings and Discussion

A. Findings

The evidence shows that the program combined formal school arrangements with adaptive work by the coordinator and teachers. Interview accounts, observed classroom practices, and documentary records supported several common patterns, but they also revealed discrepancies. The findings are presented by POAC function to distinguish what was planned, assigned, enacted, and monitored.

1. Planning through local initiative and formalization

The coordinator described a sequence in which practical implementation preceded a decree: “In practice, we had already been running for about one semester before the decree appeared” (N1-PIC). The principal situated the initiative within earlier school experience, while the English teacher recalled encouragement from the education office’s vocational-school division and collaboration with the principal (N2-KS; N5-GRBING). Planning therefore combined internal initiative with external encouragement; it cannot be characterized as exclusively bottom-up.

D1 provides direct evidence of formalization. It specifies the use of Indonesian and English in selected subjects and establishes a team responsible for planning, coordinating, and evaluating bilingual learning (SMK Negeri 2 Balikpapan, 2026). D3 records bilingual activities during 2024–2025, before the date of the available decree (SMK Negeri 2 Balikpapan, 2025c). These records support the existence of earlier activities and later documented responsibilities. They do not establish whether D1 was the first decree issued,

so the coordinator's recollection of a one-semester interval is not converted into an independently verified program chronology.

The vice principal for public and industry relations described efforts to connect English learning with vocational needs but reported that internship placement remained generally the same for bilingual and regular students (N4-WKHUM). This qualifies the program's workplace orientation: it was a planning rationale and an area of ongoing development, rather than evidence of a separate placement pathway or demonstrated employment advantage.

2. Organizing staff support amid scheduling constraints

The school had an appointed bilingual team. The appendix to D1 lists leadership, curriculum, media, monitoring and reporting, and facilities responsibilities. The coordinator also described English teachers mentoring student groups and assisting non-English colleagues (N1-PIC). D5 documents a training session for non-English teachers on December 8, 2025 (SMK Negeri 2 Balikpapan, 2025b). These sources establish the presence of staff support arrangements, although the training record alone does not demonstrate subsequent changes in teaching competence.

Regular collaboration was more difficult to sustain. The English teacher stated: "There is a program for weekly meetings so teachers can learn together ... the problem in practice is time management, because all of our teaching schedules are already very full" (N5-GRBING). This corroborates the coordinator's account of unsuccessful attempts to find a suitable meeting time and the principal's account of conflicting teaching commitments (N1-PIC; N2-KS). D2 records available coordination minutes but no regular coordination schedule. The convergence indicates a gap in recurring coordination time, rather than an absence of all meetings or teamwork.

The English teacher also reported that joint lesson design was "not yet well organized or solid" and that the coordinator had prepared a practical booklet for classroom English (N5-GRBING). D3 includes a handbook for non-English teachers in its September–December 2024 report. Taken together, the evidence shows practical support for classroom routines alongside incomplete integration of collaborative lesson planning.

3. Actuating bilingual learning through scaffolding

The coordinator explained that Indonesian was used when students needed clarification: "When students asked because they did not understand, it was then explained in Indonesian" (N1-PIC). The purpose described in the interview was to keep subject content accessible. The English teacher emphasized building an environment in which teachers and students could use English without fear of mistakes, while also reporting that

some non-English teachers experienced pressure from their bilingual assignments (N5-GRBING). These are accounts of intentions and perceived difficulties, not measurements of reduced anxiety.

O1 provides classroom evidence from mathematics on May 8, 2026. The teacher used English for greetings, attendance, and lesson objectives, then combined English and Indonesian when explaining concepts. The field notes state that “Indonesian was still more dominant to ensure understanding of mathematical concepts.” Examples, bilingual terminology, and repeated explanations supported problem solving. Some students participated actively, while others waited for guidance; spoken English remained limited. This observation supports a qualified account of language-assisted participation rather than uniformly high English use.

In accounting on May 12, 2026, O2 recorded the terms journal, ledger, transaction, and financial statement, bilingual slides, transaction documents, and case exercises. The field notes state: “Some students were willing to use English terms when explaining answers or asking questions.” Students analyzed transactions and worked on accounting tasks, while Indonesian explanations were used for more complex concepts. These field notes document student participation rather than students’ own accounts of their experiences. They show emerging integration of content, communication, and reasoning, although two lessons cannot establish the consistency of CLIL across the program.

D3 documents activities beyond lessons, including online conversations, English podcasts, community interaction, and mentoring. The September–December 2024 report describes weekly online conversations with rotating student hosts. These records corroborate the existence of planned or reported opportunities for language use. Their positive descriptions of student development are treated as the program’s own reporting, not as independently measured learning gains.

4. Controlling through general supervision and informal review

The interviews distinguish general school supervision from bilingual-specific monitoring. The principal reported semesterly academic supervision using the school’s general instruments (N2-KS), and the vice principal for curriculum described the same arrangement (N3-WKKUR). The coordinator nevertheless stated, “Unfortunately, there is not one yet; we do not have an instrument for monitoring like that” when asked about a dedicated instrument (N1-PIC). The English teacher similarly explained: “There is not yet a standardized written instrument from the school, so the pattern is more like informal conversations after class” (N5-GRBING). The evidence concerns the specificity and documentation of supervision, not the absence of all supervisory activity.

D2 corroborates several documentary gaps. On May 18, 2026, it marked bilingual monitoring records, a supervision instrument, a bilingual assessment rubric, and written improvement recommendations as unavailable. It also marked a program evaluation report as available. The linked D3 file contains activity reports and reflective summaries, but these are not equivalent to a standardized observation rubric or a traceable follow-up procedure. The sources differ in what they call evaluation. The available reports demonstrate activity documentation, while standardized supervision and follow-up remain unsubstantiated in the reviewed record.

Formal policy nevertheless required evaluation. The fifth clause of D1 directs the school to conduct evaluation and assessment of bilingual learning at the end of each semester, and its appendix assigns a monitoring, evaluation, and reporting team. D4 sets out general school assessment provisions, including formative and summative assessment (SMK Negeri 2 Balikpapan, 2025a). The central finding is therefore a gap between specific responsibilities on paper and the dedicated instruments and routines available in the research evidence. O1 and O2 recorded no supervisory visit during the observed lessons; this limited observation cannot establish that supervision never occurred.

Coordinator dependence also emerged in reporting. The coordinator said there was “not yet a solid team to help me” and explained that only three bulletins had been produced before publication stopped (N1-PIC). The vice principal for curriculum directed operational questions to the coordinator, while N4-WKHUM reported that internship monitoring did not use a separate instrument for bilingual students and that systematic alumni tracking was unavailable. These accounts indicate concentration of operational knowledge and incomplete monitoring across school functions. They do not establish total managerial withdrawal or an inevitable program collapse.

Table 2. Formal arrangements and operational evidence across POAC functions

Function	Formal or recorded support	Operational evidence	Qualified interpretation
Planning	D1 assigns program responsibilities; D3 records earlier activities.	N1 recalls practice preceding a decree; N5 also identifies external encouragement.	Adaptive development with a partly documented chronology.
Organizing	D1 appoints a team; D5 records teacher training.	N1 and N5 describe scheduling constraints; D2 lacks a recurring coordination schedule.	Assigned roles require protected time for collaboration.
Actuating	D3 records language activities and a teacher handbook.	O1 and O2 show bilingual explanations, scaffolding, and varied participation.	Emerging CLIL practices; learning gains were not measured.

Function	Formal or recorded support	Operational evidence	Qualified interpretation
Controlling	D1 requires semesterly evaluation and names an evaluation team.	Staff describe general supervision; D2 lacks dedicated monitoring and follow-up instruments.	Formal responsibilities are incompletely translated into specific routines.

Source. Synthesis of the five interviews, two classroom observations, and documentary evidence identified in the Method section.

B. Discussion

1. Institutional flexibility and continuity risks

The planning and organizing findings show how a school can sustain an initiative through local adjustment while developing its formal arrangements. POAC makes the interdependence visible: decisions to expand the program increase the need for staff coordination, instructional support, and monitoring ([Mariyah et al., 2021](#)). The problem is not that the school had no structure. It is that an appointed structure, training opportunities, and staff commitment had not consistently produced protected coordination time and bilingual-specific evaluation routines.

The coexistence of a formal evaluation mandate and limited operational instruments is consistent with a possible policy–practice gap viewed through institutional decoupling ([Meyer & Rowan, 1977](#)). Structural detachment is used here only for that limited configuration. The principal’s report of general supervision and the available decree provide counterevidence to the stronger claim that management withdrew completely. The study also provides no basis for attributing deliberate symbolic compliance, misunderstanding, or reputational motives to particular school leaders.

The agility–vulnerability paradox captures the more defensible interpretation. Flexible coordination and practical teacher support allowed activities to continue, while the concentration of operational knowledge and reporting in the coordinator left continuity dependent on a small group. This is a risk inferred from the observed arrangements, not a tested prediction of program failure. Distributed leadership provides a basis for examining whether assigned responsibilities are accompanied by the authority, time, and resources to enact them ([O’Shea, 2021](#)). Likewise, describing a school as a learning organization requires attention to the contextual meaning of organizational learning, rather than treating any informal collaboration as sufficient evidence ([Örtenblad, 2018](#)).

2. Pedagogical adaptation and shared quality assurance

The two observations show that the use of Indonesian and English supported participation in content-focused tasks. This is compatible with scaffolding in CLIL and with purposeful use of multilingual resources ([Mahan, 2022](#); [Nguyen et al., 2025](#)). However, the

evidence does not show a completed progression from EMI to CLIL, nor does it justify defining translanguaging as a stagnant transitional stage. The more precise finding is that elements of content-language integration were visible while joint planning and specific monitoring remained uneven.

Rahmiani & Marwandi (2022) account of a vocational bilingual learning ecosystem provides a relevant comparison because it connects English and non-English teaching through collaboration. The present case extends that managerial concern by showing how scheduling and monitoring can limit the enactment of collaborative intentions. The teacher's testimony and the observed variation in student English use caution against assuming that content mastery had been secured. Neither mastery nor anxiety reduction was assessed as an outcome in this study.

A practical implication is to connect existing roles to feasible routines. School leaders and the curriculum team could protect recurring coordination time and agree on a short, shared observation form covering subject objectives, language objectives, scaffolding, participation, and follow-up. English and vocational teachers could use it for joint lesson review, with monitoring duties distributed across the team already named in D1. Activity reports and language assessments could inform these reviews, while explicit records would identify decisions, responsible staff, and subsequent action. These are recommendations derived from the gaps identified; their effectiveness remains to be evaluated.

Scope and limitations

This account concerns one school, five adult interview informants, and two observed lessons. Students' experiences were represented through observation rather than interviews, and industry feedback was reported by a school informant rather than obtained directly from employers. Historical activity reports were produced for program reporting and were read alongside later interviews and observations. These differences in source, purpose, and time constrain causal and chronological inference. Future studies could include student interviews, direct employer perspectives, repeated observations, and longitudinal analysis of how shared monitoring operates. The current contribution is contextual understanding and potentially transferable insight, not statistical generalization or validation of a universal governance model.

Conclusion

The bilingual program at SMK Negeri 2 Balikpapan combined adaptive planning, assigned staff roles, and practical classroom language support. Observation evidence showed English terminology and Indonesian explanations used in mathematics and

accounting, with varied student participation. The main managerial weakness concerned the translation of formal responsibilities into consistent bilingual-specific coordination, monitoring, and documented follow-up. General supervision and program reports existed, but they did not substitute for dedicated instruments that linked language and content objectives.

The case suggests that institutional flexibility benefits from shared operational responsibility and workable quality-assurance routines. Protected coordination time, collaborative supervision, and documented follow-up may reduce dependence on the coordinator while supporting pedagogical adaptation. These recommendations require further implementation and evaluation. The findings may be relevant to vocational schools facing similar conditions, but they do not demonstrate causal improvements in English proficiency, establish inevitable sustainability failure, or support universal replication.

REFERENCES

- Birt, L., Scott, S., Cavers, D., Campbell, C., & Walter, F. (2016). Member Checking: A Tool to Enhance Trustworthiness or Merely a Nod to Validation? *Qualitative Health Research*, 26(13), 1802–1811. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732316654870>
- Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing among Five Approaches*. (4th Ed).
- Dalton- Puffer, C. (2011). Content-and-Language Integrated Learning: From Practice to Principles? *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 31, 182–204. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190511000092>
- Garcia, O. (2013). Bilingual Education in the 21st Century: A Global Perspective. 42(3), 344–345.
- Kamumu, N., Laksono, K., Mintowati, M., Nurhadi, D., Soepardjo, D., & Roni. (2022). Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) dalam Kurikulum ABEKA Sekolah Internasional. 13(2). <https://doi.org/10.31943/gw.v13i2.228>
- Mahan, K. R. (2022). The comprehending teacher: scaffolding in content and language integrated learning (CLIL). *The Language Learning Journal*, 50(1), 74–88. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2019.1705879>
- Mariyah, S., Hasibuan, L., Anwar, K., & Rizki, A. F. (2021). Perspektif Pengelolaan Pendidikan Fungsi Pengelolaan (Planning, Organizing, Actuating, Controlling). *Instructional Development Journal (IDJ)*, 4(3), 268–281. <https://ejournal.uin-suska.ac.id/index.php/IDJ/article/view/18911/8009>
- Mearns, T., Graaff, R. de, & Coyle, D. (2020). Motivation for or From Bilingual Education? A Comparative Study of Learner Views in the Netherlands. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 23(6), 724–737. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2017.1405906>
- Meyer, J. W., & Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized Organizations: Formal Structure as Myth and Ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology*, 83(2), 340–363. <https://doi.org/10.1086/226550>

- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative Data Analysis: A Methods Sourcebook* (3rd ed.). Sage Publication, Inc. <https://books.google.co.id/books?id=p0wXBAAAQBAJ&printsec=frontcover&hl=id#v=onepage&q&f=true>
- Nguyen, H. T. M., Nguyen, H. T. T., Gilanyi, L., Hoang, T. H., & Gao, X. A. (2025). Content Language Integrated Learning (CLIL): Teachers' metacognitive understanding of pedagogical translanguaging. *Learning and Instruction*, 97 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2025.102085>
- O'Shea, C. (2021). Distributed Leadership and Innovative Teaching Practices. *International Journal of Education Research Open*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedro.2021.100088>
- Örtenblad, A. (2018). What Does "Learning Organization" Mean? *The Learning Organization: An International Journal*, 25(3), 150–258. <https://doi.org/10.1108/TLO-02-2018-0016>
- Rahmiani, N., & Marwandi. (2022). Teaching English Through a Bilingual Learning Ecosystem in The Secondary Vocational School of Industrial Technology. *Journal of Applied Studies in Language*, 6(2), 167–178. <https://doi.org/10.31940/jasl.v6i2.496>
- SMK Negeri 2 Balikpapan. (2025a). *Buku Panduan Akademik SMK Negeri 2 Balikpapan Tahun Pelajaran 2025/2026*.
- SMK Negeri 2 Balikpapan. (2025b). *Dokumentasi Kegiatan Pelatihan untuk Guru Non-Bahasa Inggris Kelas Bilingual SMKN 2 Balikpapan*. https://docs.google.com/document/d/1zdIlbk5gjRfBW3XU_IKkc_k6UJH7DUSV/edit
- SMK Negeri 2 Balikpapan. (2025c). *Laporan Kegiatan Kelas Bilingual [Compiled Program Reports for July 2024–June 2025]*. <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1cry90sNVJb-iWeAjlwX3bKLotGBKBzTw/view>
- SMK Negeri 2 Balikpapan. (2026). *Keputusan Kepala SMK Negeri 2 Balikpapan tentang Pembagian Tugas Guru dalam Kegiatan Pembelajaran Bilingual Tahun Ajaran 2025/2026 (No. 400.3.8/740.a/SMKN2)*. https://drive.google.com/file/d/1HOi-UtPOEe6_tzjRcsL3KI9sZikhxR7A/view
- Wright, W. E., & Baker, C. (2025). *Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*. <https://doi.org/10.21832/WRIGHT0543>
- Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case study research design and methods* (5th ed.). CJPE: Cokroaminoto Juornal of Primary Education. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/308385754_Robert_K_Yin_2014_Case_Study_Research_Design_and_Methods_5th_ed_Thousand_Oaks_CA_Sage_282_pages