

Dissecting the Rise of Ideological Constructs in Educators' Pedagogical Discourse: A Critical Discourse Analysis

Yenni Hasnah

Doctoral Program of English Applied Linguistics, Universitas Negeri Medan, Medan, Indonesia;
Universitas Muhammadiyah Sumatera Utara, Medan, Indonesia

Amrin Saragih

Doctoral Program of English Applied Linguistics, Universitas Negeri Medan, Medan, Indonesia

Sri M. Murni

Doctoral Program of English Applied Linguistics, Universitas Negeri Medan, Medan, Indonesia

Abstract—Contemporary classrooms have undergone significant transformations, evolving from a primary emphasis on acquiring knowledge to a crucial role in shaping individual ideologies among learners. Thus, the current inquiry intends to shed light on the means by which the instructional discourse enacted by teachers in the classroom raises the ideologies of learners. In order to acquire a set of representative data, an in-depth examination of the pedagogical discourse articulated by distinct educators was undertaken. It is posited that the application of Fairclough's (1992) CDA framework encompassing text analysis, discursive practice, and social practice is considered pertinent for critically unveiling the underlying ideological constructs that emerged within the discourses. The research findings meticulously delineate ideologies that incorporate the principles of academic integrity and diligence, self-reflection and emotional awareness, critical thinking and independence, inclusivity and engagement, resilience, and continuous improvement. These elements are prominently highlighted and strongly promoted in academic contexts, especially in educational settings. To proficiently bolster the previously mentioned ideologies, language fulfills a crucial role in the complex mechanisms of ideological dissemination by utilizing a blend of imperatives, conditional frameworks, reflective and open-ended questions, and colloquial expressions, alongside a supportive tone and humor. The proactive endorsement and nurturing of diverse ideological frameworks significantly contribute to the comprehensive development of students, enhancing their progression not solely in academic pursuits but also in personal and social spheres. Hence, it is imperative to integrate various ideological frameworks into the classroom to embody the students' holistic development.

Index Terms—ideological constructs, teachers' discourse, critical discourse analysis

I. INTRODUCTION

Classrooms have recently transformed, shifting their emphasis from solely acquiring knowledge to serving a crucial function in molding ideology. In other words, the transformation of the role of classrooms has progressed from merely disseminating information to also shaping belief systems, mirroring a wider societal change in educational perspectives (Pang et al., 2023; Vindevoghel, 2016; Sumarna & Gunawan, 2022; Yin & Gu, 2023; Lück & Rudman, 2017). Such shifts attest that the educators perceived their classrooms not solely as physical settings for learning, but also as arenas for empowerment and restoration, providing students with a deeper insight into their identities as members of society during a period marked by unrest and transformation (Waly, 2022). Similarly, van Dijk (1993, 1995) also avers that classrooms are environments where discursive actions and practices are interlinked with external events and are influenced by phenomena that shape societal frameworks, including power dynamics and ideological constructs. In this regard, the ideological framework within the classroom, as a context for the pedagogical process, can be effectively influenced by student engagement, types of activities, seating arrangements, and various other classroom-related considerations (Kesevan, 2016). This underscores that ideology, as a fundamental element within the educational environment, may be molded by various factors present during instructional activities.

Looking into the necessity of ideology in the pedagogical context, it is critical to incorporate curriculum ideology into pedagogical approaches to foster students' skills, shape their beliefs, and improve their ideology, which emphasizes the significance of self-directed learning and humanistic principles in the realm of language education (Yin & Gu, 2023). Furthermore, the inclusion of ideological components into the instruction of English not only aids in the formation of appropriate values and in the development of students' ideological consciousness (Xiuli, 2023; Chen, 2023) but also plays a crucial role in shaping the overarching framework of pedagogy by placing a strong emphasis on the

objective of moral and ideological enrichment in the process of curriculum enhancement (Gu, 2023). The advancement of collegiate individuals is considered crucial for the advancement of the nation, thus mandating educators to provide students with the essential ideological and political resources to carry out their duties (Mao, 2022). Hence, embracing ideology within educational settings is deemed crucial for molding values, promoting critical thinking skills, and enhancing the societal engagement of students. However, educators may exhibit reluctance to tackle ideological subjects within the academic environment, although matters and concerns related to ideology have the potential to arise promptly and prominently within communication classes (Mazer, 2018).

In light of the above-discussed points, the scrutiny of ideological constructs, particularly within classroom discourse, has garnered considerable interest from scholars. Nevertheless, how these ideologies are either magnified or diminished within the pedagogical discourse enacted by educators is yet to be thoroughly examined. Accordingly, this ongoing investigation seeks to illuminate the rise of ideologies in the educational context, as evidenced by the educational discourses of instructors. Scholarly inquiries on instructional engagements underscore the influence of linguistic expressions on the formation of ideological viewpoints within the educational environment (Lück & Rudman, 2017), such as providing students with the necessary skills for conducting critical analyses and dismantling societal norms and biases (Bärmann et al., 2022). These results highlight the critical need for educators to effectively navigate and confront ideological diversity and its implications within educational environments to promote critical thinking and create inclusive learning atmospheres. To confront the raising of ideology within educational settings, it is vital to consider the influence of ideology on pedagogical strategies and the design of educational curricula (Myers, 2002). Instructors ought to be thoroughly mindful of the underlying ideological perspectives that may exert influence over the decision-making process and the instructional strategies, thus fostering the development of critical thinking skills and an understanding of a wide range of viewpoints (Cortés, 2023). Concerning ideological scrutiny, through the investigation of the legitimization or prohibition of ideologies within educational settings, scholars can enhance their comprehension of the mechanisms involved in ideological shaping, perpetuation, and opposition among youth. In conclusion, the present study enhances comprehension regarding power, ideology, and education. This research also contributes valuable insights to the development of policies and pedagogical strategies aimed at fostering critical thinking, inclusivity, and social equity within the educational sphere.

II. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Given that the present research endeavors to acquire an understanding of the particular significances and behaviors encountered within a distinct social phenomenon—namely, the endorsement of ideologies in educational settings, by means of the subjective experiences of the participants (Palmer & Bolderston, 2006), and its methodologies that predominantly yield textual data or words rather than numerical data for analytical purposes, a qualitative research approach was embraced (Patton & Cochran, 2002). Qualitative data analysis is directed towards uncovering and describing the processes through which individuals construct social meaning within their routines and practices (Flick, 2013), such as raising ideologies as facilitated by educators' pedagogical discourses in classroom interactions. In the current investigation, the social implications elucidated by how ideological dimensions are raised in the pedagogical interactions of educators were brought to light through critical discourse analysis (CDA).

Akin to the aforementioned particular objectives of this study, through the practice of purposive sampling, two university teachers were selected based on their extensive teaching experience to acquire profound insights into the objectives of the research, which are to explore how educators cultivate ideological frameworks through pedagogical interactions. The choice of two teachers with varying degrees of instructional experience presents scientific justifications. The senior academic, with more than 15 years of experience, was presumably to have cultivated a stable and potentially conventional teaching approach. Years of experience have molded this pedagogical framework, facilitating a thorough probe into how traditional teaching practices affect the treatment of ideologies in the classroom. What's more, the senior lecturer, after committing years to the educational system, is inclined to have internalized the norms and values of their institution, which can substantially affect her approach to ideological discourses. Her pedagogical practices may embody the institutional ethos, offering insights into how a seasoned educator directs and potentially bolsters the institutional ideologies in her pedagogical contexts. The early-career educator, on the flip side, who owns under three years of professional experience, may introduce more innovative or experimental methodologies to his pedagogical practices, demonstrating a heightened receptivity to current educational paradigms and training. This disparity enables the inquiry to look into the influence of varying levels of experience on the integration and management of ideological frameworks in the conversation during pedagogical engagement. In addition, the junior lecturer, who is notably less experienced within the domain, may still be adjusting to the prevailing organizational norms. His approach may be less ingrained with institutional standards or practices, providing a novel outlook on how novice educator addresses ideological constructs before fully integrating into the institutional milieu. These arguments highlight the noteworthiness of investigating instructors with diverse levels of experience to achieve a thorough enlightenment of how ideologies are introduced, upheld, or contested within the EFL educational environment.

Since it aligns with the parameters of qualitative research, the researcher assumes a pivotal role as a key instrument (Ginting et al., 2024; Creswell, 2007). To guarantee the process of acquiring the data and that the gathered data were accurate, while simultaneously mitigating the risk of inaccuracies and extraneous information, a sequence of procedures

of collecting the data was executed; (a) select two EFL lecturers exhibiting varying degrees of pedagogical experience; one with an excess of 15 years of experience and the other with less than 3 years, (b) ensure that both teachers conduct their instructions under the similar confines of the classroom setting to ascertain the data gained is consistent, (c) record the instructional sessions to accurately capture the dialogue. Make certain that consent is obtained from both the instructors and the learners, (d) transcribe the audio recordings precisely, guaranteeing that each utterance made by the instructors is documented, encompassing pauses, hesitations, and intonation, (e) highlight specific statements where ideological frameworks are brought up or prohibited by adding annotations to the transcripts. Add notes on the emphasis, tone, and other relevant linguistic elements, and (f) arrange a coding scheme that aligns with the research objectives, emphasizing categories based on the ideological framework.

Acknowledging that this study aimed to shed light on the ideological constructs donated in the discourse of educators engaged in pedagogical practices, adopting Fairclough's CDA framework involving text analysis, discursive practice, and social practice (Fairclough, 1992) as a methodological tool for the inquiry was deemed pertinent. This framework was utilized to examine how educators employed language to construct ideologies during classroom interactions, as well as the ways in which this linguistic usage might bolster the existing power structures. Inquiry into the textual features aimed at unpacking how language was structured to denote meaning (ideology) represented in teachers' pedagogical discourse. The next step was analyzing the discursive practice, focusing on how the text was produced, consumed, and interpreted in the classroom setting, which investigated intertextuality, genre, and interaction patterns. The final phase is the social practice analysis. The analysis goes beyond the classroom, where the broader social practices, such as societal, political, or cultural context shape and are reflected in the classroom discourse. The investigation will begin by taking into account the context, looking at how the ideologies raised and banned align with the broader societal ideologies. To achieve a more nuanced understanding, the dynamics of power relations will also be incorporated. It scrutinizes the impact of educators' positions or roles within the institution on the promotion and suppression of specific ideologies articulated in their discourses.

III. FINDING

A. *Academic Integrity and Diligence*

The educators underscore the significance of integrity, authenticity, and diligent effort through promoting the notion that learners should embrace accountability for their educational journey and fulfill their assignments with integrity, thereby cultivating a profound sense of ethical obligation within the realm of scholarly pursuits. Through the enhancement of academic integrity, educators are embedding the significance of reliability, which is essential for the scholarly and vocational trajectories of students. Moreover, this ideological framework embodies the overarching educational objective of cultivating responsible and ethically-minded citizens. This particular ideology was epitomized by the subsequent utterances made by the teacher as delineated below:

“Just speak into video as natural as possible. Don't cheat and copy paste from the internet. Pure from you.”

The instructor utilizes explicit instructions that are designed to dissuade unethical conduct. The whole of his statements serves as a salient reminder for learners to generate genuine work, thereby reinforcing integrity as an essential value within the educational environment. The casual expression “just speak into video as natural as possible” further implies that integrity encompasses the notion of self-representation, in accordance with a philosophy that prioritizes authenticity within the educational process. In addition, the examination of phrases such as ‘Don't cheat and copy paste from the internet’ was conducted through textual analysis, illuminating the employment of direct imperatives that communicate an impression of authority while emphasizing the expected compliance with ethical standards. The framework exhibits clarity and rigidity, defining integrity as a clearly articulated requirement. In the context of discursive practices, it became evident that the educator's employment of direct language seeks to elucidate the significance of integrity. This instruction is formulated as a directive, guaranteeing that every student comprehends the imperative to refrain from engaging in plagiarism. Subsequently, within the context of social practice, the expression serves to fortify the lecturer's power dynamic, thereby asserting their authority to oversee academic norms and advocate for ethical conduct.

B. *Self-Reflection and Emotional Awareness*

By incorporating emotional awareness into the classroom discourse, the educator is advocating for a holistic educational ideology that prioritizes psychological well-being and self-care practices. This methodology epitomizes an increasing recognition within educational environments regarding the significance of socio-emotional competencies as essential underpinnings for both academic achievement and overall well-being. This particular ideology was elucidated through the subsequent expressions:

“If the transition is not smooth, then the move of...first part to another part is not good.”

While this statement is centered on content, it implicitly encourages contemplation by prompting students to assess the caliber of their own output. By eliciting a critical examination of the transitions present in their compositions, the instructor fosters an environment wherein students are motivated to engage in self-evaluation and enhance their competencies. This reflective approach fosters an enhanced self-awareness concerning the consequences of one's

decisions in scholarly endeavors, thereby reinforcing the principle of ongoing personal development. Moreover, the conditional structure necessitates that students engage in a critical evaluation of their work quality.

Alternative assertions are illustrated to substantiate the presence of this ideology, as demonstrated in the subsequent example:

“What makes you happy today?”

The aforementioned inquiries suggest a sustained emphasis on introspection and psychological well-being, which incentivizes students to contemplate their emotional conditions, thereby fostering self-awareness and emotional intelligence in conjunction with their academic pursuits. The utterances such as “What makes you happy today?” explicitly engage students' emotional states, thereby facilitating overt personal introspection. This open-ended question prompts to provide answers that transcend mere academic discourse, implicitly urging students to disclose personal reflections and cultivate self-awareness. By integrating emotional reflection into the pedagogical environment, the educator mitigates the dominance of authority that conventionally focuses exclusively on scholastic achievement, thereby prioritizing individual well-being and self-examination. Moreover, the inquiries posed by the lecturer serve to explicitly stimulate students to contemplate their emotional conditions, thereby cultivating an atmosphere in which students are at ease disclosing personal narratives. This methodology not only cultivates rapport but also prioritizes emotional intelligence as an integral component of the educational process. By emphasizing the significance of emotional transparency, the educator fosters a comprehensive perspective on education that amalgamates intellectual development with psychological health.

C. *Critical Thinking and Independence*

The educators foster an environment that stimulates students to engage in critical and independent thought, frequently urging them to assess their comprehension of both subject matter and linguistic application. The prioritization of critical thinking corresponds with an educational ideology that esteems cognitive autonomy and the capacity to scrutinize and assess information. By endorsing this approach, educators are equipping learners with the ability to independently address intricate challenges, a competency that is essential in both scholarly and practical environments. Such ideology was exemplified by the subsequent assertions:

“Do you know when you should use these? If you don't know their functions, then you will find it difficult to use...”

The aforesaid open and reflective question uttered by the teacher, “Do you know when you should use these?” requires students to critically evaluate their own comprehension. In this context, the senior lecturer delineates critical thinking as a fundamental component of language proficiency, prompting students to engage in inquiry and self-evaluation. This methodology of inquiry underscores the principle of autonomy, situating the educator in the role of a facilitator instead of an authoritarian entity, thereby cultivating intellectual self-sufficiency. The inquiry promotes autonomous cognition, establishing the instructor as a facilitator instead of an authoritative figure. The structure promotes an active engagement in the pursuit of comprehension among students, signifying that critical thinking is fundamental to the educational process.

Other assertion substantiates the presence of this ideology are demonstrated in the following example:

“What do you think of that?”

The aforementioned open-ended question prompts students to formulate their perspectives, fostering autonomous cognition. By conceptualizing questions as solicitations for engagement, the lecturer mitigates hierarchical demarcations, recognizing students' viewpoints as significant enhancements to the discourse. Thus, this particular formulation fosters an environment conducive to intellectual autonomy, prioritizing the viewpoints of students. Additionally, this open framework fortifies the principle of autonomy, enabling learners to investigate concepts without constraint.

D. *Inclusivity and Engagement*

By cultivating an environment in which every student perceives their voice as acknowledged and appreciated, educators are fortifying an inclusive paradigm that underscores the principles of respect, belonging, and communal engagement within the educational setting. This ideology is congruent with contemporary educational principles that emphasize equity and inclusiveness. This particular ideology was epitomized by the subsequent assertions created by the senior lecturer:

“Any questions? Raise your hand!”

Through the explicit invitation of above inquiries, the lecturer communicates the notion that every student possesses a voice, thereby fostering an environment that encourages their active participation. Particularly, the phrase “Raise your hand” facilitates an environment of accessibility and equity in participation, suggesting that each student possesses an equivalent opportunity to engage. This open invitation affirms the educator's function as a facilitator, reducing obstacles to engagement and strengthening an inclusive educational environment. The direct address cultivates a sense of communal belonging by proactively soliciting contributions from students. This framework promotes inclusivity, underscoring the necessity of open participation as a fundamental expectation.

Additional assertions substantiate the presence of this ideology are exemplified in the subsequent discourse:

“Secret? What makes you happy today and what makes you good today?”

The augmentation of inclusivity and engagement within the educational process was likewise substantiated by the lecturer through his verbal expressions, “Secret? What makes you happy today?” utilizing colloquial language to foster a personal and inclusive environment. This methodology of inquiry implies a setting in which learners are motivated to express their thoughts openly, irrespective of the pertinence of the subject matter to the established curriculum. By soliciting personal reflections, the lecturer acknowledges the unique identity of each student, thereby fostering inclusivity via informal engagement. Furthermore, by employing open-ended questions and promoting active engagement, educators cultivate an inclusive educational environment that encourages the participation of all students.

E. Resilience and Continuous Improvement

The educators facilitate the cultivation of resilience and the concept of perpetual self-enhancement within the educational milieu. This particular ideology is congruent with a growth mindset, highlighting the notion that obstacles constitute an integral component of the educational experience. Through the facilitation of resilience, educators are fostering an environment where learners perceive diligence and tenacity as essential components for attaining both personal and scholarly development. Such a conceptual framework was articulated through the subsequent declarations produced by lecturer:

“If you want to combine them smoothly, you have to be able to make the smooth transition.”

The articulation of conditional statements such as “If you want to combine them smoothly, you...” fosters resilience by conceptualizing obstacles as resolvable problems. Through the utilization of conditional statements, the instructor subtly advocates for students to perceive mistakes as integral components of the educational journey. This methodology fortifies resilience, indicating that tenacity and cyclical learning are esteemed. Besides, his affirmative tone encourages learners to confront challenges confidently. Consequently, this formulation fosters resilience, motivating students to persist in surmounting challenges.

The different section substantiates the existence of this ideology is exemplified below:

“Oh my gosh there is no upgrading up. Did you live just die?”

Informal expressions such as “Did you live just die?” employ humor as a mechanism to normalize challenges and foster enhancement. By employing this particular form of humor, the instructor diminishes the apprehension associated with failure and implicitly underscores the significance of resilience and advancement. The relaxed, humorous tone promotes student development, cultivating resilience. This lighthearted methodology mitigates apprehension, rendering the concept of resilience more attractive. As a result, the comedic elements present within this context foster an atmosphere of resilience, depicting personal development as both attainable and pleasurable.

IV. DISCUSSION

Among the ideologies that are commonly advocated through educational dialogue is the principle of academic integrity. It was fervently boosted by educators along with explicit prohibitions against unfairness manifested through cheating or taking shortcuts, and a stress on originality and diligence. This was articulated through explicit directives such as “Don’t cheat” which institutionalized the concept of integrity as an essential standard within the educational environment. This finding aligns with the learning theory posited by Vygotsky (1978), which asserts that learners actively formulate knowledge through authentic interaction with the subject matter. Academic integrity holds paramount importance within this context, as authentic comprehension necessitates that learners eschew shortcuts and immerse themselves thoroughly in the subject matter. Furthermore, Brown and MacDonald (2018) discovered that direct discourse pertaining to academic integrity, including educators’ prohibitions regarding plagiarism, serves to enhance ethical academic conduct and fosters responsibility. This is consistent with the findings of the current research, wherein the linguistic selections of instructors serve to bolster the principle of integrity.

Furthermore, the educator’s employment of direct imperatives to underscore the significance of academic integrity, exemplified by the phrase “Don’t cheat and copy” signifies a non-negotiable stance on integrity, establishing honesty as a foundational principle. Austin (1962) and Searle (1969), in their respective contributions to speech act theory, assert that imperatives function as performative utterances, eliciting a specific action. In this context, Imperatives creates a classroom standard that disallows cheating, positioning honesty as the anticipated conduct. Similarly, McCabe et al. (2001) demonstrated that the overt discourse surrounding academic integrity diminishes dishonest conduct by establishing unambiguous standards. Consequently, the linguistic selections employed to advocate for integrity within this research embody a constructivist paradigm that perceives ethical behavior as fundamental to the learning process. Through the explicit prohibition of dishonest behavior, the educators establish normative ethical standards that are crucial for both academic and individual development. This is consistent with the current research outcomes, wherein the linguistic practices of educators delineate academic integrity as a fundamental value within the educational environment. At this juncture, the educators’ explicit discourse delineates integrity as fundamental and attainable. This methodology, rooted in performative discourse, effectively conveys the significance of integrity by clearly forbidding shortcuts, thereby conforming to ethical principles within the educational sphere.

The justification for the previously mentioned ideology posits that academic integrity is essential for upholding trust and accountability within educational environments. Through the employment of imperatives such as “Don’t cheat”, educators establish a distinct ethical standard, indicating that deceitful behavior is intolerable. This elucidation is

imperative in fostering a responsible educational atmosphere wherein learners are motivated to interact genuinely with the content. The moral development theory posited by Kohlberg (1981) asserts that the process of moral reasoning evolves through distinct stages, necessitating explicit guidance at each of these developmental phases. By establishing clear prohibitions on cheating, educators facilitate students' understanding and assimilation of the significance of ethical conduct within scholarly environments. Furthermore, McCabe et al. (2001) illustrated that when the principles of academic integrity are overtly emphasized, students are more inclined to engage in ethical conduct. This outcome substantiates the educators' implementation of explicit prohibitions against dishonest conduct, thereby bolstering ethical standards as a fundamental classroom value. Consequently, the explicit language employed to disallow dishonesty corresponds with moral development theory, establishing ethical behavior as a definitive expectation. This methodology not only deters the pursuit of shortcuts but also fosters a sense of integrity, which is essential to the holistic development of students both academically and personally.

Another ideology examined in this research focuses on fostering self-reflection and emotional consciousness via open-ended questions that prompt learners to contemplate their emotional health. Phrasing that legitimizes the discourse surrounding emotions, exemplified by questions such as "What makes you happy?" encourages learners to express introspective thoughts and implies a comprehensive perspective of students as holistic beings. As articulated by Durlak et al. (2011) in their social-emotional learning model, the cultivation of self-awareness and emotional regulation constitutes a fundamental component of students' academic achievement. The incorporation of emotional awareness within classroom dialogue fosters students' capacity to recognize and comprehend their emotions, which serves to enhance both personal and academic resilience. Furthermore, Zins and Elias (2007) observed that educational environments that foster social-emotional learning exhibit enhancements in student involvement and empathy, thereby facilitating constructive social conduct and academic achievement. The educator's advocacy for emotional awareness is congruent with the principles of social-emotional learning, underscoring mental health as a fundamental basis for learning. Consequently, through the integration of emotional awareness, the educators conform to the tenets of social-emotional learning, cultivating an environment that promotes both intellectual and emotional development.

With respect to the ideology of critical thinking and independence, the educators encouraged critical thinking by challenging students to question and evaluate their understanding. This was achieved through reflective questions that prompted independent engagement with content, encouraging students to approach learning analytically. Freire (1970) with his critical pedagogy concept advocates for teaching that empowers students to question and critically assess knowledge rather than passively receiving information. The use of open-ended questions in this study aligns with this theory by fostering student independence. Apart from that, in a study by Brookfield (2015), classroom discussions that encourage critical thinking were shown to develop independent learning habits and analytical skills. The lecturers' language choices in this study support these findings, promoting independence and a critical stance on content. Thus, through emphasizing critical thinking, the lecturers encourage students to become active participants in their learning. This aligns with critical pedagogy, suggesting that fostering independence through reflective questioning enhances intellectual growth and confidence. So, the lecturers' questioning approach aligns with critical pedagogy, which sees student independence as crucial for meaningful learning.

The cultivation of critical thinking and autonomy equips learners for intellectual self-sufficiency and enduring educational pursuits. Questions like "Do you know when you should use these?" transfer the onus of comprehension to the students, encouraging them to actively interact with the material instead of merely absorbing it passively. The Constructivist Theory articulated by Vygotsky (1978) asserts that the process of learning is inherently active and social, wherein learners derive meaning through their interactions. By fostering critical thinking in students, the educators promote a constructivist paradigm wherein learning is conceptualized as an active endeavor necessitating cognitive involvement. Moreover, Brookfield (2015) determined that promoting students' engagement in inquiry and analytical processes significantly augments critical thinking skills and cultivates autonomous learning. The discourse employed by the educators corresponds with this investigation, as it encourages students to evaluate their own comprehension, fostering intellectual independence. Therefore, the enhancement of critical thinking is congruent with constructivist theory, highlighting the necessity for students to engage actively in the process of knowledge construction. The linguistic selections promote student autonomy, cultivating an academic environment in which critical inquiry is esteemed.

The ideological framework surrounding inclusivity and engagement was promoted through discourse that fostered the involvement of all students. Questions like "Any questions? Raise your hand" indicate an inclusive and hospitable methodology, whereas informal prompts stimulate students to relate their individual experiences. Adams (1965), through his equity theory within the educational realm, asserts that all students must possess equitable opportunities for participation and achievement, irrespective of their diverse backgrounds. The utilization of inclusive language, as evidenced in this research, serves to guarantee that the perspectives of each student are acknowledged and esteemed. Furthermore, Hattie and Timperley (2007) ascertained that the presence of inclusivity within teacher-student interactions augments student engagement and cultivates a sense of belonging, thereby enhancing academic motivation. The utilization of inclusive language by the lecturers corresponds with this principle, thereby facilitating participation for all individuals. The results correspond with the principles of equity theory, as inclusive language guarantees that every student perceives their worth and is motivated to participate. Consequently, the advancement of inclusivity via

linguistic practices corresponds with the tenets of equity, thereby enhancing participation by ensuring that every student perceives their voice as acknowledged and valued.

Dealing with the ideology of resilience and continuous improvement it was augmented through discourse that contextualized obstacles as prospects for development. The educators employed conditional constructs and elements of humor, exemplified by phrases such as “If the transition is not smooth...” and “Did you live just die?” to motivate students to perceive obstacles as integral components of the educational process, fostering resilience. The mindset theory of Dweck (2006) emphasizes that the perception of abilities as malleable enhances resilience. The articulation employed by educators is congruent with this theoretical framework, conceptualizing obstacles as progressive stages towards development as opposed to fixed limitations. Blackwell et al. (2007) determined that educational environments promoting a growth mindset exhibit heightened levels of perseverance. The linguistic selections in this investigation, which underscore resilience, promote students to engage in learning with adaptability. Consequently, the utilization of humor and conditional statements by educators mitigates the fear of failure, fostering resilience. Furthermore, through the endorsement of a growth-oriented pedagogical framework, the educators equip students to perceive challenges positively, which is essential for a growth mindset. In addition, offering humor and specific circumstances to contextualize the challenges effectively mitigates fear around failure, establishing resilience as a fundamental principle. To this point, by fostering resilience, the educators facilitate the adoption of a growth-oriented mindset among the students. This linguistic methodology decreases anxiety associated with obstacles, equipping learners to confront difficulties with confidence and adaptability.

V. CONCLUSION

The research meticulously illustrates ideologies that encompass the principles of academic integrity and diligence, self-reflection and emotional awareness, critical thinking and independence, inclusivity and engagement, resilience and continuous improvement are not only emphasized but also vigorously advocated within various academic environments, particularly in classroom settings where learning takes place. In order to effectively reinforce the aforementioned ideologies, language serves an indispensable function in the intricate processes of formulating, sustaining, and disseminating ideological frameworks within the educational environment, thus influencing both pedagogical practices and student perceptions. In this context, educators meticulously employ a combination of directives, conditional structure, reflective and probing questioning techniques, informal language, as well as supportive tones, and a sense of humor. All of them serve to align seamlessly with established pedagogical theories and frameworks that guide effective teaching practices.

The active promotion and cultivation of various ideologies, specifically those centered around the concepts of resilience, independence, and inclusivity, play a significant and multifaceted role in facilitating the holistic development of students, thereby fostering their growth in not only academic realms but also personal and social dimensions. Engaging in thoughtful and reflective classroom discourse serves to enhance students' self-awareness, promote their ability to regulate emotions effectively, and cultivate critical engagement with diverse perspectives, ultimately equipping them with the necessary skills and mindset to navigate and confront the broader societal challenges that they are likely to encounter throughout their lives. By meticulously embedding the foundational principles of critical pedagogy within their instructional practices, educators effectively empower their students to actively question and challenge the pervasive societal norms and systemic inequities that exist within their environments. This comprehensive pedagogical approach not only fosters a sense of independent learning among students but also promotes their active engagement and participation in the multifaceted processes that underpin democratic governance and civic responsibility.

Since this particular study places significant emphasis on the discourse utilized by educators within the classroom environment, it would be highly beneficial for subsequent research endeavors to delve into the perceptions and interpretations held by students regarding the various ideologies that are promoted in educational settings, as this would undoubtedly contribute to a more holistic and nuanced understanding of the intricate dynamics that govern the educational landscape. Apart from that, it is also imperative to investigate thoroughly the inherent and immediate effects that various ideologies, which are intricately woven into the fabric of classroom discourse, exert on students' overall academic performance, their ability to engage in critical thinking, as well as their social-emotional development and well-being, considering the multifaceted interactions that occur in educational settings and how these ideologies can shape not only the learning outcomes but also the holistic growth of learners. As emphasized by Cortés (2023), the inclusion of diverse ideological perspectives can enhance students' critical thinking skills and foster a more inclusive societal outlook.

REFERENCES

- [1] Adams, J. S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 267-299). Academic Press.
- [2] Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Oxford University Press.
- [3] Bärmann, J., Behnke, M., & Thein, C. (2022). Controversy in the philosophy-classroom - a collective book review. *Journal of Didactics of Philosophy*, 6, 1-6. <https://doi.org/10.46586/JDPh.2022.9867>

- [4] Blackwell, L. S., Trzesniewski, K. H., & Dweck, C. S. (2007). Implicit theories of intelligence predict achievement. *Child Development*, 78(1), 246-263.
- [5] Brookfield, S. (2015). *The skillful teacher: On technique, trust, and responsiveness in the classroom*. Jossey-Bass.
- [6] Brown, C., & MacDonald, L. (2018). *Ethics in higher education: Promoting integrity*. Routledge.
- [7] Chen, H. (2023). Study on process methodology in ideological and political education. *International Journal of Education and Humanities*. <https://doi.org/10.54097/ijeh.v11i2.13525>
- [8] Cortés, E. R. (2023). Bringing ideology into the legal translation classroom: A step towards training translators for counterhegemonic legal translation? *Onomázein: Journal of Linguistics, Philology and Translation, Special Issue XII*, 26-56. <https://doi.org/10.7764/onomazein.ne12.02>
- [9] Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among five approaches* (2nd ed.) Sage.
- [10] Durlak, J. A., Weissberg, R. P., Dymnicki, A. B., Taylor, R. D., & Schellinger, K. B. (2011). The impact of enhancing students' social and emotional learning: A meta-analysis of school-based universal interventions. *Child Development*, 82(1), 405-432. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2010.01564.x>
- [11] Dweck, C. S. (2006). *Mindset: The new psychology of success*. Random House.
- [12] Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Polity Press.
- [13] Flick, U. (2013). *The sage handbook of qualitative data analysis: Mapping the field*. Sage.
- [14] Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. Bloomsbury.
- [15] Ginting, P., Murni, S. M., & Pulungan, A. H. (2024). A multimodal discourse analysis of ideological identity endorsed on the university's homepages. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 14(7), 2211-2221. <https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1407.29>
- [16] Gu, F. (2023). How to integrate curriculum ideology and politics into the language teaching system. *Frontiers in Educational Research*, 6(1), 47-50. <https://doi.org/10.25236/FER.2023.060108>
- [17] Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 77(1), 81-112.
- [18] Kesevan, H. V. (2016). Assessing ideologies and discursive practices of monolingual and multilingual English teachers in EFL classroom context. Proceedings of the First Reciprocal Graduate Research Symposium between Universitas Pendidikan Sultan Idris and Syiah Kuala University. *CAPEU: Consortium of Asia-Pacific Education Universities*, 43-56.
- [19] Kohlberg, L. (1981). *The philosophy of moral development: moral stages and the idea of justice*. Harper & Row.
- [20] Lück, J. & Rudman, S. (2017). Identity, ideology and discourse: Classroom spaces for deconstructions and reconstructions. *The Independent Journal of Teaching and Learning*, 12(1), 5-19.
- [21] Mao, X. (2022). Teaching reform practice of digital media technology course in the context of curriculum ideology and politics. *Advances in Economics and Management Research*, 1(2), 6-10. <https://doi.org/10.56028/aemr.2.1.6>
- [22] Mazer, J. P. (2018) Teachers, students, and ideological bias in the college classroom. *Communication Education*, 67(2), 254-258. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03634523.2018.1428761>
- [23] McCabe, D. L., Treviño, L. K., & Butterfield, K. D. (2001). Cheating in academic institutions. *Ethics & Behavior*, 11(3), 219-232. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327019EB1103_2
- [24] Myers, P. L. (2002). Beware of the man of my book. *Journal of Teaching in the Addictions*, 1(1), 69-90. https://doi.org/10.1300/j188v01n01_06
- [25] Palmer, C., & Bolderston, A. (2006). A brief introduction to qualitative research. *The Canadian Journal of Medical Radiation Technology*, 16-19. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0820-5930\(09\)60112-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0820-5930(09)60112-2)
- [26] Pang, M., Yang, X., Jia, Q., & Zhang, M. (2023). Research on the construction of "one core, three common learning" college teaching community from the perspective of curriculum ideology and politics. *Journal of Education and Educational Research*, 2(2), 85-89.
- [27] Patton, M. Q., & Cochran, M. (2002). *A guide to using qualitative research methodology*. Medecins Sans Frontieres.
- [28] Sumarna, C. & Gunawan, H. (2022). Foundations of constructivism philosophy in classroom learning. *International Journal of Science and Society*, 4(3), 53-65.
- [29] van Dijk, T. (1993). Principles of critical discourse analysis. *Discourse & Society*, 4, 249-283. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926593004002006>
- [30] van Dijk, T. (1995). Aims of discourse analysis. *Japanese Discourse*, 1, 17-27.
- [31] Vindevoghel, L. J. (2016). Power, identity, and the construction of knowledge in education. *Autumn*, 2(22), 87-97.
- [32] Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.
- [33] Waly, S. (2022). The classroom as a space for power and healing: Examining the case of New York City after Trump's election. In K. Monkman, A. Frkovich, & A. Proweller (Eds.), *Navigating precarity in educational contexts* (pp. 103-119). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003258223-9Xiuli>, 2023.
- [34] Yin, L. & Gu, Y. (2023). Research on the ideological and political construction path of university English courses based on blended teaching in the post-epidemic period. *Curriculum and Teaching Methodology*, 6(11), 68-72. <https://doi.org/10.23977/curtm.2023.061113>
- [35] Zins, J. E., & Elias, M. J. (2007). Social and emotional learning: Promoting the development of all students. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation*, 17, 233-255. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10474410701413152>

Yenni Hasnah is presently engaged in the rigorous pursuit of a doctoral degree specializing in English Applied Linguistics at the Universitas Negeri Medan. In addition to his scholarly endeavors, she serves as a lecturer in the Department of English Education at Universitas Muhammadiyah Sumatera Utara, where he imparts knowledge and fosters intellectual growth among aspiring educators in the field. Her area of expertise spans a range of disciplines, including English teaching as a foreign language, sociolinguistics, discourse analysis, and applied linguistics.

Amrin Saragih is a distinguished professor at Universitas Negeri Medan, Indonesia. With a solid academic background, Saragih earned his master's degree (M. A.) and Doctorate (Ph. D.) from renowned institutions, specializing in Applied Linguistics and Language Education. Throughout his noteworthy career, Professor Saragih has been rigorously participating in both educational and scholarly initiatives. His areas of expertise encompass Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL), and Language Pedagogy. His scholarly work has been extensively published in both national and international journals, offering significant contributions to the understanding of language utilization and ideology, particularly within educational contexts.

Sri M. Murni is a professor at the Faculty of Languages and Arts at Universitas Negeri Medan. Her academic credentials are notable, comprising a bachelor's degree in English Language Education, a master's degree in American Studies, and a doctorate in linguistics. Actively involved in both research and instructional endeavors, she has supervised a multitude of dissertations and theses at the higher education level. Her research interests are particularly focused on language teaching and learning, linguistics, culture and literature, as well as various domains related to applied linguistics.