

FORMATIVE STAKEHOLDER EVALUATION OF A *USING*–INDONESIAN BILINGUAL LEARNING MANAGEMENT SYSTEM INTEGRATING DIGITAL STORYTELLING FOR GENERATION ALPHA

Dana Yudha Kristiawan^{1a*}, Abd. Rahman^{2b}, Imroatul Husna Afriani^{3c}, Sahru Romadloni^{4d}

¹²³English Education Program, University of 17 August 1945, Banyuwangi.

⁴History Education Program, University of 17 August 1945, Banyuwangi

^aE-mail: dana.kristiawan@untag-banyuwangi.ac.id

^bE-mail: abd.rahman@untag-banyuwangi.ac.id

^cE-mail: imroatul.h.afriani@untag-banyuwangi.ac.id

^dE-mail: sahru.romadloni@untag-banyuwangi.ac.id

(*) Corresponding Author

dana.kristiawan@untag-banyuwangi.ac.id

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received : 30-07-2026

Revised : 15-09-2026

Accepted : 30-09-2026

KEYWORDS

*Bilingual LMS;
Digital Storytelling;
Local Language
Preservation;
Personalised
Learning; Using
Language*

ABSTRACT

This study reports a formative qualitative evaluation within the development of a *Using*–Indonesian bilingual learning management system (LMS) integrating digital storytelling and a personalised-learning orientation to support local-language preservation among Generation Alpha. The wider project was organised through the analysis, design, development, implementation, and evaluation (ADDIE) framework in Banyuwangi, Indonesia, with Kemiren as its principal cultural setting. The evidence comprised four written focus group discussion, involving teachers, native *using* speakers, Indigenous-community representatives, and students. A descriptive qualitative content analysis connected recorded responses with priorities for resource refinement. The students record described initial engagement with stories, images, audio, and *using* vocabulary, alongside minor difficulties with devices and access to features. Teachers identified corrections to grammar, terminology, vocabulary, translations, and visual presentation. Native speakers emphasised natural language use, consistent pronunciation and writing, and shared guidance for content developers. Indigenous-community feedback highlighted documentation needs, cultural context, and boundaries around sacred knowledge. These findings support a participatory approach to linguistic correction, cultural review, and interface refinement. Personalisation remains a design orientation rather than an independently tested adaptive mechanism. The study identifies development priorities but does not establish language-proficiency gains, improved usability after revision, or sustained changes in language use. Further evaluation should document implemented features, repeated learner use, and language-learning outcomes.

This is an open access article under the CC–BY-SA license.



INTRODUCTION

Using, also written as *Osing* in the literature, is closely associated with the cultural identity of communities living in Banyuwangi, East Java. A study in Macan Putih identified relationships between language, local values, traditions, and social identity, while also identifying modernisation as a threat to the continuity of the language, particularly among younger generations (Risqiyah et al., 2025). These concerns highlight the importance of developing accessible learning resources. This study addresses the educational challenge of creating opportunities for children to encounter, understand, and use *using* in meaningful cultural contexts. (Nurhayani et al., 2020) examined lexical relationships between *Osing* and Malang Javanese while recognising the importance of *Osing* for regional identity. In this article, “*using*” follows the terminology adopted in the learning materials and stakeholder discussions; “*Osing*” is retained in the titles of cited publications. This terminology recognises the community context while maintaining consistency with the cited literature.

The intended learners of this project are children aged 6-13 years, described in the project as Generation Alpha. Digital resources offer a possible entry point for reaching these learners, but age-cohort labels should not be treated as evidence of uniform abilities or preferences. Assumptions about distinctive Generation Alpha characteristics often exceed the available evidence of differences between generations (Höfrová et al., 2024). Consequently, this development project treats visual appeal, accessible navigation, language support, and opportunities for interaction as requirements to be examined with users, rather than assuming that every child is digitally proficient or learns in the same way. Digital storytelling provides an approach to connecting language with narratives, images, sound, and other expressive resources. In an Indonesian early-childhood setting, (Rahiem, 2021) found that teachers used digital storytelling to make storytelling activities more engaging and communicative. Research in Australian primary and secondary classrooms likewise illustrates how digital storytelling activities can connect instructional content with learner participation (Smeda et al., 2014). These studies provide a pedagogical rationale for exploring locally grounded stories. For this project, folktales, legends, and accounts of everyday community life offer a culturally situated basis for material development.

The evidence also requires a distinction between engagement with a digital story and improvement in language learning. (Ong & Aryadoust, 2022) identified methodological and reliability weaknesses in research on digital storytelling in children's language learning. Their review supports careful evaluation rather than an automatic claim of effectiveness. Furthermore, digital storytelling can involve either interaction with prepared stories or the creation of stories by learners. (Kim & Li, 2021) showed how student-created digital stories can support expression and identity development, but this should not be treated as evidence that viewing prepared materials produces the same outcomes. The present article concerns initial engagement with developed content; learner-authored storytelling is considered a possible later extension.

A learning management system (LMS) provides the organisational setting for bringing the project's bilingual materials and learning activities together. Its educational value cannot be reduced to attractive media or the existence of an online platform. (Al-Fraihat et al., 2020) distinguished the system, information, instructional, and support-related dimensions in evaluating e-learning success. Although their empirical study concerns university learners, these dimensions offer useful questions for formative development: Are the materials accurate? Can user access and navigate them? Is appropriate learning support available? In the present context, these questions connect technical usability with teachers' linguistic judgements and the community's expectations of cultural representation.

Personalised learning is a related but distinct design concern. (Shemshack & Spector, 2020) described personalisation in terms of learners' needs, prior experiences, interests, and goals, rather than simply the provision of digital materials. (Bernacki et al., 2021) further emphasise specifying who personalises learning, which learner characteristics inform the process, and which instructional features and outcomes are involved. Accordingly, the present study retains personalisation as an orientation towards diverse learner needs. The availability of multiple media formats alone is not taken as evidence of a functioning adaptive system, and no automated recommendation or learner-modelling mechanism is presumed without documentation

The bilingual design of the LMS is intended to connect the target language with a language familiar in school learning. As discussed by (Cenoz & Gorter, 2022), the planned use of learners' linguistic resources can support language and content learning while attending to minority-language development. This perspective provides a rationale for bilingual support, although a bilingual interface does not itself demonstrate pedagogical translanguaging. For the present project, the

immediate priority is to ensure that *using* expressions and their Indonesian explanations are accurate, accessible, and culturally meaningful. The two languages are intended to support understanding without allowing Indonesian explanations to displace opportunities for learners to engage with *using* itself.

The studies reviewed above address digital storytelling, e-learning system quality, personalised learning, and bilingual or translanguaging-oriented pedagogy, but they do not document how these concerns are brought together in the formative evaluation of a *Using*–Indonesian bilingual LMS for primary-age learners. In particular, the reviewed literature does not show how children’s initial use, teachers’ pedagogical and linguistic judgements, native *using* speakers’ language judgements, and Indigenous-community expectations regarding cultural representation can be brought together to guide revision of the same resource. This article addresses that gap by analysing four stakeholder-specific FGD records and translating their documented concerns into concrete priorities for linguistic accuracy, cultural appropriateness, interface usability, and future personalisation. Its contribution is therefore a locally grounded formative-evaluation approach for refining a bilingual digital resource for *using*, rather than a claim of tested effects on proficiency or language preservation. The study aims to describe the resource as documented during formative use, examine feedback from four stakeholder groups, and identify revisions needed for linguistic accuracy, cultural appropriateness, usability, and future personalisation. Its guiding question is how stakeholder feedback can inform an educationally useful and culturally responsible digital environment for younger learners of *using*.

METHOD

This article reports a formative qualitative evaluation within a research-and-development (R&D) project organised through the ADDIE framework: analysis, design, development, implementation, and evaluation (Branch, 2009). The wider development programme was planned for ten months in Banyuwangi Regency, with Kemiren Village serving as the principal cultural setting and source of local narratives. Community and school networks in Banyuwangi contributed to the activities. The documentary evidence examined in this study concerns four formative focus group discussions (FGDs) held between 25 April and 6 May 2026. It does not establish that the full ten-month programme or every ADDIE stage had been completed.

Within this framework, the available records document the review of developing materials by teachers and native speakers, community discussion of appropriate cultural content, and children’s initial use of digital resources. These activities provide evidence of formative evaluation and inputs for further analysis, design, and development. Teacher and native-speaker feedback identifies linguistic revisions; community feedback informs narrative selection and representation; and child feedback identifies presentation and access issues. The records do not provide a complete, dated development history or demonstrate that the proposed revisions were subsequently implemented and retested.

The intended users were children aged 6–13 years, particularly learners in primary schools. This is the project’s target age range, not a verified age range for every child in the consultation. Collaborators included teachers, Indigenous-community representatives, native speakers, cultural practitioners, academics, and technology developers. Four documentary groups are distinguished throughout the analysis: teachers identified in the project as members of MGMP (Musyawarah Guru Mata Pelajaran; a subject-teacher working group), native *Using* speakers, Indigenous-community representatives, and child representatives. The community record uses the label *masyarakat adat* (Indigenous community); its feedback is therefore reported under that documentary label rather than merged with the native-speaker record.

The group sizes reported for the formative consultations were 15 MGMP teachers, 10 native *Using* speakers, 15 cultural practitioners, and 20 Generation Alpha learners. These figures represent group-level counts rather than a verified total of unique participants, as the four written records do not contain complete participant rosters or document possible overlap between groups. To protect participant confidentiality, school names, specific FGD venues, individual ages, and identifying institutional affiliations are not disclosed, and all feedback is reported at the group level without naming individual contributors. The available project documentation does not record a formal institutional ethics committee approval or exemption number for these formative consultations; accordingly, this article does not claim that formal ethical clearance had been granted. Participation was voluntary and free from coercion. Adult participants provided written informed consent before taking part and were informed about the purpose of the study, the voluntary nature of participation, and their right to decline participation or withdraw at any stage without penalty. For participating children, written permission was obtained

from a parent or legal guardian, and age-appropriate assent was obtained from the children prior to participation. Parents or guardians and children were informed that participation was voluntary and that the child could decline or withdraw from the activity at any stage without penalty. Consent to participate was treated as authorisation for the research team to analyse the resulting FGD records for research purposes and was not interpreted as unrestricted permission to disclose, reproduce, digitise, or commercially use culturally sensitive knowledge. Where the discussions concerned customary practices, sacred traditions, or culturally restricted knowledge, reporting was limited to information documented in the project records, and no broader community authorisation for public dissemination was inferred. Any subsequent public dissemination or digital reproduction of culturally sensitive materials should therefore remain subject to separate consultation and approval by the relevant cultural knowledge holders.

The evidence comprised four written FGD records, treated as documentary summaries rather than verbatim transcripts or individual participant accounts. Document analysis provides a systematic approach to examining documents as qualitative evidence (Bowen, 2009). For traceability, this article assigns the labels FGD-T is Focus Group Discussion with MGMP teachers (25 April 2026), FGD-N is Focus Group Discussion *Using* native speakers (27 April 2026), FGD-C is Focus Group Discussion with the indigenous community (3 May 2026), and FGD-A is Focus Group Discussion with Gen Alpha generation/students of elementary school (6 May 2026). These are reporting labels introduced for this article, not original archival identifiers. The dates appear on the records; paragraph references count the narrative paragraphs after each heading and exclude signatures.

The minutes are written in Indonesian and include *Using* expressions where relevant. Their documented topics comprise grammar and translation (FGD-T), natural and consistent language use (FGD-N), cultural meanings and documentation boundaries (FGD-C), and children's initial responses and access difficulties (FGD-A). They bear the first author's name, and the teacher and native-speaker records describe the research leader opening those discussions. They are consequently treated as project-generated records, not independent evaluations. The language of the written minutes is not assumed to establish the language of every spoken exchange.

The analysis used an inductive, descriptive content-analysis approach, with categories grounded in the documented concerns rather than imposed as a predefined coding scheme (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005). A sentence or paragraph expressing a response, concern, or recommendation forms the unit of interpretation. Related issues are grouped and compared across records, while their source locations are retained. For example, the recommendation to replace *riko* with *rika* in FGD-T, paragraph 3, is treated as a vocabulary-correction issue within the category of linguistic accuracy. This example illustrates the movement from documented content to a descriptive category; it does not establish a universal linguistic rule or show that the material was subsequently corrected.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The written FGD records present four complementary perspectives on the resource. Children's recorded responses concern presentation, vocabulary exploration, and access difficulties (FGD-A, paras. 2-5). Teachers focus on grammar, wording, translation, and visual presentation (FGD-T, paras. 1-5). Native speakers emphasise natural, consistent language use and its connection with local identity (FGD-N, paras. 1-3). Indigenous-community feedback concerns cultural meaning, documentation, and limits on representation (FGD-C, paras. 1-5). These perspectives inform the interpretation of the content-development process and the priorities for refining the bilingual LMS.

Cultural Narratives as the Basis for Bilingual Digital Storytelling

The development design envisaged folktales, local legends, and everyday cultural narratives as the basis for *Using*–Indonesian bilingual digital storytelling. The selection and presentation of these narratives therefore need to address both language-learning purposes and the cultural meanings identified in the community record.

Community feedback highlighted the need to retain cultural context and respect boundaries around sacred knowledge. The record uses Pecel Pithik to illustrate ritual meaning and identifies Barong Ider Bumi and Tumpeng Sewu as traditions whose core meanings should not be altered in digital presentation (FGD-C, paras. 2-3). (Carroll et al., 2020) set out principles of collective benefit, authority to control, responsibility, and ethics for Indigenous data governance. These principles offer a relevant interpretive resource for the present findings, particularly the distinction between making

knowledge accessible and assuming that all knowledge should be publicly reusable. They were not documented as an implemented governance framework in this project. As a development recommendation, decisions about recording, translation, illustration, and circulation should remain subject to the relevant knowledge holders' review.

This interpretation does not require turning the learning platform into a substitute for Indigenous practice. A child may encounter the name of a ceremony, a cultural expression, or a locally used term through a module while its fuller meaning remains embedded in family and community interaction. The LMS can provide an educational point of contact, but the feedback cautions against presenting a simplified digital depiction as the whole tradition. (Risqiyah et al., 2025) similarly connected *Using* with community values and identity; this supports keeping language content connected to the social settings in which it carries meaning.

The Indigenous-community record also included waste sorting, village cleanliness, local agriculture, and interest in biogas (FGD-C, environmental and agricultural discussion). Its paragraph beginning “Tema lingkungan, pertanian, dan kearifan lokal (nature, agriculture and local wisdom theme)” explicitly proposes these topics for *Using*-learning materials. These themes broaden the possible content base beyond ceremonial narratives. They suggest that *using* can be taught through situations that participants consider relevant to community life. Future stories or bilingual activities could draw on these topics, subject to language and cultural review. These proposals identify directions for content development rather than measured environmental or sustainability outcomes.

Content Recording and Animation Development for the LMS

The content-recording component provided material for the digital stories (Figure 1). This stage is reported as media production, separately from the four stakeholder consultations and the initial use of the learning resource. Within the content-development activities, material was recorded for digital storytelling and animation materials were prepared for future presentation in the LMS.



Figure 1. Content-Recording Activities for Digital Storytelling Materials Intended for the Bilingual LMS

Source: Project Documentation, 2026

The community concerns reported in FGD-C provide a basis for interpreting this production work. Recording cultural content makes material available for narrative development, but it does not by itself establish that a digital story

preserves the meaning of the practice represented. The relevant development priority is to review the relationship between the recorded material, its cultural explanation, and the educational narrative. This includes decisions about what can be translated, illustrated, or circulated, rather than treating all recorded material as ready for unrestricted publication.

Animation materials were also prepared for future presentation in the LMS (Figure 2). These materials are treated as development outputs, rather than as evidence that every animation was available in the platform version encountered during the child consultation. Within the bilingual design, the proposed instructional use is to connect narrative situations with opportunities to understand and use *Using* expressions. The relationship between the animated content, any accompanying language support, and the intended learning activity needs to be specified for each resource.



Figure 2. Selected Frames from Animation Materials Prepared for Future Presentation in the Bilingual LMS
Source: Project Documentation, 2026

The minutes support a more specific account of what was encountered during formative use: children opened learning materials, viewed their visual presentation, tried features while following instructions, and encountered stories, images, audio, and *Using* vocabulary (FGD-A, paras. 2-3). The resource is therefore described here at the level of documented learning content and interaction. The records do not establish the platform version, a complete module inventory, the operation of every planned media format, or an adaptive learning pathway. The production examples and the consultation record should consequently not be assumed to represent the same product version.

Among the child representatives, initial use of the materials was accompanied by visible interest in stories, illustrations, audio, and the digital presentation of *Using*. Children were reported to show curiosity about vocabulary and willingness to try unfamiliar expressions. These observations suggest that the developed content provided an approachable entry point to the language during the activities. They do not show how much vocabulary was retained, whether pronunciation improved, or whether children subsequently used *Using* outside the session. The most defensible finding is initial engagement with the learning materials.

This pattern is consistent with (Rahiem, 2021) account of digitally supported storytelling as an opportunity for communication and participation in an Indonesian educational setting. The comparison supports the plausibility of the design choice, not a causal conclusion about the present LMS. Similarly, (Karantalis & Koukopoulos, 2022) connect digital storytelling with constructivist and collaborative approaches in secondary-school literature teaching. That work is relevant to the pedagogical use of stories, but it does not directly establish effectiveness for primary-age *Using* learners. The instructional task remains to connect attention to a story with meaningful opportunities to understand and use its language.

The child feedback also included indications of pride in encountering *Using* through digital materials. This suggests a possible affective connection between language learning and local identity. However, the reported reactions were not accompanied by a validated identity measure or repeated observations demonstrating sustained change. (Kim & Li, 2021) study of student-created stories helps explain why multimodal narrative can be relevant to identity expression, but its production-based activities differ from the initial use reported here. Pride and confidence are therefore treated as emerging responses in this setting, not as measured outcomes attributable to the LMS.

Linguistic and Pedagogical Review by Native Speakers and Teachers

Native speakers contributed a distinct linguistic perspective that is not reducible to either teacher feedback or community discussion of traditions. Their record emphasises vocabulary, sentence structure, pronunciation, and suitability for everyday communication in Kemiren (FGD-N, para. 1). It also calls for shared guidance to help scriptwriters, voice artists, and digital-content developers maintain consistency across materials (FGD-N, para. 2). The final paragraph links appropriate language representation with community identity and cautions against treating *Using* as a decorative addition. These comments identify two connected priorities: reviewing the naturalness of individual expressions and coordinating language use across media. A language guide and a native-speaker review process are implications for development, not products documented as completed or tested in these minutes.

Teachers' feedback identified a further quality-assurance priority: linguistic and pedagogical review. Their comments concerned grammar, consistent naming of *Using*, writing conventions, translation accuracy, and vocabulary choices (FGD-T, paras. 1-5). Specifically, paragraph 3 recommends replacing *riko* with *rika* throughout the reviewed module because teachers considered *rika* appropriate for its instructional context. This is a documented recommendation for that material, not a universal rule invalidating other forms across all *Using*-speaking contexts. The minutes do not supply the full sentences being corrected or evidence of a completed revalidation. The development task is therefore to verify the intended meaning and context with teachers and native speakers, revise the relevant examples, and document the subsequent review.

Translation review is particularly important because the two-language format is intended to help learners connect expressions with meanings. An inaccurate or contextually unsuitable Indonesian explanation could obscure rather than support understanding of *Using*. The pedagogical-translanguaging perspective developed by (Cenoz & Gorter, 2022) supports purposeful coordination of linguistic resources, but it does not remove the need to check each instructional example. For this LMS, bilingual support should therefore be judged by how accurately and clearly it explains the target expression, not simply by whether both languages appear on a page.

The teachers' comments also show why information quality needs to be considered alongside technical presentation. (Al-Fraihat et al., 2020) demonstrate that e-learning evaluation includes information and support dimensions as well as technical system quality. Applied as an interpretive comparison rather than a validated model for this sample, that distinction helps explain why teachers could welcome the digital approach while still requesting substantial revisions. Attractive presentation cannot compensate for inconsistent vocabulary or translation. Conversely, correct language content will be difficult to use educationally when instructions and navigation remain unclear. The image of LMS (Learning Management System) can be seen below.



Figure 3. Learning Management System Homepage

Source: Project Documentation, 2026.

Initial Learner Responses and Priorities for Lms Refinement

The child consultation record described initial interest in stories, images, audio, and the digital presentation of *Using* (FGD-A, paras. 2-4). Children were reported to show curiosity about vocabulary and a willingness to try unfamiliar expressions. These recorded responses suggest that the developed content provided an approachable entry point to the language during the activities. They do not show how much vocabulary was retained, whether pronunciation improved, or whether children subsequently used *Using* outside the session. The most defensible finding is reported initial engagement with the learning materials.

This pattern is consistent with the account by (Rahiem, 2021) account of digitally supported storytelling as an opportunity for communication and participation in an Indonesian educational setting. The comparison supports the plausibility of the design choice, not a causal conclusion about the present LMS. Similarly, (Karantalis & Koukopoulos, 2022) connect digital storytelling with constructivist and collaborative approaches in secondary-school literature teaching. That work is relevant to the pedagogical use of stories, but it does not directly establish effectiveness for primary-age *Using* learners. The instructional task remains to connect attention to a story with meaningful opportunities to understand and use its language.

The child record also notes that some participants appeared more confident when recognising, reading, and trying *Using* vocabulary (FGD-A, para. 3). This is an impression recorded during initial use, not a measured change in confidence. Cultural pride is treated here as a potential benefit of the LMS, rather than an established outcome. These distinctions matter because no validated identity measure or repeated observation demonstrates sustained change. The study by (Kim & Li, 2021) of student-created stories helps explain the relevance of multimodal narrative to identity expression, but its production-based activities differ from the initial use reported here. The present findings therefore support a cautious interpretation of emerging affective responses, not a claim that the LMS strengthened cultural identity or increased confidence.

A practical implication is to preserve the relationship between a narrative and the language-learning activity built around it. For subsequent development, a teacher could use a prepared story to introduce expressions, discuss their meanings, and invite children to retell a short part *using* available language support. Such activities would extend the use of the existing stories; they are recommendations, not additional interventions reported as completed. (Smeda et al., 2014) provide a relevant

precedent for connecting digital storytelling activities with classroom participation, while the suitability of any particular activity for this LMS would still require local testing.

Teachers requested brighter, more appealing visual materials (FGD-T, para. 4), while the child consultation record described minor difficulties relating to devices, displays, and access to particular features (FGD-A, para. 5). These issues did not prevent the reported activities from proceeding, but they identified usability concerns requiring attention. The appropriate response is not merely to add decoration. (Mutlu-Bayraktar, 2024) found that emotional-design research generally supported motivational and emotional benefits, while findings for learning outcomes were inconsistent. Visual revisions should therefore aim to improve clarity and engagement and should be evaluated separately from claims about language attainment. For the next iteration, the reported difficulties suggest checking the readability of the modules, the visibility of navigation controls, the clarity of activity instructions, and the ease of accessing audio and other resources on the devices actually used. Evaluation should consider differences in device access and the support children need when *using* the materials. The formative findings point to the need for continued attention to the learning setting as well as the interface.

These responses complement the linguistic and cultural concerns discussed above. Table 1 summarises the four records and the corresponding implications for refinement. Learner interest, linguistic accuracy, cultural appropriateness, and technical accessibility are treated as related but distinct considerations.

Table 1. Reported Stakeholder Feedback and Implications for LMS Refinement

Stakeholder Record	Feedback Reported in the FGD Records	Implications for Refinement
Child representatives (FGD-A, paras. 2-5)	Interest in stories, images, audio, and <i>Using</i> vocabulary; apparent willingness to explore the materials; minor difficulties with devices, displays, and access to features.	Retain culturally relevant multimodal content; improve navigation and instructions; examine engagement over repeated use.
Native <i>Using</i> speakers (FGD-N, paras. 1-3)	Need for natural vocabulary, sentence structure, pronunciation, and contextual usage; consistent language across media; shared guidance for content developers; meaningful representation of community identity.	Review expressions and pronunciation with native speakers; develop shared language guidance for scripts, audio, and written materials; check consistency across formats.
Indigenous-community representatives (FGD-C)	Need to document oral knowledge while retaining cultural context, sacred boundaries, and community involvement; suggestions for environmental and everyday-life themes.	Review narratives with knowledge holders; clarify permissions and limits on representation; distinguish educational access from unrestricted circulation.
MGMP teachers (FGD-T, paras. 1-5)	Inconsistent terminology, vocabulary, translations, and writing conventions; a proposed change from <i>riko</i> to <i>rika</i> in the reviewed materials; requests for clearer, more attractive visuals.	Revise the language materials and bilingual alignment; confirm usage in context with teachers and native speakers; refine visual presentation and retest usability.

Source: Descriptive synthesis of FGD-T, FGD-N, FGD-C, and FGD-A.

The labels identify the four records described in Section 2 (Method).

Implications for Language Preservation

Personalisation requires particular caution in interpreting the product. The development design includes an intention to address learner needs, interests, pace, and levels of familiarity with *Using*. However, the four records do not describe a learner model, adaptation rules, or a tested mechanism for modifying content in response to individual performance. Following instructions during the child activity (FGD-A, para. 2) is not, by itself, evidence of systematic differentiation or automated adaptation. Shemshack and Spector (2020) provide a basis for treating personalisation as more than the presence

of diverse digital resources. The evidence in this article supports a personalised-learning orientation, but not a conclusion that an automated adaptive system was operational or effective.

A subsequent evaluation should make the personalisation claim observable: identify who selects or adjusts a learning activity, what information informs that decision, what changes for the learner, and how its usefulness is assessed. (Bernacki et al., 2021) offer a framework for specifying these relationships. Teacher-guided differentiation, learner choice, and automated adaptation would need to be described separately if they are used. Documenting these mechanisms would connect the personalisation design with evidence of actual learner experience.

Taken together, the findings support a participatory approach to revising the resource. Children's recorded responses provide information about immediate appeal and use; teachers identify instructional and language issues; native speakers contribute judgements of naturalness and consistency; and Indigenous-community participants identify questions of meaning and appropriate representation. The practical contribution is the connection between these forms of feedback within one development process. An educationally useful revision cannot rely on only one of them. The priority is to retain the reported appeal of the materials while correcting language, clarifying access, and maintaining relationships with cultural knowledge holders.

Further development should prioritise the linguistic corrections and interface concerns already identified, followed by documented review with the relevant stakeholder groups. Continued evaluation could examine comprehension, vocabulary retention, willingness to speak, and actual use across repeated sessions, *using* instruments suited to the learners' age and language experience. Classroom monitoring, teacher preparation, and periodic community review could then inform decisions about wider implementation. Longer-term language preservation would require evidence of continued use beyond initial engagement with the platform.

Study Limitations

The study's limitations concern both scope and reporting. The evidence is formative and descriptive, and it does not include comparison-group results, pre-post language assessments, longitudinal language-use data, or an independent test of personalisation. Initial enthusiasm may be influenced by novelty, facilitation, and the circumstances of participation. Group discussion may also privilege some voices over others. The use of group-level summaries also limits access to individual perspectives and the detail needed to assess the transferability of the findings. The analysis depends on what was selected for inclusion in the written records and cannot recover unrecorded exchanges. Because the records were generated within the development project and bear the first author's name, their favourable descriptions should not be treated as an independent assessment of the resource. The absence of participant rosters also prevents verification of overlap between consultation groups.

CONCLUSION

The development of a *Using*-Indonesian bilingual LMS illustrates how digital storytelling, a personalised-learning orientation, and stakeholder participation can be brought together to support local-language education for Generation Alpha. The four formative records indicate initial interest among children, linguistic and pedagogical corrections identified by teachers, native-speaker priorities for natural and consistent language use, and Indigenous-community expectations concerning cultural context and sacred boundaries. The study's principal contribution is a set of connected development priorities rather than proof that the platform has improved proficiency or secured long-term language preservation.

The next iteration should address terminology, vocabulary, translations, writing conventions, visual clarity, navigation, coordinated language guidance, and ongoing review with native speakers and Indigenous-community knowledge holders. Personalisation should be specified through the functions actually implemented and examined independently rather than inferred from multimedia variety. Repeated evaluation is needed to assess learning and language use beyond the initial activities. With these conditions addressed, the LMS may develop into a useful complement to school, family, and community opportunities to learn and use *Using*; it should not be treated as a replacement for the social relationships through which the language and its cultural meanings are sustained

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors gratefully acknowledge the financial support provided by Dana Indonesia Raya, the Ministry of Culture of the Republic of Indonesia, and the Indonesia Endowment Fund for Education Agency (LPDP) for this research and the development of the *Using-Indonesian* bilingual learning management system. The authors also thank the participating students and teachers, the Indigenous community of Kemiren, native speakers, cultural practitioners, and technology-development collaborators for their contributions, feedback, and support throughout the development activities.

REFERENCES

- Al-Fraihat, D., Joy, M., Masa'deh, R., & Sinclair, J. (2020). Evaluating E-Learning Systems Success: An Empirical Study. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 102, 67–86. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2019.08.004>
- Bernacki, M. L., Greene, M. J., & Lobczowski, N. G. (2021). A Systematic Review of Research on Personalized Learning: Personalized by Whom, to What, How, and for What Purpose(s)? *Educational Psychology Review*, 33(4), 1675–1715. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-021-09615-8>
- Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document Analysis as a Qualitative Research Method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 9(2), 27–40. <https://doi.org/10.3316/QRJ0902027>
- Branch, R. M. (2009). *Instructional Design: The ADDIE Approach*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Carroll, S. R., Garba, I., Figueroa-Rodríguez, O. L., Holbrook, J., Lovett, R., Materechera, S., Parsons, M., Raseroka, K., Rodriguez-Lonebear, D., Rowe, R., Sara, R., Walker, J. D., Anderson, J., & Hudson, M. (2020). The CARE Principles for Indigenous Data Governance. *Data Science Journal*, 19, 43. <https://doi.org/10.5334/dsj-2020-043>
- Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2022). Pedagogical Translanguaging. In *Elements in Language Teaching*. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009029384>
- Höfrová, A., Balidemaj, V., & Small, M. A. (2024). A Systematic Literature Review of Education for Generation Alpha. *Discover Education*, 3(1), 125. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s44217-024-00218-3>
- Hsieh, H.-F., & Shannon, S. E. (2005). Three Approaches to Qualitative Content Analysis. *Qualitative Health Research*, 15(9), 1277–1288. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732305276687>
- Karantalís, N., & Koukopoulos, D. (2022). Utilizing Digital Storytelling as a Tool for Teaching Literature Through Constructivist Learning Theory. *SN Social Sciences*, 2(7), 109. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s43545-022-00412-w>
- Kim, D., & Li, M. (2021). Digital Storytelling: Facilitating Learning and Identity Development. *Journal of Computers in Education*, 8(1), 33–61. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40692-020-00170-9>
- Mutlu-Bayraktar, D. (2024). A Systematic Review of Emotional Design Research in Multimedia Learning. *Education and Information Technologies*, 29(18), 24603–24626. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-024-12823-8>
- Nurhayani, I., Hamamah, H., Ningrum, D. I., & Delijar, R. M. (2020). Looking into the Language Status of Osing with Contrastive Analysis of the Basic Vocabulary of Osing and Malang Javanese. *PAROLE: Journal of Linguistics and Education*, 10(2), 87–96. <https://doi.org/10.14710/parole.v10i2.87-96>
- Ong, C., & Aryadoust, V. (2022). A Review of Digital Storytelling in Language Learning in Children: Methods, Design and Reliability. *Research and Practice in Technology Enhanced Learning*, 18, 011. <https://doi.org/10.58459/rptel.2023.18011>
- Rahiem, M. D. H. (2021). Storytelling in Early Childhood Education: Time to Go Digital. *International Journal of Child Care and Education Policy*, 15(1), 4. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40723-021-00081-x>
- Risqiyah, L. I., Rofiq, A., & Manshur, A. (2025). Bahasa dan Identitas Budaya: Studi Etnolinguistik pada Komunitas Osing di Daerah Macan Putih, Banyuwangi. *Jurnal Onoma: Pendidikan, Bahasa, Dan Sastra*, 11(2), 2161–2173. <https://doi.org/10.30605/onoma.v11i2.5631>
- Shemshack, A., & Spector, J. M. (2020). A Systematic Literature Review of Personalized Learning Terms. *Smart Learning Environments*, 7(1), 33. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40561-020-00140-9>
- Smeda, N., Dakich, E., & Sharda, N. (2014). The Effectiveness of Digital Storytelling in the Classrooms: A Comprehensive Study. *Smart Learning Environments*, 1(1), 6. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40561-014-0006-3>