

## COMPETITION OF JAVANESE AND INDONESIAN: A MIXED-METHODS APPROACH TO YOUNG MULTILINGUALS' LANGUAGE CHOICE

Erna Andriyanti<sup>1)</sup> & Mehdi Riazi<sup>2)</sup>

<sup>1)</sup>Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta & <sup>2)</sup>Macquarie University

Email: [erna.andriyanti@uny.ac.id](mailto:erna.andriyanti@uny.ac.id)

### Abstract

Multilingualism differs from place to place, with different pressures and outcomes depending on each unique situation. In Indonesian context, an important factor is the status and over prestige afforded to the national language, posing a possible threat to local language vitality. This study reports the position of Javanese and Indonesian as parts of the language repertoire of young Yogyakarta multilinguals in three domains: home, school, and the street. A mixed-methods approach was used and the main data were collected through questionnaire and observations at ten participating high schools. The students' survey was responded by 1,039 students. Their natural language use was recorded at school playground. Supporting data were collected from language teachers' survey and interviews with school authorities. The findings show that Javanese and Indonesian still compete in the three domains but not in all sociolinguistic situations. The youths' Javanese-Indonesian choice is mostly dependent on gender and parental level of education.

**Keywords:** multilinguals, language domains, language choice, sociolinguistic study

## KOMPETISI BAHASA JAWA DAN BAHASA INDONESIA: PENDEKATAN *MIXED-METHODS* TERHADAP PILIHAN BAHASA ANAK MUDA MULTILINGUAL

### Abstrak

Multilingualisme berbeda di satu tempat dari tempat lainnya, dengan penekanan dan hasil tergantung pada masing-masing situasi yang khas. Di dalam konteks Indonesia, faktor yang penting adalah status dan prestis yang disematkan untuk bahasa nasional, yang bisa mengancam vitalitas bahasa-bahasa daerah. Artikel ini mengkaji posisi bahasa Jawa dan bahasa Indonesia sebagai bagian dari repertoar bahasa anak muda multilingual di Yogyakarta dengan fokus pada tiga domain: rumah, sekolah, dan jalan. Pendekatan *mixed-methods* digunakan dan data utama dikumpulkan melalui kuesioner and observasi di sepuluh sekolah menengah. Survei terhadap siswa melibatkan 1.039 responden dan perekaman percakapan natural siswa dilakukan di saat jam istirahat. Data penunjang bersumber pada survei guru dan wawancara dengan pihak otoritas sekolah. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa penggunaan bahasa Jawa dan bahasa Indonesia masih berimbang di ketiga domain tetapi tidak pada semua situasi sosiolinguistik. Pilihan bahasa oleh responden sebagian besar berkorelasi positif terhadap gender dan tingkat pendidikan orang tua.

**Keywords:** multilingual, domain bahasa, pilihan bahasa, kajian sosiolinguistik

## INTRODUCTION

Multilingual situations give rise to a number of interesting issues, such as the degree of multilingualism in speakers, code-switching and code-mixing, attitudes to language, and language use across domains. Other issues, particularly relevant to Yogyakarta youths, are the status of each language and language choice and preference. For example, Indonesian, as Indonesia's official language, is often connected to the shift away from Javanese. Smith-Hefner (2009) found that young Javanese people tend to perceive Indonesian being more "trendy", "cool", and "modern" than Javanese (p. 62). Indonesian is also perceived as easier than Javanese (Setiawan, 2013). Regarding the perceived importance of and high enthusiasm towards English especially in the educational context, some language activists and educationalists consider its negative impacts on younger generation's pride in their own language and culture (see e.g., Arafah, 2014; Hanna, 2012). Arabic is a crucial language due to its role in Islamic rituals and given that Islam is the religion of the majority of Indonesians. In Islamic education, Arabic is thus used more for religious purposes than daily communication.

Act No. 20 (2003) and Act No. 24 (2009) mandate the use of Indonesian as the main language of instruction and allow foreign languages such as English and Arabic to be used as instructional languages to support foreign language mastery. Javanese and other regional languages can be used in early stages of education (Act No. 20, 2003) and are still taught as a subject with minimum meeting hours in the school curriculum.

However, it was not tested in the high schools' highly valued National Examination, whereas Indonesian, English and Arabic (in Islamic schools) were. This has had a significant impact on language education. Indonesian, English and Arabic are taught in more meeting hours than regional languages. In the educational context, Javanese does not seem to have a good standing among students. It is commonly considered as complicated by young Javanese due to its speech levels (Smith-Hefner, 2009; Zentz, 2014), where choice affects politeness standard. Since multilingual education is important as, among others, a solid foundation for learning and multilingual literacy (UNESCO, 2014) and to promote educational policies that support linguistic, cultural, ethnic, and religious diversity and to strengthen the nation's identity (Cummins, 2001), research on students or youths' multilingualism is significant.

This current study of young Yogyakarta multilinguals' language choice is related to previous work that examines the shift from Javanese to Indonesian in Yogyakarta (Kurniasih, 2006; Nurani, 2015; Smith-Hefner, 2009) as well as in other regions (Musgrave, 2014; Purwoko, 2012; Setiawan, 2013; Untoro, 2011; Zentz, 2016). The language shift can be related to three issues: firstly the youths' language choice and preference; secondly views of the elder generation on their language use; and thirdly relationship between their language use and a number of factors such as gender and parents' education levels. This study addresses the use of not only Javanese and Indonesian but also English and Arabic, all of which are

part of the youths' linguistic repertoire. The focus, however, is on the first two due to the examined shift.

In relation with language choice and preference, this study examines the use of youths' languages in three domains: home, school, and the street, in which all the youths are assumed to share similar opportunities of using their languages. The language domains refer to a range of activities or socio-cultural constructs or contexts representing a combination of settings or place, topic, and role relationship in which a language is used (Fishman, 1991; Romaine, 1995; Spolsky, 2003). In multilingual situations, different languages are commonly assigned to different domains (Spolsky, 2003), and multilinguals usually acquire and use their languages for either particular purposes, or depending on whom they are speaking with (Grosjean, 2006).

Secondly, since young people are observed to experience pressure and shaming from the elder ones related to their use of Javanese Krama, for example through heavy corrections (Zentz, 2014), it is important to know the elder generation's view about the youths' language use. As Gafaranga (2010) claims, the young people might not realise or aware of the ongoing language shift. However, elder community members have conscious knowledge of the changing language and the shift (Karan, 2011).

Related to the third issue, factors associated with language choice: gender and parents' educational levels are scrutinised, with following hypotheses.

1) Female research participants tend to choose Indonesian, rather than Javanese, because it has higher

prestige and is a language of wider communication.

This hypothesis is based on scholars' claims that there is positive association between gender and the use of prestigious versus less prestigious languages (e.g., Eckert & McConnell-Ginet, 2003; Labov, 1990; Tannen, 2010; Trudgill, 1972). Relevant research includes Kurniasih (2006), Smith-Hefner (2009) and Bissoonauth (2011).

2) Participants with a higher parental education level tend to choose Indonesian, rather than Javanese, compared to those with a lower parental education level.

This hypothesis is built on both traditional and contemporary works (e.g., Bernstein, 1960; Bissoonauth, 2011; Kurniasih, 2006; Labov, 1963, 1972, 1990) confirming that a higher socio-economic status marks the more frequent use of language in terms of prestige.

To sum up, this study has the objectives of explaining the use of Yogyakarta youths' languages in the three domains, the elder generation's perspectives, and relationship between their language use and gender as well as parents' education levels.

## METHOD

No research method, quantitative, qualitative, or mixed-methods, is intrinsically better than the other because the choice depends on the research problem (Creswell & Clark, 2011; Riazi & Candlin, 2014; Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2010). To achieve the objectives, this present study applied both quantitative and qualitative approaches through survey, interview,

and observation. Both types of data are complementary and are not necessarily mutually exclusive (see Dornyei, 2007) and used to investigate the research object which is multidimensional (Riazi & Candlin, 2014).

All types of schools in the population were included for accurate coverage (Lohr, 2018). ‘Yogyakarta’ where the schools are located refers to the city,

not the province of Special Region of Yogyakarta. Based on principals’ and students’ consents, ten schools that have both male and female students participated as representatives of all school types: state and private general schools, state and private vocational schools, and state and private religion-based schools (Table 1).

**Table 1. School participation and types**

No	Types of schools	Participating Junior High Schools	Participating Senior High Schools
<b>Under the Ministry of Education</b>			
1	State general schools	3	2
2	Private general schools	1	1
3	State and private vocational schools	-	1
<b>Under the Ministry of Religious Affairs</b>			
4	State and private religious schools	1	1
Total		5	5

A student survey was conducted and responded by 1,039 student participants, aged between 12 and 18 years old. The SPSS was used to measure the frequency of data occurrence and find correlations between language use and gender as well as parental education level. With regard to the hypotheses, the language use is claimed to be dependent on the two independent variables if the *p*-value/value of the Pearson Chi-Square has less than the significance level of .05.

To triangulate these student data, 34 language teachers who gave consent from the ten schools were also surveyed. The majority that participated were teachers of the compulsory language subjects at their school: 8 Javanese teachers, 10 Indonesian teachers, 9

English teachers, and 3 Arabic teachers. Two French teachers from different schools, 1 German teacher, and 1 Japanese teacher also participated.

Relevant emergent data from interviews with the school authorities were used to corroborate the statistical findings. Four junior high and five senior high school principals from the ten participating schools were interviewed because one was sick. Two principals considered that being accompanied by a staff member was complementary and could provide a more complete contribution, making 11 interviewees in total: the nine principals, one vice principal of student affairs, and one language coordinator. The choice of school principals is relevant to qualitative sampling which is mostly to

select participants purposefully due to their rich knowledge, information, or experience.

It was also important to establish actual language use by observing and recording verbal interaction in real communications. To get real examples of natural language exchanges, a number of short, overt non-participative observations in playgrounds were done.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Results

With regard to demographic information on gender, the number of female and male students were 632 (60.8%) and 373 (35.9%) each; 34 (3.3%) students did not respond to gender identification. Parental level of education is shown in Table 2.

**Table 2. Students' survey data on their parents' levels of education**

Parents' level of education	Father's level of education		Mother's level of education	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Low-level education (up to JH school)	134	12.9	175	16.8
Middle-level education (SH school to college)	424	40.8	436	42.0
High-level education (higher degree)	422	40.6	364	35.0
<i>Valid responses</i>	980	94.3	975	93.8
<i>No responses</i>	59	5.7	64	6.2
Total	1039	100.0	1039	100.0

Following are relevant data related to Javanese youths' languages choice.

#### 1.1 Home

The number of young people reported using Javanese to their family is slightly larger than that using Indonesian. Table 3 indicates that a few more number of participants reported speaking Javanese than that reported using Indonesian with their mothers and fathers. More than twice as many reported speaking LJ Ngoko over HJ Krama to both their parents. With their siblings, more respondents reported speaking Javanese than speaking Indonesian.

Relatively similar figures reflect the more number of participants that

claimed speaking Javanese than that reported using Indonesian to their peer and older neighbours. Far larger number of young people reported using LJ Ngoko than that claimed using HJ Krama to peers, but contradictorily much more number of respondents claimed to speak HJ Krama with older neighbours.

A different trend appears when speaking to relatives and guests. The number of participants claimed the use of Javanese to relatives is lower compared to that of Indonesian. The use of Javanese and Indonesian with guests shows a large disparity.

This contrasts with the results of the principals' interview data (Table 4).

**Table 3. Students' survey data on languages they speak at home**

Languages participants speak	To mother		To father		To siblings		To relatives		To peer neighbour		To older neighbour		To guest	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
HJ	131	12.6	133	12.8	9	.9	85	8.2	28	2.7	444	42.7	273	26.3
LJ	363	34.9	357	34.4	516	49.7	384	37.0	511	49.2	67	6.4	14	1.3
BI	486	46.8	480	46.2	432	41.6	505	48.6	449	43.2	492	47.4	694	66.8
E	3	.3	3	.3	3	.3	1	.1	-	-	-	-	1	.1
NJ local language	14	1.3	13	1.3	12	1.2	7	.7	3	.3	-	-	-	-
<i>Valid responses</i>	<i>997</i>	<i>96.0</i>	<i>986</i>	<i>94.9</i>	<i>972</i>	<i>93.6</i>	<i>982</i>	<i>94.5</i>	<i>991</i>	<i>95.4</i>	<i>1003</i>	<i>96.5</i>	<i>982</i>	<i>94.5</i>
<i>No responses</i>	<i>42</i>	<i>40.0</i>	<i>53</i>	<i>5.1</i>	<i>67</i>	<i>6.4</i>	<i>57</i>	<i>5.5</i>	<i>48</i>	<i>4.6</i>	<i>36</i>	<i>3.5</i>	<i>57</i>	<i>5.5</i>
Total	1039	100	1039	100	1039	100	1039	100	1039	100	1039	100	1039	100

**Table 4. Interview data on the young people's language use at home**

Languages	Number of responses	Sources: principals of	Contents
J	5	JH4, JH5, SH1, SH2, SH3	Many young people cannot, hardly and rarely speak Javanese
HJ	3	JH4, SH1	Many young people do not and cannot speak HJ Krama properly
LJ	1	JH4	Young people just speak LJ Ngoko
BI	2	JH4, SH1	Young people increasingly or always use Indonesian

The results from the student survey and interview data are probably best described in a comment given by one of the school principals during an interview:

“Moreover, many of them do not use Krama in their neighbourhood. They only speak Ngoko at home. Some only use Indonesian. These days, they use more and more Indonesian for their daily conversations at home.” [P of JH4]

The Chi-square tests of relationships between the young people's gender and their use of Javanese and Indonesian in the home mostly result in  $p < .05$ , indicating a significant association, except in communication with their

fathers. The tests show that  $\chi^2 = 7.756$  and  $p = .021$  for language use with mothers;  $\chi^2 = 4.573$  and  $p = .102$  with fathers;  $\chi^2 = 17.750$  and  $p = .000$  with siblings;  $\chi^2 = 67.156$  and  $p = .000$  with relatives;  $\chi^2 = 97.380$  and  $p = .000$  with peer neighbours;  $\chi^2 = 10.471$  and  $p = .005$  with older neighbours; and  $\chi^2 = 19.578$  and  $p = .000$  with guests. The data show that female participants tended to speak more Indonesian than male participants did and the sharpest contrast was shown in their report of communicating with peer neighbours.

The other Chi-square analyses suggest a significant association between their parents' levels of education and their home languages (Table 5).

**Table 5. Association between parents' education level and home languages**

Language mostly used to talk to	Father's education level		Mother's education level	
	$\chi^2$	<i>P</i>	$\chi^2$	<i>P</i>
Mother	145.659	.000	115.947	.000
Father	153.499	.000	114.721	.000
Siblings	107.064	.000	66.288	.000
Relatives	94.027	.000	62.250	.000
Peer neighbours	69.697	.000	41.682	.000
Older neighbours	100.913	.000	79.039	.000
Guests	77.506	.000	66.667	.000

*1.2 Schools*

Among the participants, the reported use of Indonesian is extremely dominant in the school environment.

However, Tables 6 and 7 indicate that the students prefer to speak Indonesian with all school members except their peers.

**Table 6. Students' survey data on languages they speak to teachers and school friends**

Languages spoken at school	To teachers in class		To teachers outside class		To classmates in class		To friends outside class	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
HJ	19	1.8	34	3.3	4	.4	3	.3
LJ	5	.5	16	1.5	504	48.5	420	40.4
BI	995	95.8	967	93.1	476	45.8	567	54.6
E	1	.1	1	.1	2	.2	2	.2
NJ local language	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	.1
<i>Valid responses</i>	<i>1020</i>	<i>98.2</i>	<i>1018</i>	<i>98.0</i>	<i>986</i>	<i>94.9</i>	<i>993</i>	<i>95.6</i>
<i>No responses</i>	<i>19</i>	<i>1.8</i>	<i>21</i>	<i>2.0</i>	<i>53</i>	<i>5.1</i>	<i>46</i>	<i>4.4</i>
<b>Total</b>	<b>1039</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>1039</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>1039</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>1039</b>	<b>100</b>

Competition between the use of Javanese and Indonesian appears in communications among peers, both inside and outside class. For communication in class, more

respondents claimed to speak LJ Ngoko than Indonesian whereas students who claimed to speak LJ Ngoko were smaller in number than those who stated using Indonesian outside class.

**Table 7. Students' survey data on languages they speak to other school members**

Languages spoken to other school members	To principal		To administrative staff		To school janitor		To parking attendant		To canteen assistant	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
HJ	31	3.0	23	2.2	43	4.1	49	4.7	61	5.9
LJ	7	.7	11	1.1	64	6.2	92	8.9	124	11.9
BI	983	94.6	985	94.8	907	87.3	865	83.3	817	78.6
E	1	.1	1	.1	1	.1	-	-	-	-
<i>Valid responses</i>	<i>1022</i>	<i>98.4</i>	<i>1020</i>	<i>98.2</i>	<i>1015</i>	<i>97.7</i>	<i>1006</i>	<i>96.8</i>	<i>1002</i>	<i>96.4</i>
<i>No responses</i>	<i>17</i>	<i>1.6</i>	<i>19</i>	<i>1.8</i>	<i>24</i>	<i>2.3</i>	<i>33</i>	<i>3.2</i>	<i>37</i>	<i>3.6</i>
<b>Total</b>	<b>1039</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>1039</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>1039</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>1039</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>1039</b>	<b>100</b>

Only a few number of participants stated they used Javanese in interactions with non-academic school members like school janitors, parking attendants and canteen assistants. Of these interactions, more reported choosing LJ Ngoko than HJ Krama as Table 7 shows.

The students' data on their language use at school were triangulated with the teachers' (Tables 8 and 9). Most teachers admitted the dominant use of Indonesian when students speak to them both in and outside class and few teachers recognized the use of English to teacher in class.

**Table 8. Teachers' survey data on languages the students speak to teachers and school friends**

Languages spoken at school	To teachers in class		To teachers outside class		To friends in class		To friends outside class	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
HJ	1	2.9	1	2.9	-	-	-	-
LJ	-	-	2	5.9	15	44.1	24	70.6
BI	29	85.3	30	88.2	19	55.9	10	29.4
E	4	11.8	1	2.9	-	-	-	-
<i>Valid responses</i>	<i>34</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>34</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>34</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>34</i>	<i>100</i>
<i>No responses</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>
<b>Total</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>100</b>

Most teachers also observed that Indonesian dominates student interactions with principals, administrative staff, school janitors,

parking attendants, and canteen assistants. These findings confirm the students' self-reported data.

**Table 9. Teachers' survey data on languages the students speak to other school members**

Languages to other school members	To principal		To admin. staff		To school janitor		To parking attendant		To canteen assistant	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
HJ	4	11.8	4	11.8	4	11.8	6	17.6	7	20.6
LJ	-	-	1	2.9	7	20.6	8	23.5	8	23.5
BI	30	88.2	29	85.3	23	67.6	20	58.8	19	55.9
<i>Valid responses</i>	<i>34</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>34</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>34</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>34</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>34</i>	<i>100</i>
<i>No responses</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>
Total	34	100	34	100	34	100	34	100	34	100

However, there is some discrepancy between the data from students and from teachers regarding interaction with schoolmates. More teachers considered that Indonesian dominates language use inside class and Javanese is dominant outside class. However, more students admitted they use Javanese more

frequently than Indonesian inside class and they use more Indonesian than Javanese outside class.

Almost all school principals recognised the dominant use of Indonesian among students at school (Table 10).

**Table 10. Interview data on the young people's language use at school**

Languages	Number of responses	Sources: P / PV / LC of	Contents
J	14	JH2, JH3, JH4, JH5, SH1, SH2, SH3, SH4	Students rarely speak Javanese. A small number of them do it in small groups outside the class. Most of them cannot use the speech level appropriately.
HJ	3	JH4, SH1	Many students cannot use the speech level appropriately. Ability to speak HJ Krama is rare and amazing.
LJ	1	JH4	Students can use LJ Ngoko well.
BI	12	JH2, JH4, JH5, SH2, SH4	Students get used to speaking Indonesian and speak it in daily communication. Their language is influenced by the youth' sociable language.
E	3	JH2, JH4	There is almost no communication in English at school so encouragement is necessary. For example, through an activity where students have to speak English.

The principal of JH2, for example, stated that "Indonesian is used for daily conversations. Nowadays, children tend to speak Indonesian very often."

A closer investigation of peer interactions shows that there is some gender difference in the choice of LJ Ngoko and Indonesian (Table 11).

**Table 11. Students' survey data on languages they speak to school peers based on gender**

Languages spoken to peers at school	To classmates in class				To friends outside class			
	Female		Male		Female		Male	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
HJ	0	0	4	1.1	0	0	3	0.8
LJ	204	32.3	281	75.3	138	21.8	267	71.5
BI	392	62.0	70	18.7	462	73.1	88	23.6
E	1	0.2	1	0.3	1	0.2	1	0.3
<i>Valid responses</i>	<i>597</i>	<i>94.5</i>	<i>356</i>	<i>95.4</i>	<i>601</i>	<i>95.1</i>	<i>359</i>	<i>96.2</i>
<i>No responses</i>	<i>35</i>	<i>5.5</i>	<i>17</i>	<i>4.6</i>	<i>31</i>	<i>4.9</i>	<i>14</i>	<i>3.8</i>
Total	632	100	373	100	632	100	373	100

The number of female students who said they spoke Indonesian with their peers at school is higher than those who said they spoke Javanese. In in-class interactions, the number of female students who said they used Indonesian is nearly double that of students who said they used LJ Ngoko and in outside-class communications, the number is more than three times.

By contrast, more male students said they used Javanese more than Indonesian. The number of male students who said they used Javanese with classmates in class is more than four times as many as those who said they used Indonesian and related to outside-class exchanges the number is more than triple. The results of the Chi-square analyses suggest that there is a significant association between gender and the use of LJ Ngoko or Indonesian with their friends – with  $\chi^2 = 185.693$  and  $p = .000$  for communication in class, and  $\chi^2 = 248.939$  and  $p = .000$  for communication outside class.

The findings from the observations on out-of-class peer interactions support the statistical findings. There were 11 sets of recordings of naturally-occurring

conversational data. The use of only Javanese appeared in five male-to-male conversations, and only Indonesian was used in two female-to-female conversations; an example of each is in the next paragraphs. Indonesian with a little Javanese was used in three female-to-female conversations and mixed Javanese-Indonesian was used in one male-female conversation, with the male participant using Javanese while the females used Indonesian.

Following is a dialogue between two male students after a class in School SH1. Student 1 asked why Student 2 did not reply to a message he had sent via online chat. Both spoke LJ Ngoko only.

- (1) S1 : *Kowe ora mbales piye?*  
 'Why didn't you reply to my text?'  
 S2 : *Kowa-kowe, kowa-kowe. Mbales ya.*  
 'I did.'  
 S1 : *Ora ana nyoh.*  
 'Look! There was no text reply from you.'  
 S2 : *Nggonanmu kok pateni datane?*  
 'Do you think you may have switched off your data?'

- S1 : *Ora iki lho.*  
 'No. See.'
- S2 : *Nggonanmu ana centange ora?*  
 'Was there any notification on your phone?'

The following is an Indonesian conversation between four female students in School SH2. The conversation is characterised by a style that imitates the Jakartan dialect, which in many ways is considered 'trendy and modern' (see Smith-Hefner, 2009), and the Javanese influence of particles *-e* and *-pa*, which characterised locality.

- (2) S1 : *Capek, Dit?*  
 'Tired, Dit?'
- S2 : *Ya gak gitu. Ya gak gitu.*  
 'That's not what I mean. I don't mean that.'
- S1 : *Ya udalah kalo gak mau. Kalo kena air ini gak papa pa?*  
 'Just leave it if you don't want. Is it water resistant?'
- S3 : *Ya ampun gak jadi ngerjain e?*  
 'Gee...so we won't do it now?'
- S4 : *Marah gak si Dita?*  
 'Is Dita upset?'
- S1 : *Gak tau. Biar aja.*  
 'No idea. Just leave her.'

The principals of JH4, JH5 and SH2 confirmed the influence of the sociable style on the youths' Indonesian, as exemplified in the following comment.

"Nowadays, there are many students who use Indonesian, but in the youth's sociable style. They use that language style to send short messages." [P of SH2]

The common use of non-standard Indonesian is not only

heard in their daily speech but also in written communication, like SMS. This phenomenon worries the older generation, including principals and teachers, who would prefer young people to use the standard language regardless of the formality of the settings.

Relevant to Javanese-Indonesian peer interactions, a set of Chi-square tests indicates significant relationships between the parent's level of education and the use of these local and national languages with friends in class and outside class – fathers':  $\chi^2 = 31.344$  and  $p = .000$  inside class, and  $\chi^2 = 16.374$  and  $p = .000$  outside class; mothers':  $\chi^2 = 14.262$  and  $p = .001$  inside class. However, there is no significant association between mothers' level of education and the use of languages in outside class peer interactions, with  $\chi^2 = 3.951$  and  $p = .139$ .

### 1.3 Street

Language use on the street is typically informal, consisting of greetings that serve the phatic function and small talk among neighbours, friends or acquaintances as stated in the questionnaire.

Table 12 indicates that Indonesian is used slightly more frequently than Javanese in greetings with peers and with older neighbours. The reported frequency of using Indonesian between school mates is also higher than Javanese. The number of young people who claimed to use Indonesian to greet acquaintances is much higher than those who claimed to use Javanese. Only a small number of young people reported using Arabic greetings but this number is higher than that claimed to use English.

**Table 12. Students' survey data on languages they use for greetings on the street**

Languages used in greetings	Peer neighbour		Older neighbour		School mates		Acquaintances	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
HJ	22	2.1	429	41.3	3	.3	5	.5
LJ	428	41.2	34	3.3	378	36.4	64	6.2
BI	506	48.7	490	47.2	564	54.3	914	88.0
E	1	.1	1	.1	2	.2	2	.2
A	36	3.5	39	3.8	35	3.4	21	2.0
<i>Valid responses</i>	<i>993</i>	<i>95.6</i>	<i>993</i>	<i>95.6</i>	<i>982</i>	<i>94.5</i>	<i>1006</i>	<i>96.8</i>
<i>No responses</i>	<i>46</i>	<i>4.4</i>	<i>46</i>	<i>4.4</i>	<i>57</i>	<i>5.5</i>	<i>33</i>	<i>3.2</i>
Total	1039	100	1039	100	1039	100	1039	100

The Chi-square analyses show that there is significant relationship between gender and the use of Javanese and Indonesian on the street, with the following details. To greet peer

neighbours ( $\chi^2 = 125.041$  and  $p = .000$ ); older neighbours ( $\chi^2 = 11.135$  and  $p = .004$ ); school mates ( $\chi^2 = 237.575$  and  $p = .000$ ); acquaintances ( $\chi^2 = 37.951$  and  $p = .000$ ).

**Table 13. Association between parents' education level and languages for greetings on the street**

Language mostly used to greet	Father's education level		Mother's education level	
	$\chi^2$	$p$	$\chi^2$	$P$
Peer neighbours	57.119	.000	19.130	.001
Older neighbours	64.031	.000	33.992	.001
Classmates	19.076	.001	11.433	.022
Acquaintances	15.542	.016	6.694	.350

The Chi-square statistics in Table 13 reveal the significant association between parental education level and language use in five out of eight cases.

The case of Javanese use is similar with small talk, as Table 14 shows. The only difference is that more young

people reported speaking Javanese, especially the low variety, with their peer neighbours. With older neighbours, small talk occurs more frequently in HJ Krama than LJ Ngoko, as is the case with greetings.

**Table 14. Students' survey data on their small talks in the street**

Languages used for small talk	Peer neighbour		Older neighbour		School mates		Acquaintances	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
HJ	8	.8	375	36.1	6	.6	3	.3
LJ	549	52.8	64	6.2	463	44.6	74	7.1
BI	427	41.0	552	53.1	507	48.8	917	88.3
E	2	.2	1	.1	3	.3	4	.4
A	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	.1
NJ local language	1	.1	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>Valid responses</i>	987	94.9	992	95.5	979	94.2	999	96.2
<i>No responses</i>	53	5.1	47	4.5	60	5.8	40	3.8
Total	1039	100	1039	100	1039	100	1039	100

The Chi-square tests result in significant associations between gender and the use of Javanese and Indonesian except for communication with older neighbours. The details are as follows: Interactions with peer neighbour ( $\chi^2 =$

99.005 and  $p = .000$ ); older neighbours ( $\chi^2 = 8.061$  and  $p = .018$ ); school mates ( $\chi^2 = 194.497$  and  $p = .000$ ); and acquaintances ( $\chi^2 = 29.257$  and  $p = .000$ ).

**Table 15. Association between parents' education level and languages in small talks**

Language mostly used to communicate with	Father's education level		Mother's education level	
	$\chi^2$	$p$	$\chi^2$	$P$
Peer neighbours	57.130	.000	19.560	.001
Older neighbours	82.723	.000	50.209	.000
School mates	25.497	.000	27.783	.000
Acquaintances	15.082	.005	6.318	.177

As Table 15 depicts, no significant association is shown only by relationship between language use for communications with acquaintances with mother's education level.

**Discussion**

Young Yogyakarta multilinguals' higher use of Javanese than Indonesian appears in three domains: home, school, and street, depending on particular interlocutors. More specifically, the more frequently use of Javanese is

due to the contribution of the used L variety.

In the home domain, a larger number of participants claimed to speak LJ Ngoko than HJ Krama to their mothers, fathers, sibling, relatives, and peer neighbours because LJ Ngoko is the mother tongue (see also Purwoko, 2011). In the case of the young people's Javanese communications with their parents, the rules of the Javanese speech levels are not applied (Hudson, 2002). The young people's intimacy with their

parents might make them disregard an interlocutor's age as a determinant for using HJ Krama, and to some extent make the child-parent informal relationship stronger.

The more frequent choice to use HJ Krama over LJ Ngoko with older neighbours shows that these young speakers do have some knowledge of the socially determined speech levels. They are aware that non-intimacy plus an interlocutor's age becomes a determinant for the choice of the H variety over the L variety. Slightly more young people reported they preferred Indonesian to HJ Krama when speaking to older people, which is probably, as G. Poedjosoedarmo (2006) and Zentz (2014; 2015) describe, a safer choice to speak politely rather than using LJ Ngoko (see also Ravindranath & Cohn, 2014).

More young people reported using Indonesian to their relatives and guests than Javanese. This trend is increasing, which shows that the greater the social distance between interlocutors, the more likely it is that they will use Indonesian. Again, the respondents showed that Indonesian was safer than either LJ Ngoko or HJ Krama. 'Being younger or older' than relatives in the Javanese context does not necessarily mean only considering the relative biological ages of the interlocutors but also requires consideration of the age of their parents. Therefore, HJ Krama might be

used with relatives because either the speakers are biologically younger than the interlocutor or their parents are younger than the interlocutor's parents. The tendency to choose Indonesian with guests indicates that spatial distance is also likely to be perceived as social distance or non-intimacy. Indonesian is considered neutral because speakers can use it regardless whether they are familiar or not with their interlocutors and whether they are older or younger than them. For many Yogyakarta youths, Indonesian has become 'a language escape' when they find themselves in Javanese situations that normally require them to use the formal or polite form, that is the H form, from the speech levels.

The finding that more speakers of Javanese reported their use of LJ Ngoko rather than HJ Krama with family members, relatives and peer neighbours indicates that the young multilinguals consider intimacy and familiarity first regarding these interlocutors. The finding that more young people claimed to speak HJ Krama than LJ Ngoko to older neighbours and guests indicates that age is a determinant in their choice between these varieties (see Koentjaraningrat, 1985; S. Poedjosoedarmo, 1968).

The Javanese-Indonesian language patterns in their home domain are illustrated in Table 16.

**Table 16. Patterns of the young people’s language use in the home domain**

Languages to:	Mother	Father	Sibling	Relative	Peer neighbours	Older neighbours	Guest	Phone call
HJ	√	√				√	√	
LJ	√	√	√	√	√			
BI	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√

These findings relate to gender and parental education level. This present study confirms the traditional view on different language use by gender in the literature (e.g., Eckert & McConnell-Ginet, 2003; Labov, 1990; Tannen, 2010; Trudgill, 1972). They also confirm the trend strongly claimed in a number of bi-/multilingualism studies that females tend to choose the more widely used language (e.g., Bissoonauth, 2011;

Kurniasih, 2006; Smith-Hefner, 2009). With their mothers, siblings, relatives, peer neighbours and older neighbours, girls are more likely to speak Indonesian, while boys are more likely to speak Javanese.

The relationship to parental education level is illustrated in Table 17, with the arrows’ directions showing the larger numbers of speakers.

**Table 17. Relationship between parents’ levels of education and the language use**

Parents’ levels of education	The use of HJ	Interlocutors	The use of LJ	Interlocutors	The use of BI	Interlocutors
Low level	↑	Mother, father, relative, older neighbours, guests	↑	Mother, father, sibling, relative, peer neighbours, older neighbours	↓	Mother, father, sibling, relative, peer neighbours, older neighbours, guests
Middle level						
High level						

The difference in language use at home by parental level of education is in line with a number of studies on language prestige and social-economic status (e.g., Bernstein, 1960; Bissoonauth, 2011; Kurniasih, 2006; Labov, 1963, 1972, 1990). Labov (1990) claims that the use of either objective parameters: education, occupation and income; or subjective measures of social stratification, similarly refer to “the hierarchical organization of the speech community”. In this present

study, the higher the level of the parents’ education, the more frequently the young people use Indonesian, and vice versa.

In the school domain, young people reported using Indonesian dominantly to almost all interlocutors, and using Javanese irrespective of relative age or level of formality. For example, in the informal situation when pupils interact with non-academic and non-administrative school staff, the majority of young people prefer to use

Indonesian. If they do choose to use Javanese, LJ Ngoko is preferred over HJ Krama.

In the context of traditional Javanese speech, relative age, with addressee being older, predicates the choice of HJ Krama, but the findings from this present study show that this is not the case for these Yogyakarta youths. The seemingly inappropriate choice of languages by these young multilinguals can be explained according to their age, their level of competence in Javanese, and their prioritising of the intimacy dimension. First, some young people avoid using their hierarchal ethnic language because of their age, which will leave them with HJ Krama as the right choice. Since this is inappropriate for them, they switch to Indonesian. Second, other young people do not know how to use Javanese speech levels, so for them, the choice is LJ Ngoko, and this is what they use. Third, some young people know the speech levels but value the intimacy dimension more highly than other social dimensions. This also leads them to choose the low variety. The small number of young people who do speak HJ Krama probably do so because they have a good understanding of the speech levels and their social functions, and are adept at using the high variety appropriately. The shift from HJ Krama to Indonesian by most Javanese young people has been observed for more than three decades, for example, in Surakarta, another centre of Javanese culture (see Errington, 1988).

Javanese, represented by LJ Ngoko, competes with Indonesian only in the situation of peer interactions, as shown by the student survey data and the observations conducted

inside and outside classes. Actual use and adult expectations differ. The surveyed teachers reported that they thought Javanese should have been the dominant language in outside-class peer interactions, while the interviewed principals assumed that generally more students would use Indonesian than Javanese. These different opinions probably stem from their own personal associations with particular situations. As language teachers, the surveyed teachers logically considered sociolinguistic factors, such as the formality or informality of the setting or relative age. They would predict that more students would choose LJ Ngoko over the other languages. The principals just expressed their opinions based on what they observed: in general, students' poor use of Javanese and extensive use of Indonesian in the playground.

The young people's language choice tends to be highly associated with gender and parental levels of education, as the case of Javanese-Indonesian rivalry in the home domain. That there is relationship between gender and parents' levels of education and the use of languages at home and at school is comparable to Kurniasih's (2006) findings.

In researching university-aged young people in Yogyakarta, Smith-Hefner (2009) claims that young Javanese women's preference for Indonesian over Javanese relates to their gender expectations on marriage. The issues of marriage and gender equality are not so relevant to this present study's female participants, given they are much younger than Smith-Hefner's (2009) subjects. However, for both groups the young women's language

choice fits with the perceived prestige of Indonesian being “current”, and especially the youth’s everyday language, which is valued as “trendy”, “cool” and “modern” (p. 62). The young women’s use of Indonesian over Javanese might also be a signal that the use of Indonesian is an incoming norm that is being led by young women.

The data on language in the street domain shows Javanese-Indonesian competition for greetings and small talk with neighbouring peers, older neighbours and schoolmates. It also shows that within the context of speaking to older neighbours, more young people chose Indonesian than Javanese, which is different from the findings on language choice within the home domain. The significantly higher proportion of young people choosing Indonesian to interact with acquaintances both in greetings and small talk most likely indicates that social distance is an overriding factor influencing the young people’s choice of Indonesian instead of Javanese, as also shown in the home domain.

The young people’s use of languages to all interlocutors in the street domain has significant association with gender. Their language use to most interlocutors also has significant correlation with parental level of education. With regard to interactions through greetings and small talk with acquaintances, there is no correlation between the used languages with mother’s level of education. This can be related to the majority of respondents, around 90%, who admitted to use Indonesian to less intimate people.

## CONCLUSIONS

Javanese and Indonesian still compete in home, school, and street domains, but not in all sociolinguistic situations. The findings show that Yogyakarta youths are most likely to use the L form of Javanese in informal situations with peers or with older people, like parents, with whom they feel close. The competition between ethnic and national languages in the three domains suggests that even though Javanese is slightly more prevalent than Indonesian at home, its vitality is weakening. In the context of Javanese urban youth under this study, Javanese is losing ground. The evidence is that Indonesian has been replacing Javanese in various domains and functions.

If we consider that Javanese shift to Indonesian has occurred within the Javanese community itself, the concerns that many parties have about the further use of Javanese maybe well founded (e.g., *Bahasa Jawa Mulai Ditinggalkan* ‘Javanese is Becoming Obsolete’, 2009; Errington, 1992; 2003; Hanna, 2012; *Motivasi Memakai Bahasa Jawa Makin Tiada* ‘Motivation of Using Javanese is Fading Away’, 2009). The shift away from Javanese in Yogyakarta needs serious attention because this city is the centre of Javanese language and culture (Errington, 1998, 1998; Smith-Hefner, 2009). The call for a close look at the vitality of Javanese (Ravindranath & Cohn, 2014) and any better future support systems to Javanese (Vander Klok, 2019) needs follow-ups from the government, educational institutions, communities and other relevant parties.

## REFERENCES

- Act No. 20. (2003). *Undang-undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 20 Tahun 2003 tentang Sistem Pendidikan Nasional 'Act of the Republic of Indonesia Number 20 2003 on National Education System'*. Jakarta: Ministry of National Education.
- Act No. 24. (2009). *Undang-undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 24 Tahun 2009 tentang Bendera, Bahasa dan Lambang Negara, serta Lagu Kebangsaan 'Act of the Republic of Indonesia Number 24 2009 on Nation's Flag, Languages, Emblem, and Anthem'*. Jakarta: Ministry of Law and Human Right.
- Arafah, B. (2014). The Development and Challenges of Indonesian Language as an Academic Language. <http://repository.unhas.ac.id/handle/123456789/11476>
- Bahasa Jawa Mulai Ditinggalkan 'Javanese is Becoming Obsolete'*. (2009, 31 January 2009). *Kompas.Com*. [http://regional.kompas.com/read/2009/01/31/04550670/bahasa.jawa.mulai.ditinggalkan?utm\\_source=RD&utm\\_medium=box&utm\\_campaign=Kaitrd](http://regional.kompas.com/read/2009/01/31/04550670/bahasa.jawa.mulai.ditinggalkan?utm_source=RD&utm_medium=box&utm_campaign=Kaitrd)
- Bernstein, B. (1960). Language and Social Class. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 11(3), 271-276. DOI: 10.2307/586750
- Bissoonauth, A. (2011). Language Shift and Maintenance in Multilingual Mauritius: the Case of Indian Ancestral Languages. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 32(5), 421-434. DOI: 10.1080/01434632.2011.586463
- Cummins, J. (2001). Bilingual Children's Mother Tongue: Why Is It Important for Education. *Sprogforum*, 19, 15-20. [https://www.lavplu.eu/central/bibliografie/cummins\\_eng.pdf](https://www.lavplu.eu/central/bibliografie/cummins_eng.pdf)
- Creswell, J. W., & Clark, V. L. P. (2011). *Designing and Conducting Mixed Methods Research* (2nd ed.). Los Angeles: Sage.
- Dornyei, Z. (2007). *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Eckert, P., & McConnell-Ginet, S. (2003). *Language and Gender*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Errington, J. J. (1988). *Structure and Style in Javanese : A Semiotic View of Linguistic Etiquette*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Errington, J. J. (1992). On the Ideology of Indonesian Language Development: The State of a Language of State. *Pragmatics*, 2(3), 417-426. <https://journals.linguisticsociety.org/elanguage/pragmatics/article/download/232/232-519-1-PB.pdf>
- Errington, J. J. (1998). *Shifting Languages: Interaction and Identity in Javanese Indonesia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Errington, J. J. (2003). Getting Language Rights: The Rhetorics of Language Endangerment and Loss. *American Anthropologist*, 105(4), 723-732. <https://people.cas.sc.edu/dubinsk/LING240/readings/Errington.2003.AA.105.723-732.pdf>
- Fishman, J. A. (1991). *Reversing Language Shift*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Gafaranga, J. (2010). Medium Request: Talking Language Shift into Being.

- Language in Society*, 39(2), 241-270.  
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404510000047
- Grosjean, F. (2006). Studying Bilinguals: Methodological and Conceptual Issues. In T. K. Bathia & W. Ritchie (Eds.), *The Handbook of Bilingualism* (pp. 32-63). Malden: Blackwell Publishing.
- Hanna. (2012, July 5-6, 2012). *Bahasa Daerah pada Era Globalisasi Peluang dan Tantangannya 'Regional Languages in the Globalisation Era Opportunities and Challenges'*. Paper presented at the International Seminar "Language Maintenance and Shift II", Semarang. [http://eprints.undip.ac.id/54113/1/Proceedings\\_International\\_Seminar\\_July\\_5-6\\_2012\\_no\\_score\\_-\\_Hanna.pdf](http://eprints.undip.ac.id/54113/1/Proceedings_International_Seminar_July_5-6_2012_no_score_-_Hanna.pdf)
- Hudson, A. (2002). Outline of a Theory of Diglossia. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 157, 1-48.  
DOI: 10.1515/ijsl.2002.039
- Karan, M. (2011). Understanding and Forecasting Ethnolinguistic Vitality. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 32(2), 137-149. DOI: 10.1080/01434632.2010.541916
- Koentjaraningrat. (1985). *Javanese Culture*. Singapore: Oxford University Press.
- Kurniasih, Y. (2006). *Gender, Class and Language Preference: A Case Study in Yogyakarta*. Paper presented at the 2005 Conference of the Australian Linguistics Society, University of Western Australia, Perth. <http://www.als.asn.au>
- Labov, W. (1963). The Social Motivation of a Sound Change. *Word*, 19(3), 273-309. DOI: 10.1080/00437956.1963.11659799
- Labov, W. (1972). *Sociolinguistic Patterns*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Labov, W. (1990). The Intersection of Sex and Social Class in the Course of Linguistic Change. *Language Variation and Change*, 2(02), 205-254. DOI:10.1017/S0954394500000338
- Lohr, S. L. (2008). Coverage and Sampling. In E. D. de Leeuw, J. J. Hox, & D. A. Dillman (Eds.), *International Handbook of Survey Methodology* (pp. 97-112). Boca Raton: CRC Press.
- Motivasi Memakai Bahasa Jawa Makin Tiada 'Motivation of Using Javanese is Fading Away'*. (2009, 2 April 2009). *Kompas.Com*. [http://regional.kompas.com/read/2009/04/02/01330946/motivasi.memakai.bahasa.jawa.makin.tiada?utm\\_source=RD&utm\\_medium=box&utm\\_campaign=Kaitrd](http://regional.kompas.com/read/2009/04/02/01330946/motivasi.memakai.bahasa.jawa.makin.tiada?utm_source=RD&utm_medium=box&utm_campaign=Kaitrd)
- Musgrave, S. (2014). Language Shift and Language Maintenance in Indonesia. In P. Sercombe and R. Tupas (Eds.), *Language, Identities and Education in Asia: Language Contact, Assimilation and Shift in Brunei, Indonesia, Malaysia and Singapore* (pp. 87-105). London: Palgrave.
- Nurani, L. M. (2015). *Changing Language Loyalty and Identity: An Ethnographic Inquiry of Societal Transformation among the Javanese People in Yogyakarta, Indonesia*. (Doctoral Thesis), Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona.
- Poedjosoedarmo, G. (2006). The Effect of Indonesian as a Lingua Franca on the Javanese System of Speech Levels and their Functions.

- International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 177, 111-121. DOI: 10.1515/IJSL.2006.007
- Poedjosoedarmo, S. (1968). Javanese Speech Levels. *Indonesia*, 6, 54-81. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3350711>
- Purwoko, H. (2011). *If Javanese Is Endangered, How Should We Maintain It?* Paper presented at the International Seminar on Language Maintenance and Shift, Diponegoro University Semarang. [http://eprints.undip.ac.id/37403/1/4\\_Herudjati\\_Purwoko.pdf](http://eprints.undip.ac.id/37403/1/4_Herudjati_Purwoko.pdf)
- Purwoko, H. (2012). *Linguistic Domains: Keys to the Maintenance of Javanese*. Paper presented at the International Seminar on Language Maintenance and Shift II, Diponegoro University Semarang. <http://eprints.undip.ac.id/37404/>
- Ravindranath, M., & Cohn, A. C. (2014). Can a Language with Millions of Speakers be Endangered? *Journal of the Southeast Asian Linguistics Society (JSEALS)*, 7, 64-75. <https://pacling.files.wordpress.com/2016/07/ravindranathcohn2014language.pdf>
- Riazi, A. M., & Candlin, C. N. (2014). Mixed-methods Research in Language Teaching and Learning: Opportunities, Issues and Challenges. *Language Teaching*, 47(2), 135-173. DOI: 10.1017/S0261444813000505
- Romaine, S. (1995). *Bilingualism* (2nd ed.). Oxford Blackwell.
- Setiawan, S. (2013). *Children's Language in a Bilingual Community in East Java*. (Doctoral Thesis), The University of Western Australia, Perth.
- Smith-Hefner, N. J. (2009). Language Shift, Gender, and Ideologies of Modernity in Central Java Indonesia. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 19(1), 55-77. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1548-1395.2009.01019.x>
- Spolsky, B. (2003). *Sociolinguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Tannen, D. (2010). He Said, She Said. *Scientific American Mind*, 21(2), 54-59. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.2307/24943040>
- Teddle, C., & Tashakkori, A. (2010). Overview of Contemporary Issues in Mixed Methods Research. In A. Tashakkori & C. Teddle (Eds.), *Handbook of Mixed Methods in Social & Behavioral Research* (2nd ed., pp. 1-41). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Trudgill, P. (1972). Sex, Covert Prestige and Linguistic Change in the Urban British English of Norwich. *Language in Society*, 1(2), 179-195. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4166683>
- UNESCO. (2014). *Multilingual Education. Why Is It important? How to Implement It?* Retrieved from <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000226554>.
- Untoro, R. (2011). *Pemakaian Bahasa Jawa dalam Keluarga Jawa di Manado 'The Use of Javanese in Javanese Families in Manado'*. Paper presented at the Kongres Bahasa Jawa 5 'The 5th Congress on Javanese', Surabaya. <http://ki-demang.com/kbj5/index.php/makalah-komisi-c>
- Vander Klok, J. 2019. The Javanese Language at Risk? Perspective from an East Java Village. *Language Documentation & Conservation*, 13, 300-345. <https://scholarspace.manoa.hawaii.edu/bitstream/10125/24868/vanderklok.pdf>

- Zentz, L. (2014). “Love” the Local, “Use” the National, “Study” the Foreign: Shifting Javanese Language Ecologies in (Post-) Modernity, Postcoloniality, and Globalization. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 24(3), 339-359. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jola.12062>
- Zentz, L. (2015). ‘Is English also the Place Where I Belong?’: Linguistic Biographies and Expanding Communicative Repertoires in Central Java. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 12(1), 68-92. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2014.943233>
- Zentz, L. (2016). Moving Languages: Syncretism and Shift in Central Java. *Tilburg Papers in Cultural Studies, Margins, hubs, and peripheries in a decentralizing Indonesia* (162), 51-66. <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/286432921.pdf#page=51>

## Appendix

### Abbreviations

A	Arabic [used in tables]
BI	Indonesian [used in tables]
E	English [used in tables]
Freq.	Frequency [used in tables]
H	High
HJ	high Javanese
JH	junior high school
L	Low
LC	language coordinator [used in tables and sources]
LJ	low Javanese
N	number of responses [used in statistic tables]
NJ	non-Javanese [used in tables]
P	principal [used in tables and sources]
OL	other language [used in tables]
S	student(s) [used in conversations]
SH	senior high school
T	teacher [used in conversations]
VP	vice principal [used in tables and sources]