Open
Access

SANG PENCERAH
Jurnal Ilmiah Universitas Muhammadiyah Buton

Language Policy and Planning: Diglossia in Indonesia

Nurhadi Hamka[1*]

[1]Universitas Khairun, Indonesia

[*]Korespondensi: nurhadihamka@unkhair.ac.id

Abstrak
Language policy is strongly connected with language planning, and that one cannot be discussed without included the other. This article will mainly discuss language policy and planning in Indonesia, especially the diglossic situation. The discussion is departed at a wider definition of language policy and planning. After that, I directly discuss the dynamics of local languages in Indonesia regarding the language policy and planning. The third, the discussion is about diglossia and diglossia-leakage that occurred in Indonesia. Afterward, in the fourth section, it talks about the domination and subordination of language. And, finally some research recommendation regarding language domination and subordination.

1. Introduction

In the view of the sociolinguists, language policy is undeniably connected with language planning. Van Herk (2012) described that language policy is a general perspective that often reflects the language ideologies of the government or the particular organization (or those who have power), regarding the use of the language. Language planning or linguistic engineering, on the other hand, is a platform of that language policy to be put into effect – to a certain speech community, regions or provinces, and even to a bigger social scale such as: a nation or even an international society. Furthermore, Weinstein (1980, p. 56) scrutinized that language planning as "a government authorized, long-term,

sustained, and conscious effort to alter language's function in society for the purpose of solving communication problems." In this paper, I firstly describe language planning in a slightly wider definition regarding: why it is done, who can do it, and how can it be done. Then, in the next section, I explain the dynamics of local languages in Indonesia regarding the language policy and planning, and third, it is about diglossia and diglossia leakage that occurred in Indonesia. Afterward, in the fourth section, it talks about the domination and subordination of language, and finally some research recommendation regarding language domination and subordination.

2. Language Planning: why, who, how

Several researchers argued that there are some reasons why language planning occured. Mackey (1973) and Coulmas (2013) claimed that language policy is intended to manage diversity and disagreement within, or between, the country(s). They explained that the number of languages in the world are far more than the number of countries and that such languages are possibly overpowered regarding political or ideology, demographic, economic, and social situation and function or culture. Moreover, Coulmas clearly reported that language policy had been well practiced to all over the world as part of the political being by incorporating language provisions in the country's constitutions. Cobarrubias (1983), furthermore, explicitly categorized language planning ideologies or motivations into four different types. First is linguistic assimilation – one or more languages assimilate with another due to the issue of language dominant which subtly or drastically banning other minor languages. Next is linguistic pluralism – governments and society are aware of the presence of multi-languages within the country. Third is vernacularisation – an indigenous language should be encouraged to official status, such as Tagalog in the Philippines, Hebrew in Israel, and Bahasa Indonesia (Indonesian) in Indonesia. And finally, internationalization is a non-indigenous language should be promoted as official language – such as English in Singapore and English in Malaysia.

Corresponding to several reasons above, Van Herk (2012) mentioned that there are at least nine classifications of people who can plan a language so that it is accepted (either voluntarily or forcefully), and utilized widely by the target community. They are: governments, non-government (or a vast and powerful organization or company), churches (or religious text), dictionary-makers, pundits (include newspaper columnist and internet bloggers), writers, educators, media (publishers, printers, editors), and social group including independent political and social groups. These kinds of people are somehow working together in the sense that they are also part of the bigger group of individuals who form a community to escalate the status and use of a local language.

Researchers describe planning into two main kinds – status planning and corpus planning. Jernudd (1973), for example, scrutinized that the status planning is selecting one of available languages (or language varieties) and promoting one over another, in which very often lead to the declaration of an official language – that based on legislation. Jernudd also explained the status planning as language determination, while corpus planning as language development. Furthermore, this corpus planning is fundamentally concerned with the internal structure of the language where the objective of that development of one particular variant is to be accepted and to fulfil the linguistics needs of a modern society.

To explain how this language planning is established, researchers – i.e. (Fishman, Ferguson, & Gupta, 1968; Jernudd, 1973; Van Herk, 2012) proposed several steps as follows. First is a selection. It is made to decide among local languages to be promoted. When selecting one particular dialect, the planner must be prudent regarding several considerations that might affect the status and shape of the language. In Somalia, for instance, the dialect which is widely practiced in the northern part is chosen because not only it has the biggest speakers among dialects, but also the uniqueness of the dialect such as the presence of poetry that makes it easily to be accepted by the society (Andrzejewski, 1980). Secondly is codification. To be more authoritative, the language (or the particular dialect) that has been selected needs to agree-upon writing system. Such as graphization which is the development of the current writing system, grammatication which is establishing the rules of the language either in speaking or writing and lexicalization which is refining vocabulary that also sometimes lead to a borrowing of several words from other dialects or languages. Next is elaboration or modernization. The language planners have to make sure that the language (or the dialect) can be broadly accepted and used among the 'modern society' by considering all their needs, especially in linguistic. Finally, it is the implementation. After all these three steps have been completed, the language planners must make sure that the language they plan is well established. The application primarily includes the dissemination through newspapers, books in schools and curriculums, the internet, or any platforms that can be largely and freely accessed by the community (Van Herk, 2012).

3. The Dynamics of Local Languages in Indonesia

In Indonesia, the government propagate the language policy through a particular institution called *Badan Pengembangan dan Pembinaan Bahasa*. The government of Indonesia through this institution manages the status and use of language through several language policies and planning. One of famous language policies that most Indonesian linguists referring to is that – Indonesian is treated as an official language and has functioned not only to bridge the communication between distinct dialects and regions but also as lingua franca to unite the people of Indonesia (Halim, 1980). Furthermore, Halim described that the positions of Indonesian within the country is an official language of the government, medium of instruction in education, language used in any form of tests, the primary instrument of communication of the national development, and as well as being the development tool for culture, science, and technology.

Responding to the particular Indonesian language policy above, it should be admitted that the policy of selecting Indonesian as lingua franca has brought some positive impacts. One of them is that a largely different speech communities of Indonesia in various regions with diverse local languages can be linguistically connected one another. However, weak control of the policy – which focus only on the development of Indonesian as national language which in fact given a smaller attention to the indigenous languages, will reduce the role of the local languages to the community which possibly leads to a bigger negative impact that is the local languages will subtly or explicitly close-down (Purwo, 2000). On the other hand, Fokker (as cited in Purwo, 2000) argued that those minority dialects should be automatically closed-down as people moving forward to a place where a sense of unity is upheld, and therefore those local languages should agree to allow an

advanced and more powerful language to take over to be the only one to develop. The latter idea is debated by Wijana and Rohmadi (2013) who presented one of Indonesian government policies that "the local languages which are actively used by a group of people as a way of transferring information and to understand each other even in a small speech community should be maintained and developed." This policy has clearly shown that albeit the progress of community nowadays is all moving forward to becoming a 'modern society', the Indonesian government aims to keep preserving the languages of indigenous. The government gives support to the local languages of each region to be used by their speaker because these local languages are one of the principals of one culture that needs to be preserved as identity.

4. Diglossia state in Indonesia

Wijana and Rohmadi (2013) argued that the first aim of the Constitution of Indonesia regarding the planning concepts of language is to create a diglossic situation, or even triglossic – by including English, with an apparent distribution of community function as explained by Fergusson (1971). Some diglossic situation can be observed in: Haiti – between creole Haiti and French; Egypt – between classic Arab and colloquial Arab (Wijana and Rohmadi, 2013); Hongkong – between Standard Chinese and Cantonese; and Switzerland – between standard German and Swiss German (Snow, 2010). In the case of Indonesia, it is hoped that the distribution of community function of languages between Indonesian and indigenous languages can support each other. Indonesian as national language act as a high variety (H) and local languages on the opposite as low variety (L), while English is also high variety (H) but in a limited community function which is mostly in the field of modern technology and education sector.

Romaine (1989) has described the distribution of H and L varieties into eleven different situations. Religious sermon, formal speech, lecture, news broadcast, editorials and news at the newspaper, and poetry, are all using H variety. While L variety is mostly used in the situations such as talking to a personal assistant or maid, private letter, conversation with family, friends, and colleagues, political cartoon, and folk literature. In Indonesia, the research on diglossia situation conducted by Abdullah (1999) and Wijana and Rohmadi (2013) have scrutinized the typical function between Indonesian and local languages regarding several general situations: such as in the family, public space, formal meeting, school, ceremony, sermon, wedding and funeral.

Furthermore, Wijana and Rohmadi (2013) argued that the distribution of community function between H and L varieties can be observed from several indicators, such as social class, age, marriage pattern, setting and place. They undoubtedly explained that the higher the social class, the greater the possibility of speaking Indonesian. As for age group, they found that youngers are mostly speaking H variety. This is mainly because younger is mostly affected by their education environments such as school, lecture, and even assignments which all require using Indonesian (and quite often in English). While older people, they tend to use L variety as they preserve the local culture. In the mixed marriage, on the other hand, Abdullah (1999) argued that the family tend to use Indonesian as intermarriage family often comes from different background speech community and that they need Indonesian to be able to communicate properly and appropriately. Wijana and Rohmadi (2013), furthermore, explained that place and setting are also

important to consider what variant of language is appropriate. They claimed that people who live in the city prefer to use Indonesian as they frequently do business transactions with different people from different ethnic groups, while countryside tends to apply local language as the people deal with the same ethnic group. As for Setting, Wijana and Rohmadi (2013) described that Indonesian is found in the formal situation while non-formal uses low variety.

Fergusson (1971) argued that diglossia is relatively stable language situation. He claimed that every language had given some leeway to run its community function appropriately and proportionally. Diglossia is an addition to the language use which involves divergent, codification which very often use superposed variety to be more authoritative, and the use in the body of written literature to be learned in the education setting and widely employed in the community. Therefore, responding to what Fergusson said, it can be assumed that the language policy which promoted Indonesian as lingua franca is not an issue. However, the implementation of the policy which focuses only on the development of Indonesian without paying attention to the preservation of local languages should gain critiqued. Wardaugh (1986) described that a great desire of establishing language unity is the primary factor of weakening the diglossia situation. Moreover, an excessive attempt to make Indonesian being official language could indirectly make the speaker of local languages started to abandon their languages to be able to compete in the business and government sectors, and thus the local languages are less interesting to learn.

5. Hegemony and inferiority of language

Wijana (2001) explained that all languages are similar and equivalent regarding the function as a tool of communication. Thus, those languages are potentially becoming an international language. As it has been explained in the introduction of this paper, there are five indicators that can be applied to measure how powerful of one language – demographic, economic, the distribution of the speaker, ideology or politic, and culture (Mackey, 1973; Coulmas, 2013). Throughout these indicators, Mackey attempted to explain the domination of English over other languages around the world. Coulmas, furthermore, explained that China has the biggest population in the world which demographically can overpowered English. In terms of the distribution, however, the speakers of English utterers are widely distributed as compared to China. Coulmas Argued that the migration of English people (especially American) had occurred since the end of world War II. He noted that most American had migrated fourteen times in their lifetime. On the other hand, concerning economic, Japanese has a chance to overpower English. Albeit the Japanese subdue the English people regarding income, but GNP of Europe and America is higher than Japan (Wijana, 2001). And that, as Mackey argued (as cited in Coulmas, 2013) that GNP has the vital role in improving the national prestige.

Using those indicators above, we can easily assess the domination and subordination between Indonesian as H variety, local languages as L variety, and English as H variety for a certain community function. Internationally, English possess higher domination over other languages as more people started to learn the language (included Indonesian). Therefore, for modern technology, researchers argued that it uses H-variety of language due to the use of English language. On the other hand, Indonesian dominated the languages of indigenous.

It is justified from ideology indicator which forces them to master Indonesian. Coulmas (2013) justified that ideology is related to the role of language in facilitating one ideology such as religion, politics, and certain notions. Indonesian, in this case, is an efficient platform for disseminating politics doctrines or spreading religion's teachings as compared to local languages which only cover a small number of people. The second reason why local languages are being subordinated by Indonesian is that the status of local languages in the curriculum is not as important as Indonesian. It is observed that Indonesian is included in the national exam while local languages are in many cases not. Moreover, some regions in Indonesia do not include local languages in the curriculum, such as Medan, Ambon, and Jakarta, which automatically leads the local languages to be overpowered.

6. Conclusion

Linguistic homogeneity is undeniably important in building nationhood. It would be, however, a misleading to consider it as an effective tool of uniting nation that based on the diverse ethnic group (Wijana, 2001). This suggests that the development should be based on diversity in the sense that the attention to the development of linguistic homogeneity should be equal with the preservation of the diversity. Coulmas (2013) described that language policy is not an issue for the minority languages, but the implementation of the policy that makes the minority language being subtly (or explicitly) overpowered. Diglossia is a good example of how to implement the policy while preserving the language of indigenous at the same time. Therefore, the role of the local government is vital as they are the one who can decide whether the preservation of local languages can occur at the same time with the development of Indonesian language as the official language as well as lingua franca.

7. Recommendation for research

Indonesia consist of various ethnic groups in which, every region has local language that different one another. Some languages are seemed (in briefly) superior than others regarding demographic, and some other languages are overpowered due to economic factor. For example, Javanese has the largest speaker in Indonesia which might become the dominant language over others; however, such cities like Padang and Makassar regarding the indicator economic cannot be underrated among other cities as they conserve to developing. Therefore, it is interesting to research which language is dominant over others, and which language that the most overpowered and why.

References:

Abdullah, Irwan. (1999). *Bahasa nusantara: posisi dan penggunaannya menjelang abad ke-21,* Yogyakarta: Pustaka pelajar.

Andrzejewski, B. W. (1980). *The implementation of language planning in Somalia: A record of achievement*: East-West Center.

Cobarrubias, J. (1983). Ethical issues in status planning. *Progress in language planning: International perspectives*, 41-85.

Coulmas, F. (2013). *Sociolinguistics: The study of speakers' choices*: Cambridge University Press.

Fergusson, C. A. (1971). Diglosssia. *Language structure and language use,* Stanford University Press.

Fishman, J. A., Ferguson, C. A., & Gupta, J. D. (1968). *Language problems of developing nations*: Wiley New York.

Halim, A. (1980). Politik Bahasa Nasional: Jakarta, Balai Pustaka.

Jernudd, B. H. (1973). Language planning as a type of language treatment. *Language planning: Current issues and research*, 11-23.

Mackey, W.F. (1973). *Three concepts of geolinguistics*. Montreal: Recherce internationale de bilingualisme.

Purwo, B.K. (2000). *Bangkitnya kebhinekaan.* Dunia linguistik dan pendidikan. Jakarta: Mega media abadi.

Romaine, S. (1989). *Bilingualism*. Oxford: Basil blackwell.

Snow, D. (2010). Hong Kong and modern diglossia. International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 2010(206), 155-179.

Van Herk, G. (2012). *What is sociolinguistics?* (Vol. 6): John Wiley & Sons.

Weinstein, B. (1980). Language planning in francophone Africa. *Language problems and language planning, 4*(1), 55-77.

Wardaugh, R. (1986). *An introduction to sociolinguistics.* Oxford; Basil blackwell.

Wijana, I.D.P. (2001). Bahasa Indonesia orde baru diantara bahasa daerah dan bahasa asing. *Kebijakan kebudayaan di masa orde baru.* Jakarta: Pusat penelitian dan pengembangan kemasyarakatan dan kebudayaan-LIPI.

Wijana, I.D.P., & Rohmadi, M. (2013). *Sosiolinguistik*. Kajian teori dan analisis. Yogyakarta: Pustaka belajar.