

Language Policy, Ideology and Language Attitudes: A Study of Indonesian Parents and their Choice of Language in the Home

A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Garnasih Aseanti Dharmaputra

Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences
University of Sydney

2019

Declaration

This thesis is my own original work. It contains no material previously published or written by another person except where due reference is made in text. Clearance was obtained from the University of Sydney Human Research Ethics Committee for the project.

Garnasih Aseanti Dharmaputra

April 2019

Abstract

This study is driven by my curiosity about Indonesian parents' use of English, a foreign language in Indonesia, to raise children. It led me to ask why this seems like normal practice and why parents seem to have little attachment to Indonesian although they grew up speaking the language. Previous studies have focused, among others, on how Indonesian children navigated their identity as cosmopolites and how English language schools applied the national education policy. Meanwhile parents' choice of home language has received little attention.

This study fills the gap in the literature by focusing on the ideology of raising children in the school language. I draw on Bourdieu's concept of habitus to explain the motivations behind the parents' use of English. I discuss the impact of language policies during the Dutch and Japanese occupations, the New Order and post-New Order periods, on parents' language attitudes and argue that the ideology of raising children in the school language is inculcated within more than one generation. In every generation, parents use the school language in the home, respectively, Dutch, Indonesian and English, reflecting the assumption that language is a tool for economic advancement.

The study uses a combined quantitative and qualitative methodology, involving questionnaire and video/audio recordings of parent-children interactions. The participants consist of upper-middle class parents who send their children to English language schools. The findings show that most parents speak a mixture of Indonesian and English, which suggests that they still value Indonesian as the family language, but use English to support their children's schooling. I show that parents' attitudes reflect the ideology of language inculcated through language policy and implemented through education, which promotes the school language as a tool for achieving better social standing. Parents who want their children to succeed thus deem that English language schools are the best option for their children.

This study contributes to the understanding of the role of English in the Indonesian education system and the impact of language policy on language attitudes. By focusing on Indonesia, it provides an example of the process involved in the dissemination of the language through the education system.

Acknowledgements

I would like to convey my utmost gratitude towards my main supervisor, Associate Professor Dwi Noverini Djenar, for guiding me through this tough but rewarding journey. Novi provided close guidance that helped my reading and thinking processes, and tirelessly reviewed my writing. Her firm and endless encouragement provided me with the fuel to finish what I started. I also thank Associate Professor Antonia Rubino and Associate Professor Ken Cruickshank for their willingness to serve as my auxiliary supervisors.

I wish to thank my participants in Jakarta, the parents who answered my questionnaire and shared their daily family conversations for this study and the Habibie Centre which provided me with a fellowship. I could not have completed my thesis without support from one my closest friends in the academia, Dr Ariane Utomo, my colleagues at the University of Sydney's post-graduate research centre, and other friends around the world. My gratitude goes to Vivienne Burgess, who did a superb job of proofreading this thesis. I'm equally grateful to Dr Christian Tym, who, on a short notice, did an impeccable job of editing this work and Dr Harni Ningsih, who caringly helped me with the layout.

I am indebted to my four siblings Emir Firdaus, Ghafur Akbar, Garnadi Walanda, and especially, Chairy Hakim, who have given me the utmost encouragement throughout difficult times. My "other parents" papa Dr Fauzi Bowo and mama Tatiek always trusted that I could reach the stars, which helped me maintain my self-esteem along the way. I give my special thanks to Mohamad Kadri, the Singing Lawyer, who unexpectedly came into my life towards the end of my candidature, become the person dearest to my heart and who asked me to grow young with him.

My loving thanks to my father, retired Ambassador Garnawan Dharmaputra, a man of few words, who, since I was a child, always believed that I would get a Doctorate degree. The most loving thanks go to my mother, Erna Farida. Her tender care, strong character and philosophy of life have been the source of my endurance. Last but not least, I am grateful to the loves of my life, my thinking son Joseph Takbir and vivacious

daughter Louise Farida, whose existence is my reason to thrive. My children's multilingualism and multiculturalism have been my main inspirations for this study. It is to my parents and children that I dedicate this thesis.

Table of Contents

Declaration	i
Acknowledgements	iii
Table of Contents	v
List of Tables	viii
1. Introduction	1
1.1. Background and aims	1
1.2. Conceptual framework	5
1.3. Methodology	8
1.4. Significance of study	12
1.5. Organization of the chapters	13
2. Theoretical framework	16
2.1. Habitus	17
2.2. Field	20
2.3. Doxa	21
2.4. Capital	22
2.4.1. Symbolic capital	23
2.4.2. Symbolic power	24
2.5. Ideology	26
2.6. Education	31
2.6.1. Early education at home	31
2.6.2. Education at school	32
2.7. Bilingualism	35
2.8. Globalization	37
3. The elite class and prestige school language	39
3.1. Ethical policy and the national language	41
3.1.1. Ethical policy for the native elite	41

3.1.2. Roots of the national language	49
3.2. Multilingualism before the 1945 Indonesian independence	55
3.2.1. Multilingualism among the educated elite	55
3.2.2. The Indonesian language during the Japanese occupation	58
4. Ideology and language of education in Indonesia	61
4.1. The ideology of national language	62
4.2. Dissemination of national language ideology	65
4.2.1. Language planning	65
4.2.2. Language policy	69
4.2.3. Policy on language of education	73
4.3. The laws on language of education in Indonesia	75
4.3.1. Laws on language of education in 20 th century Indonesia	75
4.3.2. English language schools	78
5. School language and language shift in independent Indonesia	86
5.1. Definitions of mother tongue and language shift	87
5.2. The spread of Indonesian language during the New Order	89
5.2.1. Implementation of Law No. 4/1950 regarding the Foundations on Education and Learning, Law No. 2/1989 regarding the National Education System	89
5.2.2. 1980 Survey on Indonesian language	92
5.3. The shift of home languages in urban areas	95
5.3.1. Regional languages: mother tongue of participants' parents born between the 1920s and 1950s.	96
5.3.2. Home languages of Indonesians growing up during the New Order	99
5.3.3. Mother tongue of people growing up in the New Order	101
5.3.4. Urban areas: Home of the middle class	104
5.4. Language shift after the New Order	106
5.4.1. English as part of the home language	106
5.4.2. Aspirations for children's higher education	107

6. Bilingualism and code-switching in family conversation	110
6.1. The influence of the globalized world towards parents' aspirations	111
6.1.1. Reasons for the inclusion of English as home language	112
6.1.2. Aspirations for their children's languages in the future	115
6.1.3. Aspirations for their children's residential locations.....	117
6.1.4. The globalized world	120
6.1.5. Definitions of code-switching and borrowing.....	121
6.2. Parents who do not use English	124
6.2.1. Speaking Indonesian.....	124
6.2.2. Code-switching with a Regional Language.....	126
6.3. English as a home language	127
6.3.1. Code-switching in English, French and Indonesian	127
6.3.2. Mother and daughter code-switch fluently.....	128
6.3.3. Suffix borrowing when speaking with son.....	130
6.3.4. Inaccurate translation and phonological switching	131
6.3.5. Daughter code-switches using mostly Indonesian	133
6.3.6. Code-switching by inserting one word.....	134
6.3.7. Son speaks only English.....	135
7. Conclusion	138
7.1. Understanding the use of English in urban Indonesian homes through habitus	138
7.2. Language policy as an influencer of the choice of home language by parents	139
7.3. Final remarks	141
References	143
Appendix	155

List of Tables

Table 1. What is a mother tongue?	87
Table 2. Results of 1980 Survey - first and second language, adult category	93
Table 3. Results of 1980 Survey on language as first and second language, children category.....	94
Table 4. Language used at home in Jakarta in 1980	94
Table 5. Participants' perceptions of their mothers' mother tongue.....	96
Table 6. Participants' perceptions of their fathers' mother tongue.....	97
Table 7. Bilingualism participants' parents as perceived by participants.....	99
Table 8. Participants' mothers' language use as reported by participants.....	100
Table 9. Participants' fathers' language use as reported by participants.....	101
Table 10. Participants' self-reported mother tongue(s)	102
Table 11. Language shift before and during the New Order	102
Table 12. Places where participants grew up.....	105
Table 13. Participants' choice of home language(s) to speak with their children	107
Table 14. Location of participants' higher education	108
Table 15. Participants' expectations of their children's higher education location.....	108
Table 16. Participants' reasons in choosing English and Indonesian	112
Table 17. Participants' aspiration for their children's languages in the future.....	115
Table 18. Future country of residence of participants' children.....	118
Table 19. Home language participants speak with their children.....	122

1. Introduction

1.1. Background and aims

Indonesia is a multilingual country where the national language, Indonesian, is spoken by nearly 198 million out of the total population of 215 million (Central Bureau Statistics 2010). English is rapidly growing into a linguistic resource and people use it for various communicative purposes. In urban centres such as Jakarta, English is the medium of instruction in international schools and the national-plus schools (schools that combine national and foreign curriculums). In international schools, Indonesian is also used as a medium of instruction, but only for very few subjects, such as Indonesian language and civic studies. Many parents from upper-middle class background¹ who live in urban areas send their children to these schools, because they want their children to be able to compete in the globalized world, which often requires travel overseas for education or work.

This is a study of Indonesian parents who raise their children in Indonesian and English, a language that is not their native tongue. These parents send their children to English language schools and most of them code-switch between Indonesian and English when speaking to their children. This situation can be observed in big cities in Indonesia due to the availability of such schools. The practice of sending children to schools that use English as the primary teaching medium and Indonesian as the secondary medium leads children to acquire fluency in speaking, reading and writing in English, and usually speaking-only ability in Indonesian. The aim of this study is to understand the motivation behind these parents' use of English as the language in the home, despite the fact that English is a foreign language in Indonesia and not the native tongue of the parents.

¹ Upper-middle class in this thesis refers to "... wealthy social groups ... the common basis of their social power and position is increasingly capital, credentials and expertise rather than rent or position in the state apparatus or a feudal hierarchy ..." (Robison and Goodman 1996, 5). I also included a definition from Dick (1985, 74) who defined urban middle-class based on, among others, education, lifestyles and attitudes; and Geertz (1963, 35) who draw a correlation between metropolitan "superculture" and higher education and foreign language. With regard to the expenditure of upper-middle class, Pardede and Zahro (2018, 253) who obtained the data from the World Bank, stated that upper-middle individuals are those whose daily spending ranges between USD10 and USD20.

Participants of this study are Indonesian parents who grew up and were educated in Indonesia, and most raise their children in Indonesia. At home, these parents are eager to support their children's schooling by speaking English as much as they can to them. As the study will show, they speak to their children in a mixture of English and Indonesian from early on. Parents whose children are not yet of school age also speak English to them at home, believing that by doing so they help their children to have a sufficient level of language by the time their children enter school. For these children, their daily encounter with Indonesian outside school is generally limited to interaction with relatives and household staff (e.g., the maid, gardener and driver). As a result of this unbalanced exposure between English and Indonesian, these children become fluent in speaking, reading and writing in English, but have limited fluency in Indonesian. This creates a language barrier between them and the majority of society, for whom English is a foreign language. These children interact well with those of similar language background (i.e., proficiency in English and limited knowledge of Indonesian). Consequently, their interaction with other children educated in Indonesian is limited. Nevertheless, the fieldwork data show that most parents regard Indonesian as important and want their children to have some knowledge of this language. This is indicated for example in the way those parents code-switch between Indonesian and English when speaking to their children.

The opportunity for Indonesian parents to send Indonesian children to English language schools opened in 2003, following the enactment of Law No. 20/2003 regarding the National Education System. This law includes an article stipulating the use of foreign languages as a medium of instruction in Indonesian schools. Although international schools, in which a foreign language has always been the medium of instruction, were in existence prior to this law, attendance at such schools was restricted to foreign nationals only. The aim in prohibiting Indonesian citizens from attending such schools was to ensure that Indonesian children grow up proficient in the national language, Indonesian. In addition to Indonesian, regional² and foreign languages are also taught.

² The aim of the government has always been to unite the country, and to reach this aim the main language of instruction from kindergarten to higher education is Indonesian (Sneddon 2003, 205-207). However, to make it easy for children who are not yet fluent in Indonesian, previous laws concerning the national education system, which were Laws No. 4/1950 and No. 2/1989 and the current Law 20/2003, agreed to the use of regional languages as mediums of teaching in the first three years of primary school. A detailed discussion on laws regarding the national education system is provided in Chapter Four.

With the enactment of Law 20/2003, Indonesian parents who can afford the high tuition fee are now free to send their children to English language schools.

Parents who send their children to English language schools naturally want to ensure that their children progress well at school. One of the ways in which they support their children outside of school is to adopt English at home. Other than supporting their children's learning, speaking English at home also has an added value. In a country where the majority of the population does not speak English, using English is also a sign of prestige. English has been described as "the dominant universal language used in the global marketplace and the academic worlds" (Harper 2011, 516-518), and it is expected that people participating in the global workforce master English (Nunan 2003, 591). Awareness of the global position of English leads parents to view English language fluency as a ticket for their children to secure well-paid employment with international companies, with Indonesian seen as a less useful language outside Indonesia.

Parents who participated in this study were born in Indonesia between 1960 and 1980, spent their formative years in Indonesia, attended Indonesian schools and nearly all of them earned their tertiary qualifications from Indonesian universities. For these parents, there are many ways to support their children's English, such as sending them to private English tuition or sending them overseas to English language summer schools. Yet they also choose to integrate English at home, even though they may not have native-like fluency in English and the environment outside the home is Indonesian speaking. The challenge for these parents, then, is that they may not have the high level of competence in the English language that they aspire for their children. Thus, there is a mismatch between their own proficiency in the language they are modelling for their children and the level of language they want their children to achieve.

While it is true that most parents in Indonesia may share the view that fluency in English is crucial (Onishi 2010), as it can open up desirable employment opportunities, parents who grew up during the New Order (the period of government between 1966 and 1998) seem to hold this view particularly strongly. According to Bourdieu (1984, 1), someone's "cultural capital" is based on education and social origin. During the New Order, Indonesians who were able to speak and write fluently in English came

from families with high financial capital, and thus fluency in English already held a symbolic power for them. This is due to the fact that their own parents (who grew up before the New Order) already had sufficient “financial capital” and wanted them to be fluent in English, so many sent these children to private English lessons outside school hours.³

In order to understand the motivation of parents in present day Indonesia for speaking English to their children in the home, despite the fact that they have differing degrees of fluency in the language, I examine different language policies from the Dutch era (from 1908) to the present to gain an understanding of the impact these policies have on parents’ language attitudes. Reviewing language policies from these different eras is important, as it enables us to understand the main threads of habitus (Bourdieu 1979) that have developed over time. In particular, I focus on the language policies that were developed based on Law No. 4/1950, Law No. 2/1989 and Law No. 20/2003, all regarding the National Education System. Each of these policies nominates one language as the main language of instruction at schools. In the Dutch era, it was usual for native⁴ parents, especially for parents from a certain social class, to expect their children to be taught in Dutch, a language that was not the main language of the home. This was possible due to the Ethical Policy implemented by the Dutch colonial government, which enabled indigenous Indonesians to attend Dutch language schools.⁵

During the Japanese era (1942-1945), Indonesian was the language of instruction for Indonesians, a non-native language for most people at the time.⁶ After independence, when Indonesian was a second language to many parents⁷, sending their children to school meant that children might be taught in a language that was not their first language. The New Order period was the time when the promotion of Indonesian by the

³ This is partly due to the unsuccessful English program at schools during the New Order, which emphasised the teaching of grammar at the expense of fluency (Dardjowidjojo 2000, 26-7).

⁴ I alternately use the terms “indigenous” and “native” to refer to the Indonesian people during the pre-independent era who are not Dutch or from other Western backgrounds.

⁵ The Ethical Policy implemented by the Dutch colonial government aimed to improve the natives’ standard of living in the Dutch Indies, which involved, among others, providing education. I will discuss the Ethical Policy in Chapter Three.

⁶ Exceptions are for Indonesians coming from Malay speaking areas, in Sumatra, where Malay, of which Indonesian is a variety, is their native language. Although the language they spoke was not necessarily school Malay (High Malay), it is nevertheless similar to the Indonesian language.

⁷ Please see previous footnote.

New Order government, and the inculcation of the ideology associated with it, was most aggressive. The parents who took part in this study grew up during this period. Although they have some variety of Malay and/or a regional language (or languages) in their repertoire, the addition of Indonesian—another variety of Malay and the language of schooling—as the language in the home was a seamless process. Indonesian was promoted as a language of education, government and professional employment. The inculcation of ideology associated with Indonesian was so successful that for these participants, as for most Indonesians at the time, a good command of Indonesian was a requirement for good employment. For the parents of these participants, therefore, adopting Indonesian as a language in the home was a way of helping their children achieve that goal. Nowadays, sending children to English language schools means that children are taught in English, a foreign language for these parents. This tendency of viewing the school language as valuable capital is an example of what Bourdieu (1979) calls “habitus”, a concept that explains why certain mundane activities are conducted by individuals or groups of individuals without seemingly being formally regulated. I draw on this concept as the main conceptual orientation for this study, with the following questions guiding my inquiry:

1. Why do urban upper middle-class parents in Indonesia adopt English as the language of the home, despite the fact that it is not their first language and their surrounding environment is Indonesian-speaking?
2. Why does raising children in a non-native language seem like a normal practice for these parents?
3. Why do parents seem to have little attachment to the Indonesian language even though it is the language they grew up speaking and were educated in?

1.2. Conceptual framework

Bourdieu’s concept of “habitus” is relevant for this study, as the notion of habitus explains the “history” of individuals from childhood until the present time, seen from different aspects of life. I draw on this concept to explain why upper-middle class parents in Jakarta include English as the home language, despite the fact that English is not their first language. According to Bourdieu, habitus is inculcated during childhood and becomes part of an individual’s “capitals” (Bourdieu 2006, 47).

People navigate themselves in the social world, which Bourdieu called “the field”, using the capitals that they possess (Thomson 2008, 67). The more capitals one owns, the more flexible one is at navigating the field and the more “dominant” one also is in different types of fields. Conversely, the lesser capitals one owns, the less flexibly one is able to navigate the field and the more “dominated” one is in many fields. As habitus is learned from home, children whose parents have high capitals will more easily accumulate their own capitals. Capitals constitute “power” and “power relations” develop when individuals interact with each other.

Bourdieu’s theory will shed light on how the language policies in Indonesia are embraced by people and how these policies have created a habitus in which raising children in a non-native language seems like natural social practice. Bourdieu’s concept is also useful in understanding the power relations between the government (the “state”) that employs the educated elite (the “technocrats”) and the people. I draw on this concept to understand why Indonesians abided by the language policy during the New Order, even though the policy urged them to raise children in a language that was not their first language. The ideology, or “doxa” (Bourdieu and Eagleton 1994), of the technocrats is spread via the legal system and the mass media. This could be seen in the crucial role the television played in spreading the national language ideology during the New Order.

The discussion on language planning, language policy and language shift in this study (Hornberger 1994, Swartz 2013, Spolsky 2004, May 2007) shows how the ideology of language was disseminated by the elite on behalf of the state through language policy. Ideology is a concept of systematic ideas, culture, common sense and representation in the social world (Gal 1992). It connects identity and ideas of social groups, schooling, nation-state and law (Woolard 1998, 3) and is put into practice through citizens’ participation in a certain language community (Silverstein 1998, 420). In examining language use among upper-middle class families in Indonesia, it is therefore necessary to bear in mind the role of the aristocrats (*priyayi*) in pre-independent Indonesia, for it is through the power of this elite social class (Bourdieu and Passeron 1979, Robison 1996, Lev 1990, Siegel 2002, Dick 1985) and their bilingualism (Wright 2004, Grosjean 1982, Baker 2000) that the ideology of using school language in the home has influenced their language attitudes.

Across different periods, from the Dutch era to present day Indonesia, there have been shifts in the dominant language in school which influence the choice of home language in independent Indonesia. The term “language shift” is used in this study to refer to the shift, from one generation to another, in the choice of language in the home among the Indonesian upper-middle class. As Fishman states, the process of language shift within a society should be seen from both historical and contemporary perspective (Fishman 1991, 55). To locate the language shift before and after the Indonesian independence, spanning from the beginning of the 20th century until now, I use the work of Gal (1979) on the definition of language shift, as well as Romaine (1989) and Grosjean (1982) on different types of language shifts. Gal stated that there are bilingual societies in transition which experience language shift (Gal 1979, 1-2). I draw on Gal’s discussion to support my argument that the Indonesian upper-middle class societies have always been bilingual and in transition, from bilingualism of regional languages and Dutch, to Indonesian and regional languages and now to Indonesian and English. Romaine stated that there has been a global scale trend in which the world languages, such as English, create a shift in the language use (Romaine 1989, 38-39). I apply Romaine’s contention to my study to show that currently, English is also influencing a language shift in the home of upper-middle class Indonesians. Grosjean describes that one of the strongest motivations for a family to speak a certain language in the home is the emotional attachment towards the language (Grosjean 1982, 109-110). I use Grosjean’s idea to support my argument that parents use bilingual Indonesian and English in the home with an aim to, among others, maintain their children’s Indonesian, given that it is their first language and they thus have an emotional attachment to it. I draw on discussions from these scholars to gain an understanding of the change of home language in Indonesia from one generation to the next after independence. In particular, I discuss which language is considered the mother tongue (the first language) by people growing up before, during and after the New Order.

This study also discusses the impact of globalization on language policy and the rationale for the establishment of international and bilingual English-Indonesian schools in urban Indonesia. Globalization is a result of the connections between states in fields such as politics, economy and education (Waters 2001, 168-169, Lauder et al. 2006, 30-31, Papastephanou 2005, 534). In the education field, English language schools were

established outside English speaking countries (Mejía de 2002, 14) initially to cater for native English speaking children who followed their parents to live overseas, but later on accepted children from the local community. I use these scholars' work in my study to support my argument that the reasons parents enrol their children in English language schools is to ensure that their children can go to university and work not only in Indonesia, but also overseas. The work of Appadurai (1996), Higgins (2011) and Spencer and Wollman (Spencer and Wollman 2002) are used to discuss the hybrid natures of people in the 21st century. Appadurai states that people move between places and technology and that ideas move across state boundaries, which in his opinion is the extension of Benedict Anderson's "imagined communities", which creates hybridity (Appadurai 1996, 4, 8, 22, 33-37). Hybridity is fluid, as mixed identities change constantly (Spencer and Wollman 2002, 159-162), changes that can happen from acquiring a new language (Higgins 2011, 1, 2). Discussions by these scholars are used to understand the reasons why parents include English in the language of the home, enrol their children in English language schools and hope they work overseas.

1.3. Methodology

To address the research questions, a mixed qualitative and quantitative method is employed. As stated by Greene (2007, 98), the purpose of using a mixed quantitative and qualitative method is to gain a better understanding of the phenomena under the study. The mixed method was used as a triangulation, a research strategy to reduce the bias of a specific method (Greene 2007, 100). Triangulation involves gathering more than one type of evidence and more than one procedure to ensure accuracy (Johnstone 2000, 61-62). Triangulation involves using methods with different strengths and limitations to capture various aspects of the phenomenon under study (Greene 2007, 100). The aim is to gain a deeper understanding of the topic investigated by ensuring that every method supports a single conclusion (Maxwell 2013, 102-104). I pursue this by designing a questionnaire and collecting supporting data from audio/video recordings. The questionnaire provides the quantitative data, while the qualitative data is obtained from both the questionnaire and video/audio recordings. The recordings enable me to review the questionnaire results and cross-check for accuracy.

With regard to participant selection, I focused on Indonesian parents who grew up between the years 1960 and 1980. The reason for this was that these parents were raised during the New Order era, when schooling for Indonesians was conducted using the Indonesian language (Dardjowidjojo 1998, 36). Thus, their natural acquisition of the Indonesian language can be assumed. This is important because the purpose of this thesis is to understand the reasons why parents choose to speak a non-Indonesian language to their children. In view of this, the process of participant selection was based on “purposive sampling”, a method of sampling in which I, as the researcher, deliberately chose participants who could provide information “relevant to my questions and goals” (Maxwell 2013, 97) at a location I was familiar with. This purposive sampling strategy was chosen to enable maximal data collection within a relatively limited time (Johnstone 2000, 62). I limited the participants to parents who send their children to private English language schools and who speak English to their children at home. The child or children of each family were aged between 5 to 13 years old at the end of 2014, the year I conducted my fieldwork. The decision to limit the ages of the children was based on the consideration that bilingual children of these ages would have a sufficient spoken language ability to carry out elaborate and understandable enough conversations in every language they have been exposed to (Grosjean 1982). Also, children between these ages still spend much time doing activities with the whole family, particularly with parents. This eases the family gathering process for the purpose of data collection in this study.

I selected participants from Jakarta and its greater region, an area known as Jabodetabek, which includes the capital Jakarta and the surrounding urban areas of Bogor, Depok, Tangerang and Bekasi. Depok and Bogor are located on the southern border of Jakarta, while Tangerang is on the western border and Bekasi is on the eastern border. I chose this greater region, rather than limiting my fieldwork to only the city area, to maximize participant recruitment. Within the greater region of Jabodetabek, it is common for families to live in, for example, Tangerang or Depok, but work and send their children to schools in Jakarta. The inverse also often occurs, where families live in Jakarta, work in Tangerang and send their children to school in Bogor. Having been partly raised in Jakarta myself, I am familiar with the area and this has facilitated my fieldwork. As in Johnstone’s comment on one of her research students who conducted

fieldwork in her community, “It was wise to choose to do her work in a community in which she partly grew up”, as familiarity with the community is useful for one’s fieldwork (Johnstone 2000, 33).

The data collection for this study took place over a period of eleven months and was conducted both from Sydney and in Indonesia. The initial five months (the first stage of data collection) were devoted to remote data collection involving sending questionnaires from Sydney. In the following six months (i.e., the second stage) I collected audio/video data of parent-child interaction in Jakarta. Fifty-four participants responded to the questionnaire, consisting of three single mothers, fourteen couples and twenty-three people without their spouses. Seventeen couples agreed to participate in the video/audio data collection. The participating families consisted of either a father, a mother and a child or children, or single parents and a child or children. All participants were Indonesian citizens. The purpose of the questionnaire was to find out about language attitudes, while the video/audio recording was designed to enable me to cross check the questionnaire results.

The questionnaire consisted of three parts and was designed to gain insight into the participants’ language attitudes. Part I contained questions about the participants’ background, while Part II included questions about the participants’ views on the use of Indonesian in comparison to English. Part III was designed to assess how much the participants’ attitudes towards these languages influenced their decision regarding their children’s languages. In analysing the data collected through the questionnaire, I undertook a data reduction process, which involves, among others, summarising, coding, establishing themes and clusters (Miles and Huberman 1984, 21).

I recruited the participants through advertisement, circulated through social media (Facebook and blog), email and school networks. I employed the “snowball” technique, a technique that uses social networks to recruit participants (Milroy and Gordon 2003, 32) by requesting friends and families to put the advertisement on their social media accounts and to forward it to potential participants. I also asked friends and families whose children attended English speaking schools to put the advertisement in their children’s school. Once the participants were recruited, I sent them the research information sheet, consent form and the standardized questionnaire (see Appendix).

Standardized here means every participant received the same questions. So where the family consisted of two parents and a child or children, the father and mother answered two separate questionnaires. As Johnstone states, asking many people to answer the same questions provides a way of “approximating reliability and validity in qualitative research” (Johnstone 2000, 61). I use the “direct approach” technique in the questionnaire; that is, participants are asked questions about their opinions on the languages and to specify their language preference, thus explicitly showing their attitude towards the languages and the social phenomena around them (Garrett 2010, 39).

Following the questionnaire stage, I travelled to Indonesia for six months. During this time, I observed language use interaction within the families through audio/video recording. The purpose of the observation was to cross-check the written answers provided by parents in the questionnaire against the language(s) used in spontaneous family interactions. I focused on 17 families (involving 27 adults and 26 children) and recorded up to three videos/audio per family, with each recording varying between 5-20 minutes in length. A total of 32 video recordings, which were done mostly at home and in the family car, were collected. The recording was made using a smart phone owned by the parents and recorded by these parents themselves, or by another family member without my presence. This is similar to what Poplack (1980) did in her research when eliciting information from a close-knit community through an insider. Insider involvement was the most suited for my research, as the family interactions included children who were very young (i.e., aged between 5 to 13 years). Having their conversations recorded by familiar persons with familiar devices was less threatening and, therefore, the children’s speech and the family interaction would approximate their most natural form. As a researcher, it is possible that my presence would make the whole family more self-conscious, hence the advantage of using a recording, as I did not need to be there (Johnstone 2000, 105). The recordings were made during family times, such as in the car on the way to an activity or at home (e.g., while watching television or sitting together in the living room). Obtaining data from different settings at different times, as Johnstone (2000, 61) argues, is a way of ensuring validity and reliability of data. I subsequently checked my interpretation of the data with the participants. I use this “feedback system” (Johnstone 2000, 65) to ensure that my interpretation of what was said in the recording was correct. The data obtained from the video/audio

recordings show that while some parents speak only Indonesian or only English to their children, some others code-switched between the two languages. I discuss this situation in more detail in Chapter Six.

1.4. Significance of study

Several well-known scholars have conducted research on the Indonesian middle class. Robison (1996, 1998) contributed to the understanding of what constitutes the Indonesian middle class and how it differs from the middle class in Western countries. Van Leeuwen (1997, 2011) described the daily activities of the Jakarta middle class and provides an insight into the social attitudes of this social group. However, even though these scholars' discussions were about the educated middle class, they did not discuss the use of language in the home of the upper-middle class

There is an increasing body of literature on the role of English in Indonesian society, examined through the growing number of schools that use English as a teaching medium, the growing number of children that attend such schools and the use of English in different areas of Indonesian social life. A recent study by Tanu (2013) examines how Indonesian children growing up in different countries, and those who stay in one country but attend international schools, navigate their identity as “international” citizens. Tanu conducted her fieldwork at an international school in Jakarta. Her study affords an insight into the shared and different experiences of a transnational upbringing in which children are exposed to different cultures and languages. Tanu also describes the role of English at international schools and argues that being able to speak fluent English affects the way those children perceive themselves. Another study by Mayall (2010) provides an insight into how national plus schools (i.e., schools that use the Indonesian curriculum next to a foreign curriculum) in Jakarta implemented the National Education Policy and shows the impact of having such a school system on student enrolment in national schools. Mayall's study sheds light on some of the reasons why Indonesian parents send their children to such schools. I also discuss the major issues concerning the implementation of the National Language Policy, one of which is the unclearness surrounding the implementation of the policy in national plus schools. The studies by

Tanu and Mayall are relevant for this study in that they tell us about the impact of English language education on children. Nevertheless, education is not only about the children, the system and the educators but crucially involves parents, as they are the ones who make the decision about whether their children are to attend English language schools or not. Examining the parents' attitudes toward the English language and their aspirations for their children's future, therefore, fills the gap in our understanding of language policy in Indonesia and why English has become one of the languages of the home for many urban families.

There have been many studies on language policy in Indonesia. Anwar (1980) provides a detailed account of how the Indonesian language was cultivated and developed, showing how the Indonesian elites, through language policies, disseminated the national language within the society. Nababan (1991) examines the function of the Indonesian language in the education system and how it affects the use of regional languages, as well as English. His study shows how the education system contributes to bilingualism in Indonesian society. Although both Nababan and Anwar provide detailed accounts of how Indonesian developed into a national language and how it has become the first language of Indonesians, they did not discuss how the language policy was perceived by parents of the children who attended the education. By examining how the parents who grew up in the New Order interpret the policy, the present study contributes to an understanding of why English has become a language of the home for a growing number of families in urban Indonesia.

1.5. Organization of the chapters

This chapter introduces the study by pointing out that many upper-middle class parents speak English to their children in the home, even though English is not their first language and the children attend English language schools. Following this introductory chapter, in Chapter 2 I describe in more detail Bourdieu's concepts of habitus, field and capital, explaining how these concepts are applied in the fields of ideology, education, bilingualism and globalization. In Chapter 3, I show that the current habitus of sending children to schools that use the dominant language of the era began during the Dutch

colonial period and developed through an education system designed for the native elite. I discuss the effect of the Ethical Policy, in pre-independent Indonesia, on the native elite and their eagerness to be free from the colonial government. I show how the Dutch inculcated the native elites with their national language ideology through their education system. I discuss how the Dutch ideology was used by the elite to develop a sense of nationalism among themselves. Later, after Indonesia became an independent state in 1945, this sense of national unity among the elites became the reason behind the dissemination of the national language ideology in multilingual Indonesia.

Chapter 4 discusses theories of ideology and national language ideology. The aim of the chapter is to show the mechanism through which the educated elites in the government in independent Indonesia spread the Indonesian language throughout the country via language policy. This chapter explains how at the same time, the fast process of disseminating the language inculcated the view among the Indonesians that language is a tool for economic advancement. This chapter discusses the laws on the language of education, showing that there has been a shift in the focus of the language. The globalized 21st century, in which English has become the dominant language, led the educated elites to change the policy to include English as one of the languages of education by law, which allows Indonesian children to attend international and bilingual schools. Parents enrol their children in such schools to ensure that they can have a better education to participate in the globalized world. This shows that the policy stipulated by the educated elites in the government influences the parents' decision when choosing their children's education, which influences their choice of language in the home.

Chapter 5 analyses the fieldwork results, highlighting the language shift that has occurred in Indonesia. The aim of this chapter is to show how the implementation of Laws No. 4/1950, No. 2/1989, No. 20/2003 on the Education System changed the languages of the homes in urban Indonesia and created a pattern of language shift for every generation. The chapter provides an analysis of the data on languages used by the participants' parents when speaking to them at home and the language the participants consider as their mother tongue. This chapter also discusses the 1980 bilingualism survey conducted by the government on the use of Indonesian and regional languages to show that, like language shifts in general, the shift in the use of languages in the home is a gradual and continuing process.

In Chapter 6, I analyse code-switching in the family conversation data to show that most parents code-switch in a variety of ways. Analysing their code-switching provides an insight into their use of English and Indonesian. I draw on theories on globalization to analyse part of the data which show the parents expressing their wishes with regard to their children's higher education and work. In this chapter, I reiterate my argument that raising children in a non-native language is a habitus formed through the process of implementation of the laws on education and the promotion of the school language in different spheres of social life.

Finally, Chapter 7 provides a summary of the chapters and offers thoughts on how this research may support future studies in the field of language policy and language attitudes, particularly in Indonesia.

2. Theoretical framework

Overview

This chapter introduces the main theoretical concept applied in this study, namely “habitus” (Bourdieu 1977).⁸ Habitus is a concept that explains why certain mundane activities are conducted by individuals or groups of individuals, without seemingly being formally regulated. Habitus explains the inculcation of a certain tendency within a group, such as raising children in a non-native language⁹ among upper-middle class parents in Indonesia. Drawing on this notion will afford an insight into the process of the inculcation of English as a language in the home among 21st century urban Indonesians.

This chapter discusses the process of habitus, which starts from home and continues at school. I show how the ideology of the educated elite is disseminated in society through a systematic mechanism, namely, the education system. The inculcation of this habitus takes place across generations, such that it becomes second nature to the group. Habitus is dynamic and adapts to “fields” (Bourdieu 1990). Fields are places or locations where individuals live and engage in social activities. A person’s habitus would place her/him relative to the field s/he is interacting in. Her/his position in different fields depends on the amount of “capital” s/he holds (Bourdieu 1977). The more capital a person has, the easier for that person to move from one field to another.

Habitus is ubiquitous; it explains different aspects of social interaction. Bourdieu discusses habitus particularly in relation to areas such as education (Bourdieu and Passeron 1977), language and ideology (Bourdieu 1991), social class (Bourdieu 1984) and globalization (Bourdieu 2001). Taking habitus as the main theoretical concept for this study, I show how a particular ideology about language was disseminated by the educated elite within Indonesian society and how this educated elite was granted power

⁸ Other concepts drawn upon in this study such as nationalism, language shift and globalization will be discussed in Chapters Three to Six.

⁹ I use the term “non-native language” instead of “second language” because the fieldwork data show that many Indonesians who were parenting children between 1966 and 1980 had already acquired more than one language before learning the Indonesian language. Definitions of one language or more and code-switching are given in Chapters 3 and 6.

to run the state and stipulated regulations concerning language on behalf of the state.¹⁰ These regulations were then followed by Indonesian people and gradually developed into habitus.

The policy on the language of education during the New Order era (1966-1998) specified Indonesian as the language of instruction in schools.¹¹ Although many people spoke some form of Malay at the time, for most, Indonesian was basically a new language. The exception was people from the eastern parts of Sumatra, whose native language was Malay, the language that was later renamed Indonesian. In 1971, 41% of the total population spoke Indonesian, which then increased to 62% in 1980 and 83% in 1990 (Sneddon 2003, 200). In 2003, the government introduced a new language policy that allowed English to become the language of education in private schools (Hadisantosa 2010). Thus, like Indonesian before it, a new language of schooling was introduced and welcomed by middle-class parents; now, their children have the option of being enrolled in schools that use English as the teaching medium. In both cases, language policy was imposed by the government and through the process of subscribing to it, parents internalised the ideology of speaking a “new” language in the home. By doing so, they developed the habitus of including school language in the languages of the home and thus encouraging bilingualism among children¹².

2.1. Habitus

Bourdieu believed that to understand the social world, one should look not only to the empirical data of the present, but also the collective history that precedes it (Bourdieu 1998b, 2). It is important to know “what they learn, how they learn and what they do as a result of learning” (Nash 2003, 53), “they” here meaning “people”. Although

¹⁰ The inculcation process of English as the home language by parents in urban Indonesia requires analysis from different perspectives. Besides habitus, I draw on theories of language planning, language policy and language shift (Chapter Four), and bilingualism and code-switching (Chapter Six) to explain the language situation under study.

¹¹ Indonesia was the name given to the national language of the newly formed state. It originated from the High variety of Malay spoken in the Riau Johor area of the Malay Peninsula.

¹² For children who were already bilingual in Indonesian and a regional language, this was an additional (third language).

historical events do not determine the behaviour of agents, they can give some influences, because habitus and behaviour have the capacity to be affected by historical events around them (Bourdieu 2000, 148-149).

Although Bourdieu's habitus is very much inspired by Marx' theory on social class, Bourdieu disagreed with Marx regarding his view on the class division as "class-in-itself, class-for-itself" ideas. Marx views movement between classes as determinist, based on logical, mechanical necessity, or voluntarist, based on an "awakening of consciousness" (Bourdieu 1985, 726-727). In opposition to Marx's idea, Bourdieu developed a theory based on historical research and empirical sociology data, including statistical analysis (Garnham and Williams 1986, 117), to show the struggle of human actors to reach their economic objective (Bourdieu 1985, 727). The struggle occurs because a person's life strategy intermingles with those of others. Habitus describes the mechanism of human struggle to reach their economic goal in society. A person's struggle operates based on the logic of practice (Garnham and Williams 1986, 119-120).

Habitus is "a set of dispositions that leads agents to act and react in certain ways" (Thompson 1991, 12). Dispositions have four characteristics, namely, inculcation, structured, durable, and generative and transposable. Inculcation is a mundane process, which "molds the body" and makes certain behaviours and mindset "become second nature". The inculcation of habitus begins at home, before formal education (Bourdieu 1977, 217). As agents, young children imitate body language, for example, ways of standing, speech style and facial expressions of their parents and other people in the house to make themselves look and behave like adults. They listen to conversations on different issues and observe the attitudes of the adults around them (Bourdieu 1977, 89).

Dispositions are structured and durable. This means dispositions reflect the social conditions of the society in which they were acquired and cannot easily be changed (Thompson 1991, 12). Dispositions are historical products (Bourdieu 1977, 82, 85) structured by agents past and present, which are then utilized to structure their present and future practices (Maton 2008, 51). Habitus and its dispositions are not individual-based (Garnham and Williams 1986, 120). They involve interaction among agents. During the ingraining process, agents produce and reproduce dispositions by negotiating them with their environment to create a harmony of practice (Bourdieu 1977, 166-167).

Such harmony can be reached through confirmation from and reinforcement by other members and institutions (e.g., on language, myth and art). Thus, habitus functions, among others, to create unity of style of a class (Bourdieu 1998b, 8).

However, agents are unconscious of the fact that their tastes, actions and behaviours are guided by habitus. This is because the practice is a homogeneous and regular “mental process” (Grenfell 2012, 29) that creates “the logic of practice”, which has a common sense of its own. The homogeneity of practice is guided by the common code of the society the agents live in, which disposes them to act and think in a particular way (Bourdieu 1989, 17). The harmony of dispositions makes those from similar backgrounds have similar dispositions. Habitus and its dispositions is, thus, a method of categorizing and analysing dominant and subordinate groups in society (Reay 2004, 436).

Further, dispositions are generative and transposable, meaning they are “capable of generating a multiplicity of practices and perceptions in fields other than those in which they were originally acquired” (Thompson 1991, 13). Agents will be able to “perceive, classify and memorize” other experiences using the unintentional learning in other fields (Bourdieu 1986a, 172). Habitus, then, gives agents a “feel for the game”, a “practical sense”, because their bodies incorporate histories of dispositions. Agents follow the memory of their bodies when acting and reacting, for example, the language they use when getting angry, even though each circumstance is different. Habitus also classifies agents’ principles (Bourdieu 1998b, 8) “within individual bodies in the form of mental and corporeal schemata of perception, appreciation and action” (Wacquant 1992, 16) that enables agents to determine what is right and wrong, good and bad, distinguished and vulgar. However, the distinction between what is right and wrong, and other qualities, is arbitrary depending on each agent. For example, the same piece of art can be considered as cheap by an agent, creative by another or distinguished by someone else.

2.2. Field

Agents practice their habitus in a specific social context (Thompson 1991, 14), which is called the social space, with several dimensions, or the “field”, as Bourdieu named it (Thomson 2008, 67). Bourdieu’s social space is in opposition to Marx’s theory, as it takes into account relationships between agents, their social fields and symbolic struggles, unlike Marx’s, which ignores all these (Bourdieu 1985, 723). Also unlike Marx, Bourdieu deems that social classes exist only on paper (Bourdieu 1998b, 12-15). What exists in reality is a social space, the field. Within the social space, there are differences in the positions of individuals based on the capital they possess. When interacting with each other, individuals “occupy relative positions in a space of relations” (Bourdieu 1998b, 31). Invisible boundaries keep individuals with similar capitals within the same positions in the social space (Bourdieu 1998b, 15).

While habitus is an incorporated history within agents, field is an objectified history that consists of “historical relations between positions” (Wacquant 1992, 16), where agents utilize the practical sense and a “feel for the game” (Bourdieu 1990, 66). Besides providing a meaning and orientation—a feel for the game—inculcated within them through habitus, it also gives objective sense to anticipate what might happen in the future. To clarify the notion of field, Bourdieu analogizes it to a “game” (Bourdieu 1990, 80-82, Thomson 2008, 68-69). Like in a game, agents should know how to play the social game to be able to function properly within a society (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992, 98). Like in a game, where it is clear who becomes, for example, the goal keeper, the striker, the quarterbacks and other roles, and what each of them should do, their habitus and dispositions make agents know their positions in the social fields, whether they are dominant, subordinate, and so on (Bourdieu 1989, 19). Unlike the sports field with its written rules, the social field regulates itself semi autonomously through habitus. Agents’ and groups of agents’ habitus and “capital”, which will be discussed below, destine their position against other agents or group of agents within a social field (Bourdieu 1985, 724).

Further, agents do not live in a single field only. They move from one field to another. For example, an agent might have his/her home, office and music group as his/her fields. An agent will interact with other agents within the same or different fields. “The

rules of the game” of each field is different; for example, the rules of the home differ from the rules of the office; music group A does not have the same rules as those of music group B, and so on. This means that habitus works at an unconscious level, except in situations where agents are confronted with different rules of the game (Reay 2004, 438). In such situations, habitus begins to surface to consciousness and the agents question the rules they have been following. Therefore, a field is always the site of “symbolic struggles” (Bourdieu 1989, 20), where conflicts and competition are found (Wacquant 1992, 17).

2.3. Doxa

The rules of the game, the “practice”, has a logic that is different from the logician’s (Bourdieu 1990, 86). Practical logic is not rigorous or constant or mathematical (Bourdieu 1990, 102). As Rasmussen says, “The practical logic depends on the coherence and the ability of symbolic systems to instantaneously transform themselves to practical functions which have generated the symbolic systems” (Rasmussen 1981, 276). The logic of practice of an agent is based on history ingrained in habitus. Agents are not aware that their ways of behaving, their decisions, are based on the underlying experiences of the past (Bourdieu 1990, 92). This concept might be similar to concepts in the discussions of ideology and hegemony, as it basically states that “we can only think what our culture makes it possible for us to think” (Nash 1990, 443). However, Bourdieu prefers to use the term “doxa” to ideology (Bourdieu and Eagleton 1994).

Doxa refers to agents’ opinions about the social world they live in, which, according to them, is logical, natural and self-evident (Bourdieu 1977, 164). It is a taken-for-granted assumption, a “misrecognition” according to Bourdieu; that is, it is a fundamental belief where agents consider the practice as non-arbitrary and unquestioned (Bourdieu 2000, 15, Hardy 2008a, 120, Bourdieu 1977, 166): in short, it is a mental structure. The reinforcement by other members of the groups and legitimation by the institutions which hold the authority in, for example, language, myth and art, reinforce and affirm doxa (Bourdieu 1977, 167-169). Doxa is revealed when different cultures and classes are in contact with each other, and questions from opposite classes can destroy the taken-for-granted belief. Those who defend doxa are usually the dominant classes, as

doxa are developed by them and, thus, give privileges to them. Doxa contested by the less privileged create “orthodoxy”, a situation where the dominant group recognize the arbitrariness of doxa but nevertheless attempt to restore it. Opposing orthodoxy is “heterodoxy”, the competing belief inserted into the dominated class by the educated-but-non-dominant group (Hardy 2008a, 123).

2.4. Capital

Capital is not only economic capital, which is transparent in nature because of its material sense (Moore 2008, 103), but also two other fundamental types of capital, namely cultural and social capitals, with their own intrinsic values (Bourdieu 2006, 47). Bourdieu’s division of capital is intended to widen the narrow understanding of capital from merely tangible economic exchange to include anthropological and cultural transactions as well (Moore 2008, 102).

Cultural and social capitals are persistent and take time to be produced, accumulate and reproduce. Economic capital constitutes material wealth, such as property, money and shares (Thompson 1991, 14), and can be acquired instantaneously (Bourdieu 2006, 47). Cultural and social capitals, on the other hand, are considered as symbolic capitals, which in a longer run will guarantee economic profits, even though they are disavowed and misrecognized as not rooted in economic capital (Bourdieu 2006, 54, 1986b, 132). Symbolic capital is based on cognition and recognition (Bourdieu 1998b, 85). Bourdieu’s notion of capital is influenced by Marx; however, Marx did his research during the early development stage of capitalism at the beginning of the 20th century, and thus dichotomized the bourgeoisie and the proletariat based solely on economic capital (Moore 2008, 89). Bourdieu, on the other hand, did his research in the second half of the 20th century, where high-salary professionals and employment in European public sectors had emerged, and hence obscured the dichotomy between capital owners and workers. The development of the education sectors also contributes to Bourdieu’s view that capitals exist beyond economics alone. Critics state that Bourdieu has misunderstood Marx’s definition of capital, as Marx’s actually includes socio-historical relations and exploitation beyond the simple economics alone (Desan 2013, 336).

2.4.1. Symbolic capital

Cultural capital is divided into three states: embodied, objectified and institutionalized (Bourdieu 2006, 48). The embodied state of cultural capital, which is habitus, cannot be transmitted instantaneously, as it needs time to be inculcated. It is hereditary in nature, as it depends on the capitals the parents possess. For example, knowledge and skills acquired at home, then at school and higher education, depend on parents' cultural and economic capitals. This means the current possession of cultural capital is unequal from one agent to another, as it depends on the amount possessed by the previous generations (Moore 2008, 109). Further, cultural capital in its objectified state takes the form of cultural goods, such as pictures, books, machines and so forth (Bourdieu 2006, 47). Cultural goods can be acquired materially, like economic capital, and symbolically, like cultural capital (Bourdieu 2006, 50). For example, an agent who wants a book needs money to purchase it and needs the ability to read; or, if unable to read, s/he will have another person with reading skills put the book into usage. Such knowledge and skills acquired by agents "have the same biological limits as its bearers", unless they are objectified. This objectification is done through academic qualification granted by authorized bodies. The institutionalized state of cultural capital would free the agents from having to constantly prove their academic competence, as such institutionalization guarantees recognition (Bourdieu 2006, 51). This way, an agent could sell a service based on the academic qualifications they hold in exchange for money. Seeing the connection between family background and education, by itself, cultural needs, practices and preferences of agents also depend on one's education level and social upbringing (Bourdieu 1984, 1). Thus, Bourdieu deems formal education as the most important form of habitus, as it is an institutionalized capital (Moore 2008, 105) which will give access to economic capital (Garnham and Williams 1986, 124) and legitimize the social hierarchy and taste stratification (Moore 2004, 46). The individual histories of agents, together with capitals and habitus, is an endlessly transforming and fluctuating process with respect to agents' position in the field and structures of the field (Hardy 2008b, 132).

Next to economic and cultural capitals, possessing social capital would benefit agents as well. Social capital is a durable network which is "the product of investment strategies, individual or collective, consciously or unconsciously, aimed at establishing or

reproducing social relationships that are directly usable in the short or long term” (Bourdieu 2006, 52). The volume of social capital of each agent depends on how much economic and cultural capital s/he has in connection to the capitals her/his network possesses (Bourdieu 2006, 51). The aim of networking is to produce mutual knowledge and recognition between the networking members. This is developed through social institutions, such as families or aristocracy, and enhanced by continuous reproduction and exchanges of capitals, such as gifts and words. Membership into the group is limited based on the criteria fulfilled, as a new member might alter the whole definition of a family, clan or club (Bourdieu 2006, 52). As an example of the alteration, a school that accepts students with high marks will alter its definition when it starts accepting those with mediocre marks. Solidarity among members is developed by the profit they create from each other. However, this does not mean members are conscious that they are pursuing profits.

2.4.2. Symbolic power

The more capital an agent holds, the higher “symbolic power” s/he holds and the more dominant s/he is in the field. Like Marx, who used the term “ideology”, and Weber, who used the term “theodicies”, Bourdieu states that the function of symbolic systems is both as instruments of knowledge and instruments of domination (Wacquant 1992, 13). According to Bourdieu, symbolic power is not less powerful than physical force, as physical force alone is not enough to exercise power (Swartz 2013, 38). Agents holding a large amount of capital will be able to dominate those who hold less capital through “symbolic violence” (Bourdieu 1977, 190). Symbolic violence is an “unperceived form of violence ..., effective and efficient form of domination ...[as] the rules of the system provides [the dominant agents] ... privilege” (Schubert 2008, 184). Although agents from the dominated class might not tolerate the symbolic violence enacted towards them, they accept and agree to things more than the classes above them, because symbolic violence is spread through subtle and effective mechanisms and their habitus and doxa prevent them from fighting against it (Bourdieu and Eagleton 1994, 268-270, Bourdieu 2000, 170). In fact, symbolic domination is successful because agents comply with it, as they are unconscious that they are being dominated (Bourdieu 1991, 50-1). Submission of the dominated is not deliberate, as it is a combination between their habitus and the field they live in (Wacquant 1992, 24), and because the symbolic power

has turned into a general rule (Bourdieu 1998b, 143). This general rule is considered as legitimate (misrecognized, naturalized), is found in cultures and everyday practices leads to an unequal distribution of resources and centralized control of social order (symbolic violence) (Swartz 2013, 1, 4). Although Bourdieu's concepts of symbolic power, symbolic violence and linguistic capital are sometimes considered similar to ideology, Bourdieu avoided the word ideology because, according to him, it has been misused and abused (Bourdieu and Eagleton 1994, 265). In the present society, one of the examples of successful symbolic violence is what has been done by the state through the education system (Bourdieu 2000, 174), a topic discussed in the subsequent section below.

During the regular encounter between habitus and the field, agents can predict and adapt in advance the actions they should take and the consequences, based on identical or similar past conditions they have experienced (Bourdieu 1990, 62). However, such self-regulating mechanisms are disrupted if the field they encounter is too different from the one they adapted to in the past, a condition called "hysteresis" (Hardy 2008b, 134). Hysteresis is "one of the structural lag between opportunities and the dispositions to grasp them, which is the cause of missed opportunities" (Bourdieu 1977, 83). When hysteresis happens, new opportunities appear within the new field (Hardy 2008b, 148). However, agents endowed with high capitals are the ones who will be able to see new opportunities in the altered field structure, as they are equipped with enough dispositions and practices to recognize such (Hardy 2008b, 135).

Supporters of Bourdieu's theories view his contentions as uncovering the hidden truth and naïve understanding about daily social interaction of individuals, within the same and between different groups (Wacquant 1992, 3). In his fieldwork, Bourdieu observes the power relations between teachers and their students and the way people talk with others from the same groups and with those from different groups. His observation reveals the continuous struggle for domination and power relations between individuals. Bourdieu's way of connecting language use and identity helps to avoid the notion that identity is pre-given, as identities are formed through performing the language (Pennycook 2004, 17).

Meanwhile, those opposing Bourdieu view his theory as over deterministic (Hardy 2008b, 131), because it presents habitus-field-capital as a condition that dictates the behaviour of individuals and the whole society, as if there is no room for improvement for individuals (Yang 2014, 1523). However, Maton (2008, 48) argues that the concept of habitus has been “misunderstood, misused and hotly contested” and that “it remains anything but clear”. One of the reasons for such misunderstanding is the late appearance of the English translation of Bourdieu’s work, which only took place at the end of the 1970s and throughout the 1980s (Brubacker 1985, 745, 770). The slow translation process created a fragmentary understanding, which led to some “serious misreading of the theory” (Garnham and Williams 1986, 116). In addition, Bourdieu’s writing style tends to be misunderstood by readers not familiar with his work (DiMaggio 1979, 1466). Despite good quality translation, Bourdieu uses very long sentences with a lack of commas or semi colons, too many negations and paradoxes, phrases embedded in one another, inconsistency in terminologies and lack of definition for them (DiMaggio 1979, 1467). In this study, I use Bourdieu to show a certain habitus of raising children in the school language. Bourdieu’s theory supports my argument that the habitus of raising children in the school language is inculcated in the home and that the process of inculcation happens over several generations.

2.5. Ideology

This section explains how doxa, the view of the dominant, becomes the foundation of society within a state. It discusses the facts of state as the centre of all capitals, of individuals who turn into agents working for the interest of the state and of the juridical and journalistic fields, which are used as a means to promote the view of the state. Doxa is used as the foundation to explain the situation of juridical and journalistic fields in Indonesia. The doxa of the Indonesian educated elites on language of education were disseminated into the society through the language policy, which was aided by entrenched propaganda spread through the mass media. The doxa of the elites influenced Indonesian parents’ language choice when speaking with their children. I will discuss other scholars’ opinions on ideology in Chapter Four.

According to Bourdieu, when a state is constructed, it also develops a common history (Bourdieu 2000, 175). Such common history is developed through “common symbolic forms of thought, social frames of perception, understanding, or memory ... practical schemes of perception, appreciation and action”, which are, basically, the ingredients of habitus. Bourdieu’s contention is influenced by Durkheim, who stated that primitive societies applied forms of classification based on the embodiment of group members (Bourdieu 1994, 13, Durkheim 1984). This idea is elaborated by Bourdieu, who stated that the moulding of mental structures, through the inculcation of habitus, imposes common principle (the doxa) (Bourdieu 2000, 94, 1994, 7). This common principle becomes a custom, with the result that the society falls into “collective amnesia”. The dominated groups follow the custom, not because of “cultural messages or explicit discourses”, but because of taken-for-granted assumptions (Swartz 2013, 40). They forget that the doxa is formed by the dominant groups and that such doxa has only then turned into the general rule. This collective amnesia is the combination of habitus of the individual (individual history) and habitus of the group (collective history) (Bourdieu 1994, 14). The combination creates misrecognition on what is fair and unfair for them as the dominated groups. Submission of individuals towards the order of the state is the product of collective and individual histories in the bodies (dispositions), which make them view it as natural (Bourdieu 2000, 176). Such social reality constructed by the state is further produced, reproduced and imposed throughout the society (Bourdieu 1994, 13).

The state holds the monopoly to force and apply (symbolic) violence for disobedience (Bourdieu 2000, 168) through policy and regulations. Political order is formed by social order that is inculcated in individuals’ dispositions (Swartz 2013, 33). Bourdieu’s idea on symbolic violence shows that “persuasion, consent, choice, influence and negotiation” conducted by the dominant members of democratic states are as powerful as corporal punishments and threats done by authoritarian states (Swartz 2013, 42).

How is it possible for the state to have such universal power? According to Bourdieu, it is due to the concentration of different kinds of capital in the hands of the state (Bourdieu 1994, 4). The concentration of capitals in the state originated back to the era of kings and queens, a system that survives in the current model of nation-state (Wacquant 1993a, 41, Bourdieu 2004). The state has a monopoly over the army and the

police, that is, the capital of physical force, to prevent and curb threats from the outside and from within (Bourdieu 1994, 6). It means that physical violence is lawful only when it is conducted by the army and police. The state is also the centre of economic capital, as it holds the monopoly to collect taxes from the inhabitants. The income the state receives from tax is used to fund its informational capital, that is, to unify linguistics and juridical codes and homogenize communication by classifying them as bureaucracy, education and social rituals (Bourdieu 1994, 7).

The concentration of three capitals in the state leads it to hold the ultimate symbolic capital, in the sense that the individuals of the state recognize and give value to the act of the state (Bourdieu 1994, 8). Such recognition can be seen in, for example, the unquestioned acceptance of documents where the state puts signature and stamp (Bourdieu 1996, 376). The unification and homogenization of linguistics and juridical code turn them into a general rule, which then becomes the national culture and identity, developed at the same time as the invention of the state (Bourdieu 1994, 7). This national self-image is promoted by the education system where teachers teach the common history, civic duties and dominant language. However, facilities to acquire the national language and culture are accessible only to those with privilege, which excludes individuals from dominated groups. The decline of the regional cultures and languages, in combination with exclusive access to national culture, creates a monopoly of the dominant groups and the “mutilated humanity” of the dominated (Bourdieu 1994, 8). The dominated groups have a more restricted access unless they manage to acquire the national language and culture.

Public service, a devotion to the state, is an occupation that needs certain dispositions and skills, which are acquired through higher education (Bourdieu 1996, 379). The academic titles held by the top public servants are guaranteed by the state as the precondition to access such positions (Bourdieu 1996, 374). The top public servants are referred to by Bourdieu as the “state nobility”, the technocrats, widely known to be the chosen ones, who serve the state in the name of public service, although they actually serve their own interests just as much (Bourdieu 1996, 375). The technocrats make sure that they have monopoly “over various forms of legitimate appropriation of public goods” (Wacquant 1993a, 42). As technocrats accumulate economic and cultural capital simultaneously, within the social space they are located in between agents endowed in

cultural capital but poorly in economic capital (such as academics, teachers, artists) and agents very rich in economic capital but poor in cultural capital (such as corporate lawyers, bankers) (Wacquant 1993a, 23). Like noble titles, academic titles give privilege to the holders (Bourdieu 1996, 374). Unlike noble titles, however, academic titles do not constitute property that can be inherited from their ancestors. Therefore, the future technocrats need to acquire technical competence before the titles are bestowed upon them by the state. The academic title is accepted by the public, that is, in everyone's understanding including the bearer himself, as carrying rights and responsibilities (Bourdieu 1996, 377).

To exercise its power, the state, through its public service, especially the technocrats, should legitimate itself by justifying its actions (Bourdieu 1996, 382). For power to be largely accepted, it "must be known and recognized for what it is not" (Bourdieu 1996, 383). Acts of legitimation from technocrats should appear that they are conducted for universal cause, authentic, sincere and "disinterested". From the technocrats' perspective themselves, since they have been told that they are "the chosen ones", probably since they were children, and then continuously when they are at school and at higher education, they do believe themselves as the "necessary agents of necessary policy" (Bourdieu 1996, 383). The "power of suggestion"—that is, to tell them what they are instead of telling them what they must do—leads the future technocrats to become durably what they have to be (Bourdieu 1991, 52). It is an effective way to inculcate the habitus of symbolic power, as when adults, they will continue to operate as such. Such a system of self-belief goes back to the genesis of kingdoms during the beginning of the dynastic era, where the king himself believed he was the king "because the others believe (to some extent) that he is king, each having to reckon with the fact that the others reckon with the fact that he is king" (Bourdieu 2004, 19). Thus, the habitus leads the technocrats to "misrecognize" their action as legitimate. No matter how unfair it is for the dominated group, they keep on believing that it is carried out for the good of the state. An example of technocrats (the educated elite) during early Indonesian independence is the engineers of the Indonesian language. The Indonesian language was yet to be developed when Indonesia won its independence in 1945, and so the state employed some experts in language to develop Indonesian. These experts worked hard in cultivating the Indonesian language in every way. They believed that their work for the state was genuinely for the good of the country and that they were eager to make

everyone speak Indonesian in no time. This effort and goal were imposed with the spirit to unify Indonesia, despite the fact that citizens of the new country were in fact told to acquire a completely new language, with the consequence that their native languages would be seen as less important.

The dominated agents must not realize that they are being forced to follow rules that are advantageous for the technocrats. This way, the dominated groups misrecognize the technocrats' actions as having a goal "for the greater good", even though the policy or constitution might actually give the dominated groups disadvantages, such that the technocrats' acts of legitimation are highly accepted by the dominated group. This is because the symbolic efficacy is high, due to the disappearance of symbolic interests of the technocrats. Symbolic efficacy is granted by the dominated when they trust the technocrats. Such trust arises because of the capitals they own, that is, the certificate of education from reputable higher education (cultural capital), networks (symbolic capital), and accumulated due to social inheritance (economic capital). The misrecognition regarding technocrats' actions leads the dominated groups to misrecognize their obedience as conduct based on their own choice. For example, the Indonesian Constitution states that the Indonesian language is the language of the school, and the Law stipulates that Indonesian is the official language used by public servants (symbolic power).

During the New Order era, this stipulation gave more advantage to children who lived in urban areas, as schools in those areas were equipped with teachers who possessed good command of Indonesian and good access to books. Thus, the ones who could apply to become public servants were those who had access to such schools. Such symbolic power turned into symbolic violence in daily practices (social interaction), as only those who came from families with enough capitals would be able to afford to equip their children with enough Indonesian language capability. Yet in this case, symbolic violence was misrecognized as a legitimate general rule, because it was disguised by the power the state gives to policy and regulation (the authority). Those language experts had the networks (symbolic capital) to lobby for Indonesian to be granted the status as the official language, instated in the Constitution and made into a compulsory language in the education system from at all levels of education.

2.6. Education

Bourdieu had a major concern for the education system (Wacquant 1993b, 2). He considers school as the very means to produce and reproduce social stratification in present-day states. According to Bourdieu, the notion that education liberates and increases social mobility of the students is, in fact, a myth (Bourdieu 1974b, 33). The limited number of success stories of those coming from an underprivileged background enhances the myth of success based on hard work and gift alone, while according to Bourdieu, success at school is actually based on social heritage. Education is not neutral, as its function is to legitimize and spread the culture of the dominant class (Desan 2013, 323, Zanten 2005, 672). Bourdieu does not believe that the school system is established for the “common good” or on moral grounds (Zanten 2005, 677).

2.6.1. Early education at home

Although Bourdieu’s writing is based on his research on the French education system, his ideas are relevant to systems in other countries as well (DiMaggio 1979, 1463). Bourdieu views families as corporate bodies, whose main purpose is to sustain their social being, by reproducing through fertility, marriage, succession, economy and education (Bourdieu 1998b, 19). Since World War II, families have the tendency to invest more in their children’s education, due to their belief that education is the means to increase economic capital. As part of this, to help their children educated middle class parents familiarize them with the school culture from home. For example, parents provide books for their young children, speak the school language with the children and so forth, with the conscious or unconscious aim of preparing them for school.

Bourdieu deems such home inculcation as primary pedagogic work, which starts before formal schooling. The pedagogic work from home equips middle-class children with the expected behaviour, attitude and language of the education system. These lead children to feel at ease at school, blend smoothly within the school system and achieve good results at school. Since parents’ pedagogic work done at home is part of embodied capital (Bourdieu 2006), that is, without a proof of certificate or any legitimate evidence, the school teachers often mistake their students’ aptitude as a natural gift. This is actually a social gift inherited from their parents, which functions as the

foundation of children's ability to assimilate with the culture and education at school (Bourdieu and Passeron 1977, 43). Early inculcation performed by the family, and continued by the education at school, gives a deeper and more durable disposition in comparison to belated and mere methodical learning (Bourdieu 1984, 66). The early inculcation creates self-certainty and ease, a dual title to cultural nobility (Bourdieu 1984, 81). This gives a touch of excellence, showing children's possession of the culture. Here, the habitus provides a clear connection between the centrality of family resources and the differentiation of education outcomes (Nash 1990, 446).

2.6.2. Education at school

Bourdieu classifies two types of inculcation conducted by the education system (Bourdieu and Passeron 1977, 44). One is to substitute or convert one habitus for another, and the other, to maintain and reinforce the primary habitus. Although some critics maintain that Bourdieu's work on education pictures it as having passive roles, such classification shows otherwise (Nash 1990, 435). Bourdieu does believe that school has an active and powerful role over and above the pedagogic work inculcated by the family. An example of substituting one habitus for another can be seen in the education system during the New Order regime. Back then, the school language was Indonesian, the lingua franca of the nation. As mentioned above, the government encouraged parents to speak Indonesian at home with their children, although Indonesian was not the first language of many parents. The intense propaganda by the government turned raising children in a non-native language into a primary habitus of the parents during that era. Maintenance and enforcement of such primary habitus are further conducted through the Law on Education in 2003, in which English is allowed to be used as the teaching medium at private schools. As will be discussed in Chapters Five and Six, nowadays urban parents who received their education during the New Order regime enrol their children in such schools and maintain the habitus inculcated by their own parents, which is to speak the language of the school at home to support their children's education.

Education is a transposable disposition (Bourdieu 1984, 28). This means that agents acquire the legitimate culture at home and school, together with the cognitive ability to perceive and evaluate such culture and later on to apply it to general life. This can

be seen from the dispositions inculcated by parents within their children during the New Order regime, that is, to speak in a non-native language at home. This is then transposed by the current parents (the participants of this study, who were children during the New Order) by speaking another non-native language to their own children. These parents unconsciously evaluated the education they received at home and at school during the New Order, where the language policy encouraged the inculcation of the Indonesian language. They then adapt it into the current situation and inculcate the English language at home.

Further, the systematic style of schooling in an education system gives the impression that schooling is a necessity, as one can distinguish between the tangled thought of uneducated agents and the cultured way of thinking of those who have gone through formal schooling (Bourdieu 1974b). This understanding of the necessity of education leads agents to accept and follow the education system. The reason for such understanding, the *doxa*, goes back to the early stage of a nation. In the early formation of a state, the government is run by technocrats who come from privileged classes, and these technocrats build the state based on their values. Those who write the law and regulations do it to promote the values of the state, which are basically the values of the privileged classes (Bourdieu 1998b, 39). Technocrats who come from working class families—in Indonesia, for example, the former president, Suharto, who rose to the elite class through his military career—promote the value of the privileged classes as well. This is because Suharto and those from working class backgrounds who were accepted to join the elite and experience the advantages of becoming part of the dominant group were those who survived the elimination process. Referring to Hegel, Bourdieu states that “those who serve the state also serve their own individual interest under the pretext of serving the universal” (Bourdieu 1998b, 144). The state unifies the culture through its law, regulation and education so as to create the national identity and self-image, which is accompanied by legitimizing a dominant language and culture (Bourdieu 1998b, 45-46).

However, such universalization of language and culture is not accessible to all, which then creates a monopoly by the privileged classes (Bourdieu 1998b, 47) and “profits of distinction” (Bourdieu 1984, 562). This creates an arbitrariness to the education system, as it is based on the culture of the privileged (Bourdieu 1974b). The design

of the education system excludes children from working class and cultural minorities (Nash 1990, 440). Even though, for example, in Indonesia free primary education has enabled children from a working-class background to receive education, most of those children are not equipped with the culture of the dominant. This is due to the fact that children from those groups do not possess the means to acquire the dominant culture, simply because it is not their culture (Desan 2013, 323). Such exclusion is connected to the fact that the success of an education system depends on the accomplishment of parents' pedagogic work towards their children at home (Bourdieu and Passeron 1977, 43). This is crucial, as the closer the pedagogic work or the cultural arbitrariness of parents resembles the cultural arbitrariness of the school, the more effective the teaching-learning process will be (Nash 1990, 435). However, the connection between the importance of the pedagogic work at home and the pedagogic work at school is made implicit in order to make sure that the dominated class complies (Grenfell 2008, 159). For example, during the New Order regime, parents inculcated the Indonesian language within their children's habitus to resemble schools' pedagogic work as a compliance to the language policy of the time.

Furthermore, an education system is based on national characteristics and history of a nation (Bourdieu 1971, 201). This shows that social and mental structures, the doxa, are important parts of political functions (Wacquant 1992, 13). After all, one of the major powers of the state is to "produce and impose categories of thought that we spontaneously apply to all things of the social world" through the education system (Bourdieu 1998b, 35). The schooling process of an education system provides a certain pattern of thoughts, which is more than a reference map, as what has been learned is used as an itinerary for students throughout his/her life, misrecognized as freedom (Bourdieu 1971, 196). The complex features of content and spirit of the education system are capable of moulding the minds of agents (Bourdieu 1971, 204). Obvious similarity of thought is found among the educated class of a nation, as the longer an agent spends time at school, the more deeply inculcated the habitus of the education system is within him/her. It is no surprise that the hidden effects of the education system is the ennoblement of the agents who hold institutionalized cultural capital and, at the same time, the stigmatization of those who lack this capital (Bourdieu 1984, 23-24). A high educational capital creates high self-esteem and high

ambition so as to embrace the struggle in the competitive market (Bourdieu 1984, 564). Nowadays, parents in urban Jakarta send their children to schools that use English as the teaching medium and implement a curriculum from developed countries, so that these children can attend higher education overseas. Certificates from such schools will ennoble the children and develop their self-esteem, so as to achieve the ambition to study overseas and secure high paying jobs. This will be discussed further in the analysis of the data in Chapters Five and Six.

2.7. Bilingualism

Opinions by scholars other than Bourdieu on bilingualism are discussed in Chapter Five; here, I focus on Bourdieu's views only. An education system, after obtaining recognition from the authority through policies on education (Bourdieu and Passeron 1977, 124), has the monopoly to produce producers and consumers of language. This makes the position it gives to certain languages an important issue (Bourdieu 1991, 57). Monopoly by an authorized institution turns school language into a symbolic capital (Bourdieu 1991, 37). In this view, as education is part of cultural capital and in itself habitus, it produces, reproduces, separates and distances agents between social classes (Bourdieu 1996, 3, 5). It thereby plays an important role in the "struggle for the monopoly on dominant positions" and the institution of the "social border" (Bourdieu 1998b, 21).

The language of the school is, most of the time, the official language of the state. The state gives directives on how to carry the language in a proper way (Bourdieu 1991, 45-46). Through school, the official language is socialized (Bourdieu 1991, 48), and school literature is written based on the style deemed by the state. Usage of appropriate language, that is, by following the correct rules of the game, shows social differences between individuals within and outside the education sphere (Bourdieu 1991, 54). This is because children begin their schooling with the language they receive at home, bringing the style of their home language (Bourdieu 1974a, 338-339). If the language of home is different from the school language, children will become bilingual once they start learning the school language. As mentioned above, middle-class parents, who are mostly educated, provide access to the school language through different means, such as

by speaking and reading to the children, or gathering with people who possess the same level of language, which turns the school language into their own culture (Bourdieu 1974a, 347). The number of vocabularies developed by children from home, and continued at school, provides them with the ability to analyse complex structures, both in logical and aesthetic ways (Bourdieu and Passeron 1977, 73). The long process of language inculcation by the parents and school teachers creates a huge opportunity for the students to perform in the linguistic markets (Bourdieu 1991, 51). The standardized education system creates a single market for agents to convert their cultural capital into monetary gain (Bourdieu 1977, 187).

The education policy does not necessarily need to give corporal punishment to parents for not abiding by the recommendation, for example, to speak the school language to the children. This is due to the fact that the sanction is in the form of symbolic violence. As stated by Bourdieu, “the soft approach may be the only effective way of exercising the power of symbolic violence in a determinate state of the power relations, and of variably tolerant dispositions towards the explicit, crude manifestation of arbitrariness” (Bourdieu and Passeron 1977, 17). This is similar to what happened in France, as described by Bourdieu. Parents speak French to their children, even though their first language was not French, to increase their value in the job market (Bourdieu 1991, 49). The understanding of the existence of such symbolic violence is inscribed within disposition through a long and slow process of education (Bourdieu 1991, 51). Agents obey because the sanctions are found in the linguistic market, which show that if they do not comply, their children will not have enough capital in the field. The style of the language shows the social condition of the acquisition of the language and how it has been used (Bourdieu and Passeron 1977, 116, 119). This is why parents begin the pedagogic works of language inculcation at home for familiarization, to fulfil the demand of the school and higher education. Compliance with the domination of the school system means increasing the chance to gain economic and symbolic capitals. In a nutshell, the silence and persistence of such symbolic violence through education is powerful and hard to resist, as agents’ habitus and doxa aid them to comply (Bourdieu and Eagleton 1994). This is due to the “status the position (the education system) assigns, the qualification

it awards and the social positions to which the latter give access” (Bourdieu 1984, 26). This creates early bilingualism in children, which is then developed throughout the education years.

2.8. Globalization

Discussion on globalization by scholars other than Bourdieu is presented in Chapter Six; here, I focus on Bourdieu’s views only. Parents and children nowadays live in a globalized world where people compete internationally in the job market. Bourdieu equates globalization with the state. According to him, the state unifies and integrates the economic space through its politics in order to increase internal and external commerce (Bourdieu 2001, 1). Unification and integration brings the concentration of power and monopolization, which is centralized on the state. This means that integration and control within the territory is the condition of domination. Such condition is realized because the social agents, which are in social relations with each other, are not equally prepared culturally or economically to enter the economic game. Bourdieu argues that unification profits the strongest states, and he views globalization as the extension of the state. Throughout most of the 20th century, the national boundaries and geographies limited the circulation of goods and persons (Bourdieu 2001, 2), but developments in technology weakened such limitation at the end of the 20th century.

Bourdieu states that globalization has two different meanings. First, it can be seen as the unification or extension of the economic field to the global scale. Second, it can mean neo-liberal politics, that is, “economic political efforts to unify the economic field through legal-political measures by beating all the obstacles which are mostly linked to the nation-state” (Bourdieu 2001, 2). It is planned politics for the creation of domination over the agents and enterprises that used to be protected by their national boundaries. Such a reality has been disguised by utopian capitalism, which states that globalization is the destiny for universal liberation, which is the end process of natural evolution and civic ethical ideal, where democracy and the market will emancipate politics and the people in every country (Bourdieu 2001, 3). Bourdieu further states that the dominant

economy, the United States, holds several advantages with this idea of globalization, advantages in the fields of finance, economics, politics, the military, culture and linguistics, as well as symbolically through the universal use of English.

In Indonesia, upper-middle class citizens own the capitals to provide their children with international education. Access to English speaking schools opens up chances for urban upper-middle class parents to raise children as cosmopolitans. As they occupy the thin layer of the upper society in Indonesia, their option to increase their children's economic and social capital is by pursuing higher education aimed at subsequently working overseas. This will enable them to increase the opportunity to gain capitals as individuals outside Indonesia.

Closing Remarks

Habitus is a concept to explain why certain mundane activities are conducted by individuals or groups of individuals, without seemingly being formally regulated. Habitus is dynamic and adapts to fields, which are places and locations where individuals live and do activities. His/her habitus would place him/her relatively to the fields s/he is interacting in. His/her position in different fields, whether it is in dominant or dominated positions, depends on the amount of capital s/he holds. The more capital a person has, the more often s/he is in a dominant position. The concept of habitus is relevant to many aspects of living, its ubiquitous nature including the field of ideology, education, bilingualism and globalization.

This study investigates parents' language history by tracing it back to the previous generations until the beginning of the 20th century. Bourdieu's theory is drawn here as the overarching framework for analysing the thread of language shifts from pre-independent to 21st century Indonesia from the perspectives of the elite class, multilingualism, language planning and language policy and globalization.

3. The elite class and prestige school language

Overview

This chapter explains how the education system provided by the Dutch colonial government for the elite class at the beginning of the 20th century became a mechanism for disseminating the Dutch language and the national language ideology of Europe to the Dutch-Indies. The Dutch schools for indigenous Indonesians used Dutch as the medium of instruction and created a Dutch-speaking community within the indigenous community.¹³ The Dutch education system gave access to the idea of a national language, an ideology from Europe that spread like fire throughout the archipelago during the first few decades of the 20th century. The aim of this chapter is to show that the inculcation of the habitus of sending children to schools that use a language considered high prestige (the dominant language) began during the colonial period through the education system for the native elite. Parents of the native elite, the *priyayi*, who were part of a social class consisting of aristocrats and high ranking officials (Van Niel 1970, 50-51), had access to send their children to the Dutch language schools. This situation provides a good example supporting Bourdieu's argument that education is the source of inequality in society, reproducing social stratification (Bourdieu 1974b). The Ethical Policy introduced by the Dutch was meant for, among others, educating the indigenous people in order that they could be employed later as civil servants.

Elite indigenous people received their European education in the Dutch language, while the rest of the society followed traditional education taught in regional languages. This constitutes the idea of how language policy sustains what Bourdieu calls the dominant-dominated positions in society. By pointing out the elitism of the Ethical Policy, I aim to show that the thread of elitism in the education system could be seen to be already operating in pre-independent Indonesia.¹⁴ Fluency in the school

¹³ As stated in Chapter One, I alternately use the term "indigenous" people and "native" people to refer to the Indonesian people during the pre-independent era, who are not Dutch or not having Western background. Educated indigenous people are those educated by the Dutch colonial government, who mostly came from the *priyayi* class.

¹⁴ Pre-independent here means the 20th century during the Dutch and the Japanese occupations.

language, which was Dutch during the colonial era, was a prerequisite for a successful education journey, and success in this journey was an aid for the speakers' social advancement. Along with the idea of prestige language, the concepts of nation and nationalism spread from Europe to its colonies, including the Dutch-Indies. The education received by the native elite through the Ethical Policy also provided them with access to learn about Western nationalism and instilled in them a sense of their own nationalism. The ideology that a single common language is a crucial element of nationalism (May 2007) led the native elite to begin thinking about having their own common language to unite the different ethnic groups in the archipelago. In 1928, the decision was made to install the high variety of Malay, renamed Indonesian, as the national language. The elites' choice of Indonesian was in spite of the dominance of the Dutch language at that time, which was the language spoken among themselves and the language used by the Dutch schools and the colonial government. Although elites spoke regional languages as well, Dutch and Malay were the languages that brought the young elites together in promoting nationalism.

This chapter further discusses language policy during the Japanese occupation from 1942 to 1945. In this period, the Dutch language was completely banned by the Japanese. Instead, the Japanese promoted the use of Indonesian language for war propaganda, because they saw it as impossible for the natives to master Japanese within a short period of time. As a consequence, this turned the brief Japanese occupation into an era of rapid development of Indonesian. Thus, what began in 1928 with the declaration of a national language gradually led to the inadvertent promotion of Indonesian language by a foreign power. Later, following the declaration of independence in 1945, Indonesian was instated within the Constitution as the unifying language of the new nation.¹⁵

Further, I describe the languages spoken among the native elite households to show that multilingualism among the native elite, involving two or more regional

¹⁵ I refer to Indonesian independence as 1945 because this is the time when activities related to Indonesian language planning began to accelerate. In reality, Indonesia did not gain its full independence until 1950. Following the 1945 declaration, the Dutch launched multiple military attacks in an attempt to reoccupy the territory. Their occupation ended in 1949 following the Dutch-Indonesia roundtable conference held in The Hague and subsequent acknowledgment by the international community of Indonesia's independence.

languages, shifted to include Dutch language as well upon the promulgation of the Ethical Policy. I argue that Dutch became a part of the *priyayi*'s linguistic repertoire due to its use as the teaching medium at school. The *priyayi* remained multilinguals, but Dutch became the most dominant language used in official settings, such as school and government workplaces.

In this chapter, I also discuss the implication of the worldview of Western educated young elite, which shifted from that influenced by the traditional cosmic-syncretic ideology to a secular-rational mindset influenced by Western education. Discussion on this worldview and languages spoken by these young elite in pre-independent Indonesia is relevant, as the young elite were the people who later became technocrats in independent Indonesia and imposed their ideology and interests on the masses. Even though the multilingual *priyayi* promoted the use of Indonesian as the language that would unite the country, they used Dutch among themselves when planning the nationalist movement.

3.1. Ethical policy and the national language

3.1.1. Ethical policy for the native elite

This section discusses the Ethical Policy, a policy implemented by the Dutch to enable the native elites to be educated in Dutch schools. The aim of this discussion is to show the transformation in the worldview of the native elite from a traditional to a Western worldview. The inculcation of Western education was successful due, among others, to the native elite being already equipped with high level traditional cultural capital, which enabled them to adapt to the Dutch schooling system smoothly.

According to Hobsbawm, 19th century European society treated non-Europeans as inferior, backward and in need of being converted to adopt European values (Hobsbawm 1987, 79). Irvine and Gal, in their account of language ideology, identify three semiotic processes that were used by the Europeans to build ideological representation of linguistic differences, namely iconization, fractal recursivity and erasure (Irvine and Gal 2000, 37-38). Iconization is the way a certain group uses the

language, which is seen as iconic and considered as identities of the speakers. Fractal recursivity is the effect of iconization, that is, “othering” anyone with different language identities. Erasure is the process of maintaining the otherness from one group to another. Irvine and Gal mention that these processes were initially employed by the colonial linguists. Through cases of language differences in southern Africa, Senegal and Macedonia, Irvine and Gal show that through iconization, colonial linguists determine the linguistic features of a language. Iconization then aided observers to see that there were also differences within one language itself, which created subcategories called fractal recursivity. As the linguists examined the language through the western perspective, they simplified the incomprehensible social and historical aspects of non-European language through the process of erasure. These semiotic processes were based on the 19th century “science of language”, which believed that language is nature and not directed by the will of man (Irvine and Gal 2000, 73-74). This view led to a perception among Westerners that they were better than people in the rest of the world.

Colonialism and imperialism spread around the world during the 19th century and created a single global economy, as people, money and goods circulated and linked many countries, whether developed or underdeveloped (Hobsbawm 1987, 62). Merchant shipping and railways connected the developed nations with remote areas in underdeveloped and dependent territories. The single global economy was not in favour of the natives in the dependent territories, whose peoples were unfamiliar with capitalism, and this prevented them from being able to participate in white capitalist culture. The colonizers used the native’s difficulty in understanding capitalist culture as an excuse to hire them as cheap labour (Hobsbawm 1987, 65). In the Dutch Indies, occupational categories were controlled by the Dutch, and discrimination based on scale of salary and positions between the Dutch and the natives was obvious (Kartodirdjo 1984, 125).

The Dutch colonized the Indonesian archipelago for nearly one and half centuries. The Dutch originally came to trade in spices naturally grown in the archipelago and established the Dutch East Indies Company for trading purposes (De Jong 2002, 7). The inability of the Dutch East Indies Company to compete with the English East India Company and the war between the Dutch Republic and England forced the Dutch East

Indies Company to declare bankruptcy in 1796. The Dutch government took over the company's assets, and the colony of the Dutch-Indies was born in 1816 (Van der Veur 1969, 1). Expansion of the territory was gradual. It began on Java island and completed in Aceh in the northern part of Sumatra in the 1930s (De Jong 2002, 9). During the Dutch occupation, the aim was to exploit the Dutch-Indies, among others, through the Culture System in Java in 1830, where the Dutch considered the whole of Java as their possession and forced the indigenous people to work long hours doing hard labour with poor pay for the benefit of Dutch government (De Jong 2002, 8). The profit went to the Dutch treasury. The monopoly of the Dutch government on the trading of goods (e.g., spices, sugar) encouraged abuse in the Dutch-Indies, and only a small fraction of the profit was used to improve the welfare of the people in the Indies.

In the Dutch-Indies, Western education during the first half of the 19th century was only for the children of Europeans, indigenous people of Christian background and soldiers (Van der Wal 1963, XVIII). In the 19th century, the Fundamental Law of 1818 prescribed education for the indigenous people, with the aim of introducing secular subjects in Muslim religious schools and allowing native children to attend Dutch schools. After 1848, the Dutch government set aside a budget to establish primary schools for the natives in Java, and also schools to train indigenous teachers. At the end of the 19th century, the Dutch made it possible for children of native aristocrats and wealthy families to be educated in the Dutch schools; throughout the first few decades of the 20th century, the number of natives who received Dutch education increased (Alisjahbana 1976, 36-37; Alisjahbana 1986, 43).

The Ethical Policy was officially introduced in 1901 (De Jong 2002, 10). The aim was to develop the country according to the Western model and to unify the entire archipelago under the Dutch dominion. The policy was also intended to improve the standard of living of the indigenous people through internal migration, education, agriculture and industry. The Ethical policy was meant to bring the native aristocrats, who in the 19th century rejected the western ideology on freedom, civilization, culture and prosperity, into agreeing to such. In the Dutch-Indies, 98% of Javanese people belonged to the common class, who worked in the rice fields and lived in villages and towns (Van Niel 1970, 16). The thin layer of the native elite (the *priyayi*) provided the intellectual, cultural and cosmological basis of the native society (Van Niel 1970, 23).

The proud aristocracy refused Western education, because they deemed the native media, for example music and dance, which were integrated in daily life and ritual rather than being merely performance, as sufficient education (Embree, Simon, and Mumford 1934, 37, 40-41). However, not long after the enforcement of the Ethical Policy, Dutch education was seen as a symbol of high status, as it opened up the possibility to move upward in the social ladder (Kartodirdjo 1984, 125). From the Dutch perspective, educating the natives provides a way of training them to become low-rank civil servants for the government, with low rates of pay (Moeliono 1993, 130, Furnivall 1942, 87).

Admission to the primary school was selective, based on parents' occupation, lineage, wealth or education (Kartodirdjo 1984, 121). In principle, the line was drawn between schools for the indigenous and those for the non-indigenous. Schools for the indigenous consisted of the traditional schools and the Dutch-Native schools. The schools for the non-indigenous were the Dutch schools (children from high native aristocracy were given access to the Dutch schools) and schools for Foreign Orientals (for the Chinese and Indians) (Brugmans 1987, 191). The idea to establish Dutch-Native schools came from the fear on the part of the Dutch colonial government that too many indigenous children would apply for places in the Dutch schools (Moeliono 1993, 130). In the Dutch-Native schools, Malay and local languages were used during the first years of primary school, before switching to Dutch in the higher grades (Van der Veur 1969, 2), while in the Dutch schools, Dutch was used throughout all grades. The curriculums of the Dutch schools and Dutch-Native schools were the same, with both schools being subsidized by the colonial government. Easier access to schools in Dutch through Dutch-Native schools resulted in many indigenous people having a good command of Dutch. In 1928, 45% of the indigenous students who completed primary education were civil servants (Kartodirdjo 1984, 118). In 1930, Malay ceased to be the required language in the Dutch-Native schools (Moeliono 1993, 130). In the 1940s, although

70% of the indigenous population were still illiterate¹⁶, more than 2.3 million indigenous children were in primary school, more than 9,000 in secondary school and nearly 700 attending university (De Jong 2002, 10).

During this period, Dutch educated indigenous Indonesians immersed themselves in Dutch ideas (Kartodirdjo 1984, 196). Many parents of the native elite sent their children to live in big cities such as Batavia (now Jakarta) and Bandung and to board with Dutch families, with the aim of immersing their children totally in the Dutch language and culture (Vickers 2005). Living many years away from their traditional societies estranged the young elite from parents, families, values and manners of the traditional community (Alisjahbana 1966, 31). As a result, the Dutch Ethical Policy on education was criticized for their failure to integrate Western education with the history and culture of the archipelago (Embree, Simon, and Mumford 1934, 71). In effect, the regional language used for the few years of the lower education was merely a vehicle to teach Western ideology. Critics stated that such alienation would disinherit pupils from their traditional way of living and would make them equate progress with the West (Embree, Simon, and Mumford 1934, 72). This was seen as a danger for the natives, as there was a sharp “cleavage between the ancient arts of living and the modern tools of power and success” (Embree, Simon, and Mumford 1934, 75). The exclusion of traditional values in Dutch education was due to the Dutch government’s prejudice against native traditions, which deemed the natives as backwards and considered Western education and civilization as the only means of rescuing them (Embree, Simon, and Mumford 1934, 83-94). Because of the adoption of the intellectual framework of the colonizers, the Dutch educated natives also adopted a tendency to dichotomize the East and the West (Bourchier 2014, 27).

Modernist nationalist scholars, among others, Kedourie, supported such critics. According to Kedourie (1996, 107), as a result of exclusionary practices by colonial governments, upon national independence, intellectual disorientation occurred in newly independent countries. The reason for this is because Western education for the natives

¹⁶ The claim that the natives were illiterate is debatable, as literary culture had already existed in the regional languages, such as Riau Malay, Javanese and Sundanese, for hundreds of years (Van der Veur 1969, 1). Sundanese was written in the Arabic script from the 15th century until the Dutch introduced Roman script to the Sundanese language area in the 19th century (Moriyama 2005, 24).

was intended as a means of transferring the necessary knowledge to run a Western style government and industrial organization. Instead of adapting Western education to traditional knowledge and practices that the native pupils had learned from home, schooling was instead based on Western science and philosophy, which were alien to them. Later, when the elite children occupied ruling positions in postcolonial countries, they also imposed a similar ideology, demanding the masses follow Western style nationalism and abandon the old way of living, which debilitated the traditional social and political system. As a result, the new native leaders dominated the disoriented citizens, and thereby gained absolute power (Kedourie 1996, 107).

In the context of the Dutch-Indies, the Dutch government was the one holding power and authority over education and language policies in early 20th century. Even though high rank natives refused to be educated (Embree, Simon, and Mumford 1934, 37, 40-41), the Dutch government enforced the Ethical Policy regulation, which was obeyed by the native rulers. Here, we can see the dominant-dominated relationship between the colonial government and the indigenous inhabitants, in which the dominant had the power and tool of enforcement which the dominated should follow, whether they liked it or not. The Westernization process was successful because, as argued by Bourdieu, the education system moulds certain patterns of thoughts and minds. The longer one stays in the education system, the deeper the habitus is inculcated. This is why there is a similarity in thought pattern among the educated class as they learned the same ways of thinking. This pattern of thinking is guided by the educated elite. Following Bourdieu's theory, we can consider the success of the inculcation of Western ideas among the native elites as being due to sufficient cultural capital the native elites possessed. Even though the traditional communalistic culture is not the same as Western individualism, the strong acquisition of the traditional culture from home during childhood served as the cultural capital that eased the elite children to acquire and adapt to the new Western culture.

However, the Ethical Policy had a two-sided result. On the one hand, the aim of the Dutch to employ the natives for low rank jobs in the government was reached, but on the other hand, the natives used their education as a tool for power (Furnivall 1942, 84). This reflects Hobsbawm's (1987, 79) argument that the most powerful legacy of colonialism is Western education, which not only taught literacy to the indigenous

population, but also created an ambition to become part of the colonizers' system and occupy respectable positions, such as teachers, bureaucrats or soldiers (Furnivall 1942). We can consider this situation in terms of Bourdieu's theory of power relations. Since the Dutch government held the capitals in terms of financial, culture and network to establish, socialize and enforce the Ethical Policy, the previously reluctant native rulers began to comply with such policies and, in the end, embraced Western education as a means to increase their social standing. The fact that Dutch education opened up the opportunity to become part of the elite colonial circle, instilled in parents the desire to help their children by enrolling them in Dutch or Dutch-Native schools. As native traditions were disregarded in the Dutch education system, people were forced to abandon the habitus inculcated by their families in their traditional homes during formal education.

On the other hand, as a result of the Ethical Policy, ideas of democracy, equality and nationalism began to spread among the educated elite (Kartodirdjo 1984, 197), promoting self-assertiveness, rationality and individuality and encouraging critical thinking. As a result, colonial institutions began to be viewed with hostility. These traits were in opposition to traditional dispositions, where "the rudimentary state of individuality, the feeble sense of individual dignity, insensitivity towards the rights of individuals and the reluctance to criticize authority" were highly regarded (Kartodirdjo 1984, 199). The educated native elite went through a process of uniformity, in the sense that they now became fluent in Dutch and so, linguistically, they became more homogeneous. In addition to language, they also developed a similar worldview on education. This uniformity weakened the traditional bonds which upheld collectivism, among other things. This supports Bourdieu's contention that high self-esteem and ambition correlate with one's high education capital. Through the inculcation of Western ideology from childhood to adulthood, the native elites learned that having a high capital (in this case, the knowledge that used to be the monopoly of the colonizers was something they now possessed through education) enabled them to develop a doxa or a worldview closer to the Dutch worldview. As a result, the ambition to acquire the same freedom as the Dutch arose. Hobsbawm (1990, 136) explains why ideas about nationalism emerged within the elite native society by taking the rise of nationalism in India as an example, which, in my view, mirrored what occurred in the Dutch-Indies. Nationalism in India was driven by a small fraction of the population, which ironically

was educated by the colonizers. Like in the Dutch-Indies, the nationalist movement in India was motivated by a resentment toward their colonizer (Hobsbawm 1990, 136). In the Dutch-Indies, in 1928, there were 1,513,088 pupils in the elementary level of the Dutch-Native schools, which comprised only 2.93% of Java's total population, and 2.91% of the outer islands' total population (Kartodirdjo 1984, 119). Meanwhile, the total number of native high school students was 6,468 and higher education, 259 (Kartodirdjo 1984, 120). These figures show the small number of Western educated elite in the Dutch-Indies. The fact that the elite adopted a particular Western ideology that could be used to overthrow the colonial government shows that nationalism in Asia and Africa was created by the imperial conquest (Hobsbawm 1990, 137). This is also supported by how claims over territorial borders are made. As pointed out by Hobsbawm, indigenous claims over territory were usually based on the territory mapped out by the conquerors (Hobsbawm 1990, 138). This is the case with the Indonesian nationalist movement, which laid a claim to the territory that has become the current territory of the Republic of Indonesia.¹⁷

Further, the inspiration for a nationalist movement usually comes from the colonial body itself. For example, Dutch socialist Henk Sneevliet brought the knowledge about the October Revolution in Russia to the Dutch-Indies (Hobsbawm 1994, 66). His article in a newspaper in the Dutch-Indies urged the natives to follow the steps of the October Revolution. This inspired the formation of Sarekat Islam, the first Indonesian national liberation movement. As the colonial government failed to meet the demand to educate the natives on a larger scale, in 1922, a school called *Taman Siswa* (The Pupils' Garden) was established by Ki Hajar Dewantara (Van Niel 1970, 220), previously known as Suwardi Suryaningrat (Vickers 2005, 81). The aim of the school was to educate native pupils who possessed spiritual and intellectual consciousness.

The founders believed that Western education could be adapted for such purpose. In the beginning, the Dutch supported *Taman Siswa* by not interfering with its development (Embree, Simon, and Mumford 1934, 92). As a result, and because the Dutch did not

¹⁷ The process of claiming the current Indonesian territory was not a smooth process. Immediately after 1945 independence, some parts of Indonesia within Java and outside Java wished to have their own sovereignty. The Indonesian government considered the movement to be rebellious and used military force to squash it.

subsidize the school, Taman Siswa had some freedom regarding the design of their subject offering (Van der Veur 1969, 22). Although they used the Dutch curriculum, Taman Siswa also taught traditional dancing, music and culture, which gave a sense of enthusiasm and national pride on the part of the students and the teachers (Embree, Simon, and Mumford 1934, 62-63). As the reputation of the school grew, before the outbreak of World War II, Taman Siswa began receiving the colonial government subsidy (Van Niel 1970, 221). The educational program of Taman Siswa was developed to be equivalent to the Dutch curriculum so that its graduates could compete in the entrance exam for the Dutch secondary school (Van Niel 1970, 222).

3.1.2. Roots of the national language

This section describes how the nationalist ideas include an awareness of the importance of having a single common language to unify the country. In what follows, I discuss the process by which Malay was chosen as the foundation of the language of the nation, that is, the Indonesian language. This will provide an insight into how the doxa/ideology of the elite, which is based on Dutch education, was disseminated to Indonesian society.

As mentioned, part of the nationalist idea which spread from Europe is the necessity to have a single common language (May 2007, 261). One common language, the national language, is seen as having a utilitarian purpose, that is, as the medium of communication for technocrats in their endeavour to build the country and for the masses to feel they are part of the nation (Wright 2004, 42). To fulfil this purpose, the common language has to be standardized so it would become a language fit for a new nation. The national language itself is developed through legitimation and institutionalized process, and mass education is developed to disseminate the language within the population of a state. The legitimation and institutionalization process of the national language, and its use as the medium of education, results in the general public accepting the standard national language as a common language. The national language is then associated with modernity and progress (May 2007, 262). As a consequence, other languages are considered a minority and associated with tradition, and even a hindrance to national unity.

According to Spolsky (Spolsky 2004, 26-27), the standard language of a country can be developed based on five different dimensions. The first is when the standard language is treated as a language that carries a divine mandate. For example, Sanskrit, Classical Arabic and Latin are used in sacred texts or connected to the history of the people and, therefore, have a symbolic status and are adopted as a national language (Spolsky 2004, 26). Second, a standard language can be seen as a result of consensus among educated speakers (Spolsky 2004, 27). The third is the belief that every language is equally good. The fourth is when people acknowledge that the standard language has a higher status. The fifth is when it is believed that the standard language is superior, and this is due the desire of the elite to maintain power. In Indonesia, the elite nationalists adopted Malay as the national language and renamed it Indonesian. The choice of Malay was based on the fact that it was already widely spoken in the archipelago as a lingua franca. A native language spoken by merely 8% of the population at the time, Malay¹⁸ eased the tension among speakers of more dominant languages (for example, the Javanese language was the native language of half of the population at that time) and became the language that was capable of uniting the country (Fierman 1991, 23).

According to Hobsbawm, national languages are mostly semi-artificial, invented constructs (Hobsbawm 1990, 54). National languages, which are designed as a lingua franca, with the help of economic advancement, technology and politics arise together with identities in a complex process (Hobsbawm 1990, 94, Joseph 2004, 124). For example, Indonesian was engineered through a language planning policy, in a way that “does not evolve from communal activities in the ordinary lives of its speakers, has not been a mother tongue to anyone and the speakers learn it from authorized institutions and professionals as a language their mothers do not speak” (Heryanto 1995, 5).¹⁹ A national language became an important element in nationalism because, first, it creates an elite community (Hobsbawm 1990, 60). It does not matter that speakers of the intended national language are a minority, as long as they are a “minority of sufficient political weight” (Hobsbawm 1990, 60). Second, the construction of a common

¹⁸ Malay or *Bahasa Melayu* is also the name of the national language of Malaysia (previously *Bahasa Malaysia* ‘Malaysian’). The Malay language in present day Malaysia and the Indonesian language are both varieties of an older language called Malay.

¹⁹ The High Malay language was standardized and is now the standardized Indonesian used in education, government, the law, mass media and other formal activities. The Low Malay variety continues to be used in informal situations (Sneddon 2003, 9,10)

language and its existence in print form make the language appear fixed and create the illusion of eternity (Hobsbawm 1990, 61). Third, the national language becomes the language of the state through education and administrative mechanisms (Hobsbawm 1990, 62). Wright states that language was the centre of nationalism, which was used to define a group's identity and for wider communication throughout the country (Wright 2004, 8). The language spoken by the masses becomes essential due to the growing momentum of economy, technology and politics (Hobsbawm 1990, 94). The rise of television and radio make the use of lingua franca of the nation become even more important (Hobsbawm 1990, 94).

After 1830, language was viewed as the soul of a nation and increasingly became the important criterion of nationality (Hobsbawm 1990, 95). Nationalism became political, because the state had to be manipulated if a "nationality" was to turn into a "nation" (Hobsbawm 1990, 96). Hobsbawm does not explain what constitutes a nation; however, he uses Gellner's definition of nationalism, namely, a principle that treats political and national units as congruent (Hobsbawm 1990, 1-9). Linguistic nationalism was and is essentially about the language of public education and official use (Hobsbawm 1990, 96). For example, according to Ager, in late 19th century France, the educational policy resulted in the attrition of regional languages (Ager 2001, 17). Ager states that "[p]rimary education was made secular, obligatory and free in 1881, and from then until after World War II a consistent policy of using French, banning regional languages from the school itself and both punishing and ridiculing any child caught speaking a language other than French led to the practical disappearance of local languages and dialects from public life" (Ager 2001, 17). Although nationalism was promoted as protecting the rights of individuals and the masses and used as a tool to show that the rights of the masses were above those of individuals, individuals who wanted to educate their children in a regional language did not have that option.

This can be seen in present-day Indonesia, where mass education uses the Indonesian language and access to education in solely regional language does not exist anymore. Further, the elites who were active in the nationalist movement (and, generally speaking, those who held the most symbolic capital through the ability to speak the

national language), wanted to “ensure that they obtain the power they have not been able to gain in the larger community, hence the choice of language for official use and education” (Ager 2001, 37). During the New Order in Indonesia, although some majority regional languages, such as Javanese and Sundanese, were taught for three years at elementary school, they served merely as transitional languages. The aim was solely to ease the students whose home languages were not Indonesian into adapting to formal schooling. Beyond the third grade of elementary school, the regional language was taught depending on the availability of materials and teachers (Nababan 1991, 130).

According to Joseph, some historians, sociologists and political scientists believed that the national language is the foundation of the nationalist ideology, while some others argued that national languages are part of the construction of a nationalist ideology (Joseph 2004, 94). For example, the linguistic repertoire of people in the British Isles was for centuries a patchwork of local dialects, Germanic or Celtic languages. “Only in modern time did individuals, motivated by nationalistic ambitions, establish ‘languages’ for the nations of England, Ireland, Scotland, Wales, Cornwall and other smaller regions” (Joseph 2004, 94).

Under the Dutch Ethical Policy, some young native aristocrats, children of wealthy entrepreneurs of Javanese aristocrats and West Sumatrans (Elson 2008, 8), had the opportunity to study in the Netherlands. They mostly studied in the cities of Leiden, Amsterdam and Rotterdam (Elson 2008, 21). The Indies Association, the association for Indonesian students in the Netherlands, published a monthly journal called *Hindia Poetra* (Sons of the Indies) (Elson 2005, 151). In its first edition in 1916, Suwardi Suryaningrat urged the use of Malay language, instead of Dutch, as the language of a yet to be formed nation of Indonesia. Anderson points out that “Malay was a language simple and flexible enough to be rapidly developed into a modern political language ... without strong traditional traits ... as a lingua franca ... was tied to no particular regional social structure” (Anderson 1966, 104). The variety that was considered simple and flexible was bazaar Malay, the lingua franca of the archipelago. However, this was not the variety that was adopted as the national language. Rather, the origin of the national language is the high variety of Malay, widely believed to be from the prestigious Classical Malay of Riau-Johor (Heryanto 1995, 39; Sneddon 2003, 8).

Meanwhile, the indigenous people were excluded from the colonial society at the beginning of the 20th century (Maier 1993, 60). Indigenous Indonesians who spoke Dutch fluently were not allowed to speak Dutch during that period (Vickers 2005, 61). In Java, the natives had to use High Javanese, complete with the gesture of obeying, when speaking to the Dutch. This became one of the reasons for the development of nationalistic sentiments among the educated natives. One of the ways in which the message of nationalism was spread across the archipelago in Malay was through newspapers. This was the case, for example, with the newspaper owned by Tirta Adi Suryo. He hired editors from North Sulawesi, Sumatra and Central Java to raise awareness of the daily issues people faced in the Indies. The circulation of these newspapers helped raise the status of Malay to a dominant language in the archipelago, and this was supported by the Dutch government. As noted by Vickers (2005, 62), the Dutch considered Malay easier to learn than Javanese. This owed to the fact that the Malay language of the 1920s functioned in a complex triglossic situation (Moeliono 1993, 129). In the first place, there were two varieties of Malay being spoken, the standardized Riau Malay and the non-standardized (low) varieties. Second, there was the relation between Malay and the regional languages and between Malay and Dutch. Third, in the process, the standardized Riau Malay was spread outside the Riau area and the grammar was simplified and, in practice, was influenced by the local Malay dialects. For those who only knew the simplified Malay, this triglossic situation created an illusion that Malay was an easy language. At that time, when the Dutch people said Malay was easy, they referred to the low varieties, whereas the grammar and vocabulary of the high variety (the Riau Malay) were unfamiliar to them, and thus this variety was considered difficult (Moeliono 1993, 129).

However, although the society began to use Malay, the Dutch language remained a prestige language in the Dutch-Indies (Halim 1971). It was used as the official language of government and also became the language of the Indonesian elite when interacting with one another. Good acquisition of Dutch guaranteed well-paid employment, social status and access to European based knowledge. Because of this, the native elite wanted their children to be fluent in Dutch. Meanwhile, nationalists such as Muhammad Yamin, in a speech given in Dutch, predicted that Malay would become the language that would unite Indonesia. Another native figure, Mohammad Thamrin, a prominent member of

the People's council, suggested that Malay should be the second official language after Dutch (Moeliono 1993, 129). At the beginning of the 20th century, Malay was recognized as the second official language, even though only a small proportion of the population spoke the high variety of the language.

The situation in the Dutch-Indies, in which only native parents from privileged background could send their children to the Dutch school, tells us that modern Dutch education system was meant for the privileged classes and, as a consequence, it was also people from this background who secured their dominant status in society. These parents sent their children to board with the Dutch families, to inculcate the school habitus within home settings so that their children could perform well at school. Even though the native elites were members of the upper layer of indigenous society, they nonetheless had to follow the education policy set by the Dutch colonial government. As the dominated class, the elites abided by the social convention of that time, which was to equip their children with the necessary language to secure future employment. In other words, the position of a person in society, whether it is dominant or dominated, is relative against the field s/he is in. The native elites were the dominant group relative to the mass subjects, but at the same time they were dominated by the colonial power.

Bahasa Melayu, “Malay language”, was renamed *Bahasa Indonesia*, “Indonesian language”, during the Second Youth Congress in Batavia on 27-28 October 1928, and through the Youth Pledge read at the end of the Congress, declared as the national language of Indonesia (Moeliono 1993, 135), a new nation whose independence did not come about until the end of 1949. The change of the name was intended to provide a sense of unity among the different ethno-linguistic groups and orientate them towards thinking of themselves as a nation. Malay was chosen by the nationalist thinkers to be the national language due to it having been a lingua franca in the archipelago, and also it being perceived as an “egalitarian” language due to its lack of speech levels, meaning that it can be spoken by anyone, regardless of social class (Keane 2003, 519). The vision, then, was to have a common language that was not biased towards any particular culture. Once declared the language of the nation, Indonesian thus became the unifier, bringing the multiethnic groups together and giving them a sense of national identity (Paauw 2009, 5).

Even before Malay was adopted as the national language for the Indonesian nation, the colonial government aided the promotion of the language across the archipelago, for example, by publishing literary works in this language. *Balai Poestaka*, the government publishing house, was established in 1915 (Moeliono 1993, 131) with the aim of providing affordable reading materials on science and literature to the general audience. In addition to Balai Poestaka, the publication of the literary journal *Poedjangga Baru* in 1933 contributed to a further promotion of Indonesian as the national language (Moeliono 1993). The aim of the journal was to provide educated Indonesians with articles on literary and cultural issues in modern Indonesia. Alisjahbana, one of the editors, was determined to develop the Indonesian language so that it could become the language of modern Indonesia. The fact that the Indonesian language, as the vehicle of Indonesian nationalism, was spread through printed publication is in conformity with Anderson's notion that one of the ways in which nationalism is spread is through mass printing of literature (Anderson 2006). In 1938, ten years after the declaration of Indonesian as the language of unity, the first conference on Indonesian was held in Surakarta. Issues that were brought up in the conference were related to the concepts of the language in which it was agreed to: incorporate familiar foreign lexical items in scientific language; borrow foreign words; reform the spelling and grammar; develop language of the press; and establish an Indonesian language institute (Moeliono 1993, 138). However, due to the looming World War II, the next Indonesian language conference was not held until after the 1945 independence. Through the publication of literary work, authors who were Dutch educated disseminated not only the language, but also the worldview of the West, especially nationalism.

3.2. Multilingualism before the 1945 Indonesian independence

3.2.1. Multilingualism among the educated elite

The term multilingualism and bilingualism are used interchangeably in literature to refer to competency in two or more languages. According to Edwards (1995), the most common reasons for multilingualism are movement of people, such as immigration and territorial expansion, and political union among different languages, such as the case of Switzerland, in which four languages are all officially recognised, and Belgium, with its

French and Flemish speakers (Edwards 1995, 33). Thus, multilingualism describes linguistic diversity around the world and represents individual language abilities within (Edwards 2012, 25).

With regard to bilingualism, there seems to be no exact definition. According to Romaine (1989, 10), it has often been “defined in terms of categories, scales and dichotomies”, while Edward concludes that “earlier definitions of bilingualism tended to restrict bilingualism to equal mastery of two languages” (Edwards 1995, 56). For example, Bloomfield described it as a “native like control of two languages” (Bloomfield 1935, 55- 56); MacNamara (1967, 59- 60) considers a bilingual as somebody who continuously holds one of the four language skills—speaking, listening, reading or writing—in their second language. Grosjean, additionally, shows two contrasting views of bilingualism: the fractional view, which defines bilinguals as two monolinguals in one person; and a holistic view, which considers a bilingual as a unique linguistic profile, rather than embodying two monolinguals (Baker 2000, 15).

Many early studies on bilingualism conducted in the USA at a time of great concern with the flood of immigrants from Europe early in the 20th century associated it with low intelligence (Edwards 1995, 68). The studies at that time found that bilinguals had problems such as limited vocabularies and grammatical structures, mistaken word order and morphology, hesitation and stuttering. On the level of intelligence and cognitive development, numerous studies found bilingualism to be a handicap (Grosjean 1982, 220). In contrast, recent studies found bilingualism advantageous, as it promotes, among others, sensitiveness towards language difference, facilitating the learning of a new language, better academic achievement (Grosjean 1982, 221) and high intercultural skills (Baker 2000, 13). In the opinion of Harding-Esch and Riley (2003, 75), most studies that reported that bilingualism had negative effects were carried out on children from minority language groups who were forced to learn the language of the majority, and had not reached a very high degree of proficiency in their mother tongue when they started the second language in school. On the other hand, most of the studies reporting positive effects were conducted in societies in which bilingualism is encouraged, usually because the languages concerned are both high-status languages and the parents

whose children are tested belong to a high socio-economic class. Skutnabb-Kangas dichotomizes these as folk versus elite bilingualism (Skutnab-Kangas 1981, 97). Folk bilingualism occurs when children have no choice on the language they use, while elite bilingualism occurs when native speakers of a major language choose to learn another language.

There are two ways to acquire childhood bilingualism, namely, simultaneously, where the child is exposed to two languages from birth, or consecutively, where a new language is added after another (Edwards 1995, 61). The concept of “acquisition” differs from “learning” a second language (García 2009, 63). Acquisition occurs mainly within the family and/or environment, while learning a second language is mainly done at school (García 2009, 63). Based on case studies of earlier researchers, Romaine (1989, 166-168) explains that the most common situation with children growing up in multilingual environments is that they are raised in mixed-languages (code-switching), and so bilingualism happens naturally.

For the educated elites in the Indies, the Dutch language came to function similarly to the High Javanese (Anderson 1990, 132). As the Dutch education was meant for the *priyayi*, the Dutch language acquired an “esoteric” aura, in the sense that it was viewed as the language of those from an aristocratic background, like High Javanese. Once they acquired Dutch, it became common for elite Javanese families, who worked for the Dutch government, to speak Dutch in their homes. Many of them spoke Dutch with an accent and with the occasional insertion of words from their regional language. Dutch, for them, was a language of prestige that enabled them to gain economic and social advancement. The native elite who attended Dutch secondary schools and higher education began to occupy important government positions (Alisjahbana 1966, 63). At the same time, they also developed an awareness that proficiency in the Dutch language would not help them to have close ties with the majority of the population. They understood that to enable the people to gain independence from the colonial government, they needed to unite the different groups. This made the elites turn to Malay (Alisjahbana 1966, 63), which they used Malay to spread nationalism, and soon the language became part of their linguistic repertoire, next to Dutch and the regional language(s) they already knew.

3.2.2. The Indonesian language during the Japanese occupation

During the brief Japanese occupation between 1942 and 1945, use of Dutch language was prohibited (Lowenberg 1992, 64). The Japanese realised that teaching Japanese to the population would be time consuming, so they made use of the Indonesian language to spread war propaganda. The Indonesian language thus became the language of education from primary school to university (Alisjahbana 1976, 41). The language was standardized and developed by The Commission for the Indonesian Language²⁰ and evolved into a language “with widespread status and prestige, its own literature and sufficiently developed registers for government, law, science and technology” by the end of the Japanese occupation (Lowenberg 1992, 64-65). As the whole society, including the mass media, was forced to abandon Dutch language due to the Japanese occupation and used Indonesian language instead, the position of Indonesian was strengthened throughout every aspect of life (Sneddon 2003, 112). Nevertheless, during the Japanese occupation, elements from Japanese society and culture were introduced, including the calendar system, the time, holidays, the flag, the compulsory bow to the Japanese soldiers and corporal punishment (De Jong 2002, 43). At schools, pupils were taught Japanese legends and songs (Anwar 1980, 38) and school teachers were also learning Japanese in order to then teach their pupils (Anwar 1980, 37). Anwar mentions that, as the natives were already multilingual at that time, they did not have any difficulty in learning another language, namely Japanese, and some even found Japanese easier than Dutch (Anwar 1980, 37).

However, attempts by the Japanese to win over the indigenous masses and the elite were only mildly successful (De Jong 2002, 41). In comparison to many native elite who went to the Netherlands to study, only a small number studied in Japan. One of the reasons for this is that, despite the allowance given by the Japanese to promote the use of Indonesian language, brutal treatment by Japanese soldiers towards the natives created antipathy and resistance. Nationalist sentiment, which was already deeply rooted at the end of Dutch colonization, developed further during the Japanese occupation. The Japanese war effort disrupted Indonesian society and put the people in a completely new situation. The desire to be independent, already apparent during the

²⁰ The Commission for the Indonesian language was established by the Japanese and consisted of Japanese and prominent Indonesians (Lowenberg 1992, 64).

Dutch Ethical period and, later, in combination with the mobilization of the natives for the Japanese war effort, enhanced the elites' sense of togetherness and strengthened their desire to achieve independence (De Jong 2002, 45).

As the Japanese prospect of winning the war waned, the Japanese facilitated the establishment of an Investigating Body for Preparatory Work for Indonesian Independence (*Badan Penyelidik Usaha Persiapan Kemerdekaan Indonesia – BPUPKI*) (Romano 2003, 2). The aim of the BPUPKI was to transfer the power to govern from the Japanese to the nationalists and to draft a constitution. Professor Soepomo, a native jurist, proposed that Indonesia should become an organic state based on family principle (Butt and Lindsey 2012, 8). An organic state is a totalitarian state where citizens and leaders are politically unified, a model inspired by the German state. The family principle, inspired by the Japanese society, has the leader of the nation as the spiritual centre uniting himself with the people. The argument for following such a principle was twofold. First, Indonesians saw themselves as having a sense of shared communal life, oneness, togetherness and harmony that are characteristics of the Indonesian people (Rahardjo 1994, 495); second, for Soepomo, uniting the outer and the inner world, the macro-and micro-cosmos, between the leaders and their people, was the ultimate goal (Butt and Lindsey 2012, 8-9). Soepomo's concept survives until now, as seen in the five principles called Pancasila, which provide philosophical and moral guidance for the nation²¹. Burns saw the irony that, like in any other postcolonial country, the Indonesians struggled hard to win their independence and to establish a national identity; however, ideas that underlie the national identity were more grounded in Dutch than in traditional thinking (Burns 2004, xv). According to Burns, Indonesian nationhood and independence are among the ideas created in the basis of the Dutch laws.

Closing remarks

The Dutch Ethical Policy created the Western educated elite as a dominant group among the natives. These educated elite, whose members were mostly from an

²¹ Pancasila, the five pillars.

aristocratic background, became the ones who articulated the national ideas in the Dutch-Indies. The inculcation of a durable disposition during the formative years, through Western education, transformed the elites' traditional/spiritual view of the world into Western doxa based on secularism. The moulding of mind and thought during the schooling years made the elite misrecognize their doxa as freedom of thinking. The brief Japanese occupation, which mobilized the indigenous people for the purpose of war, strengthened the elites' desire to fight for independence. During the Dutch occupation, the dominant group was the colonial government and the dominated were the natives. After independence, the dominant consisted of Western educated elite, while the majority of the population was the dominated mass. Having been exposed to Dutch education, the native elite treated Dutch as the prestige language and a vehicle for better employment and social status, thus viewing language as a mere pragmatic tool. This is an ideology that is carried forward into independent Indonesia, as will be discussed further in Chapter Four.

4. Ideology and language of education in Indonesia

Overview

In Chapter Three, I showed how the national language ideology from Europe was adopted by the educated native elites in the Dutch-Indies and argued that the habitus of treating the school language as a desirable language to be included in the home began in the Dutch-Indies. During that period, the school language was already perceived as the language instrumental for securing future employment.

This pragmatic view of language, as I argue in this chapter, is a result of the relatively fast process of disseminating the national language within the society. According to Fishman (1968), national language development in postcolonial states focuses on efficiency, as language had to spread quickly to create unity within the state's boundary. The speedy process of dissemination of the Indonesian language could be viewed as an effort to follow the European model of national language, where the states have the principle of "everyone speaks the same language" (Heller 2007, 4). However, unlike in Indonesia, Europe went through a long transformation, which began in the medieval era, where national language grew as the society did. In contrast, the development of Indonesian as a national language took less than a century although Malay, from which Indonesian derived, had been in existence as a lingua franca in the archipelago long before that. The point here is that, Indonesia – a postcolonial nation – adopted Malay as its national language by renaming it as Indonesian, and subsequently disseminated this language within a relatively short time, with the purpose of unifying the new nation. In this sense, the adoption of a new language was undertaken to serve a practical purpose.

In this chapter, I show the mechanism through which language policies in independent Indonesia have been instrumental in disseminating the Indonesian language all over the country and inculcating the view that language is a tool for economic advancement. These policies, stipulated in 1950 and 1989 respectively, indicate a shift in terms of the language of schooling. Law No. 4/1950 puts an emphasis on Indonesian as the school language, regional languages being accommodated to serve as support for children who are not yet fluent in Indonesian. Meanwhile Law No. 2/1989, enacted during the New

Order, specifies the same functions for Indonesian and regional languages, but also adds that a foreign language, namely English, would also be taught to serve the limited purpose of transferring knowledge. To ensure that citizens acquire the national language quickly, the language policy stipulated that Indonesian be used as a teaching medium at school (Spolsky 2004, Bourdieu 1991, Bourdieu and Passeron 1977). Each of these Laws was introduced to the citizens by means of propaganda through the mass media or “journalistic field” (Bourdieu 1986-1987, 1998a), encouraging parents to speak this language in the home. As English language schools were restricted only to foreign nationals at the time, Indonesian parents who has the means and wanted their children to gain competence in English were left with the option of sending children overseas for schooling. During the Asian economic crisis of 1997, as the value of rupiah plummeted, many of these school children had to return to Indonesia, as their parents could no longer afford the tuition fee. Following the end of New Order in 1998, to cater for the needs of the returning students, a new law was issued. Law 20/2003, effective from the beginning of the 21st century, went further in allowing foreign language to be used within schools. According to this law, these languages, especially English, were taught in international schools and in national plus schools. International schools are schools that adopt entire foreign curriculums, while national plus schools follow both national and international curriculums. Although there has been no promotion from the government to use English at home following the promulgation of Law 20/2003, upper-middle class parents whose children attend these schools nonetheless use English in the home. Including English in the home, as I argue, reflects the parents’ view that language is a tool of economic advancement.

4.1. The ideology of national language

This section discusses the process of transformation from a multilingual society into a state that is based on the national language. I will discuss the process in both Europe and postcolonial countries such as Indonesia, showing the differences in the length of time it has taken for the development of a national language to take place and the impact of this difference on the relationship between the speakers and their national language. The purpose of this discussion is to get an understanding of why upper-

middle²² class urban Indonesians view the national language as a tool for economic advancement, despite this not being the intention of the policy makers when they promoted the use of Indonesian during the New Order era.

According to Wright, the ruling class in medieval Europe was multilingual, as a result of marriage agreements between dynasties across the continent, while the commoners, who were tied to the land, were largely monolingual (Wright 2004, 20-22). During this period, the concept of linguistic minority was unknown, given the instability of the rulers between dynasties (Wright 2004, 25). The notion of linguistic minority emerged much later, during the Enlightenment period, as a result of the establishment of national borders and central government, which raised the idea of nationalism and the promotion of one language (Spolsky 2004, 114). During this period, the idea of national identity and the concept of the state also emerged (Wright 2004, 25-26). In the 19th century, the French Revolution triggered nationalist projects uniting peoples beyond the state of France, and linguistic unity through language planning was an important part of these projects (Wright 2004, 35). These projects were designed to create patriotism and a sense of belonging.

In the 20th century, at the close of the First World War, the creation of many nation-states within Europe, with borders that surround a certain size of territory that isolated each state, was considered important (Wright 2004, 37). National ideology was developed, which made the citizens of one country consider the citizens of other countries as the “others”, and thereby creating a sense of belonging and patriotic identity, in which belief in the importance of national language is an important part (Wright 2004, 38). Part of this ideology is the assumption that everyone should speak the same language (Heller 2007, 4). The concept of a national language was therefore widely spread by World War II, even before the establishment of postcolonial states.

Indonesia, a postcolonial country, developed and spread its national language within a relatively short period of time. On 28 October 1928, Malay was renamed Indonesian and declared as the language of unity, the national language of a nation that was to be formed. The desire to have a national language emerged as part of the sense of

²² See footnote 1 for definition of upper-middle class in this thesis.

nationalism among the Dutch educated elites, who grew to despise the colonizers and demanded independence. The ideology of nationalism thus had its origins in the European education the elites received, outside of their traditional ideology. Within less than a century, Indonesian language was cultivated and spread widely, with the educated elites demanding that the population learn the Indonesian language and speak it daily at home and in public. Although cultivation and promotions of the language began since the declaration of the national language in 1928, they were most rigorous after independence, especially during the New Order period (1966-1998)²³ and spread widely, especially during the New Order period that spanned between 1966 and 1998.

Fishman, in his discussion of the differences in the transformation process between language ideology in Europe and in postcolonial countries, stated that Europe went through different types of transformations, from ethnicity-based to nationality-based ideology, and subsequently, from nationality-based to larger nationality-based ideology (Fishman 1968, 41-42). Sometimes the transformation continued to a more inclusive nationalism, through the absorption of smaller surrounding nations. In each stage of the transformation, the nationalist ideology is also transformed. In Europe, the sentiment of nationalism was motivated by the need to obtain territorial boundaries, meaning that nationalism formed the state and simultaneously, the society was actively pursuing sociocultural unification based on common nationality. The national language was therefore already in existence during the process of sociocultural unification, as the symbol of the state ideology. Thus, the issues in the transformation of Europe's nationalism in relation to the national languages of the states were ones of maintenance, reinforcement and enrichment, not the establishment of a national language. Yet, as the ideology associated with the national language became part of national ideology, the language chosen as the national language went through this transformation process at the same pace as society, and speakers developed a close affinity with their language.

This is in contrast to states where nationalism had to be disseminated within the territory that is already there (Fishman 1968, 43-44). In postcolonial countries, the sociocultural unity had to be fostered in correspondence with the geographical boundary, and the national language had to be chosen and socialised quickly to create

²³ The cultivation of the Indonesian language consists of, among others, the development of vocabularies and grammar (Sneddon 2003, 132-6).

unity among the people. Keeping the boundary of the country is seen as most important. This means that, even though ethnic groups may be socio-culturally different, they had to treat each other as fellow countrymen and women if they reside within the territorial boundary. This ideology thus created a pressure to develop an authentic national culture within such a boundary. In this boundary-based nationalism, language planning might either strengthen or weaken sociocultural unity, but regardless, within this endeavour, the development of national language is not so much concerned with authenticity—that is, deep feelings towards the language—as with efficiency. Authenticity is a secondary consideration and one that language planners hoped would develop following the normal adoption of the national language.

The development of the Indonesian language fits Fishman's description of language development in post-colonial states. Indonesian was cultivated in an efficient manner within less than 50 years, and the aim of the cultivation was to ensure unity by disseminating this language throughout the territory. This aim has been successful as measured by the large number of people acquiring the language within the border. However, the fast paced and efficient manner by which Indonesian was spread also gave rise to the view, particularly among upper-middle class Indonesians, that language is a vehicle for economic advancement. In the next section, I discuss how this process of fast dissemination of the national language took place

4.2. Dissemination of national language ideology

4.2.1. Language planning

In this section, I discuss how Indonesian educated elites translated and applied Western style Language planning and language policy in the multilingual situation of the country. The purpose of the following discussion is to show that the fast process of disseminating the national language in a multilingual society indirectly gave rise to an instrumental view of language.

According to Hornberger (1994, 78), the term language planning was first coined by Haugen (1959, 8) when he was researching language standardization in modern

Norway. Kaplan and Baldauf define it as “a body of ideas, laws and regulations (language policy), change of rules, beliefs and practices intended to achieve a planned change (or to stop change from happening in the language use in one or more communities)” (Kaplan and Baldauf Jr 1997, 3). Language planning and language policy (LPLP) are widely understood to be the work of the government, even though it can also be the work of more modest authorities. In postcolonial nations such as Indonesia, the main goal of LPLP is to develop the language to the level of modernity (Anwar 1980, 76). Other terms such as “status planning/corpus planning” and “acquisition planning” have also been used to refer to language planning activities more broadly. The former term was used for the first time by Heinz Kloss in 1969, while latter was employed by Cooper in 1989 (Hornberger 1994, 78). Status planning refers to the stage of determining which language is selected as the official language of a state (Wright 2004, 43). This is the stage when the decision on national language and the language of education is made (Liddicoat 2013, 2). Corpus planning involves distinguishing the national language from regional languages; minimizing variations of form and maximizing variations in functions and expand the language for use in all domains (Wright 2004, 48). In other words, the aim of corpus planning is to standardize and codify the language (Liddicoat 2013, 2). Acquisition planning is constituted by policies and strategies to spread the national language throughout the state, with the goal of ensuring that all citizens have competency in the language (Wright 2004, 61). At this acquisition planning stage, literacy, acquisition of another language and maintenance of languages are carried out mostly through the school system (Liddicoat 2013, 2).

Language planning, especially language standardization, is heavily burdened by political-economic considerations, with support from the state deployed to the benefit of certain social groups (Kroskrity 2005, 501). The ideology of the educated elites, or the *doxa*, in language planning is naturalized by the majority group and it is considered normal to start inculcating this ideology immediately by raising children in the national language (Kroskrity 2005, 503). Ordinary people, such as the rural populations, which were considered backwards by the New Order government, were treated merely as recipients of policy formulation or implementation, rather than active participants in language planning processes (Errington 2001, 104). The policies along these lines, which guided language planning activities in Indonesia during the New Order has

received both positive and negative criticism. Critics supporting the government's planning strategies were of the view that the government's success in transforming Malay into language known by most Indonesians was due to the particular traits of the language. According to them, Indonesian is seen as culturally neutral, that is, it does not carry any reference to regionalism. This view is reminiscent of Gellner's (1983) theory on homogenized high culture, which posits that a homogenized high culture free of regionalism is necessary in the nationalist project. Meanwhile, critics such as Errington (2001), have argued that regardless the attempt by the New Order to make Indonesian part of the national high culture by relegating regional languages to low position (a process known as "erasure"), Indonesian has never been a culturally neutral language as it carries influences from other languages such as Old Javanese, Sanskrit and English (Kroskrity 2005, 504). As a consequence, language planning is often viewed as a contested project, especially since it is engineered by the educated elites, does not take into account the voice of those for whom the planning is carried out. It can therefore be considered as a process that creates social inequality supported by the state.

Language standardization is maintained by an institution within a linguistic community (Silverstein 1996, 285). The institution holds the authority and what it stipulates is followed by citizens. According to Silverstein, standardization is hegemonic, aggressive and dominates other styles of the language and minority languages (Silverstein 1996, 286). Other varieties and languages are therefore measured relative to the standard language. This also suggests that the ideology of standard language rationalizes this dominate-dominated situation. Silverstein argues that within the framework of language ideology, language becomes the object of rationalization and is treated like any other object in culture and an instrument with which a person enacts personal values (Silverstein 1996, 290-291). Silverstein gives the example of the use of Standard English for commercial activities in the US. Experts such as doctors, technicians and scientists offer services using Standard American English, similarly advertisers use Standard English to influence citizens to buy certain products or services, and Standard English is also used by the media to spread messages to the public. Processes of language standardization and spreading thus become a practice, which manifests itself in the social actions of the citizens. Furthermore, the standard language becomes a means for showing personal values or worth and similarly, its practice becomes a culture that is seen by the citizens as natural. In short, using standard language is a

practice and is treated by the citizens as a natural part of culture. The working of power and authority in relation to language, follows the same logic as the centralization of power in politics, economy and cultures, and is in conformity with Bourdieu's notion on language and power (Silverstein 1998, 412, Bourdieu 1991).

Indonesia declared its independence on 17 August 1945 shortly after the Japanese left. The 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia was formalized the following day (Anwar 1980, 58). In Article 36 of this Constitution, Indonesian language is specified as the language of the nation. For the newly formed nation, the national language and the national legal system were important formal apparatus for unifying Indonesia (Rahardjo 1994, 497). The government adopted a monolithic Indonesian legal system, developed based on uniformity and centralization, and this system was treated as part of the nation building project and promoted as being in accordance with the character of the Indonesian people. Thus, the development of the law went hand in hand with the development of the national language. As the uniformed law was positioned above the traditional forms of social controls, so is the Indonesian language positioned above regional languages.

The language planning for Indonesian language had already begun before the declaration of independence in 1945 but was accelerated after independence. A committee was established by the Ministry of Education and Culture in 1947 to oversee planning activities. The *Balai Bahasa* (Language Council) was formed a year later to accommodate these activities. The Council was renamed *Lembaga Bahasa dan Budaya* (Institute of Language and Culture) in 1959 (Dardjowidjojo 1998).

During the New Order (1966-1998), *Lembaga Bahasa dan Budaya* changed its name several times before it became *Pusat Pembinaan dan Pengembangan Bahasa* (National Centre for Language Cultivation and Development) in 1975, or better known as *Pusat Bahasa* (Dardjowidjojo 1998, 39, 40)²⁴. One of their tasks was to make sure that Indonesian language became the "national language in its true sense" (Dardjowidjojo 1998, 41). When Indonesia declared its independence in 1945, the spelling system devised by Van Ophuijsen in 1901 was based on the sounds of Dutch, was still used.

²⁴ It is currently called *Badan Pengembangan dan Pembinaan Bahasa* (Centre for Language Cultivation and Development), under the Ministry of Education and Culture.

This was replaced two years later by the “Soewandi Spelling” system. Since then, Indonesian has undergone several spelling changes, the most recent ones being the “Reformed Spelling”, introduced in 1972 and the “Indonesian Spelling” instated in 2015. Renaming and making changes to the spelling system were part of the overall planning efforts by the government. Other efforts during the New Order included publishing standard dictionaries and grammar of Indonesian and holding national language congresses. In addition, the role of the *Pusat Bahasa* included the establishment of “weekly TV series, upgrade lectures, or courses to various agencies ... and hotline telephone services to the public” all designed to promote “good and correct” Indonesian (Dardjowidjojo 1998, 41-3; Keane 2003, 519). During this period, the government also formed projects involving both domestic and foreign agencies, and private organizations that focused on language activities and development.

4.2.2. Language policy

Language policy is part of language planning (Paulston 1997, 77), in the sense that language planning is preparatory work for the formulation of language policy (Liddicoat 2013, 1). In this section I discuss how the view that equates language to an exact science, common at the beginning of the 20th century, affected the implementation of language planning in language policy. My aim is to show that even though critical theory of the 1970s attempted to change that view by approaching language in a more critical manner, the multilingual citizens of Indonesia at the time were already subscribing to the belief that their national language was the prestige language. However, with globalization accelerating, upper-middle class Indonesians look beyond the national border and considers English as the prestige language. They transformed the New Order propaganda of raising children in Indonesian into raising children in a language that provides a promise of economic and social advancement, namely English, and regard it important that this language is a language of the home

According to Spolsky, the concept of language policy is unclear and subjective (Spolsky 2004, 41), due to the fact that language and linguistics themselves developed relative to social categories such as class, gender and ethnic groups, which are fluid and dynamic rather than fixed and rigid. This is unlike the natural science field, based on the precision of mathematic calculations. Spolsky (2004, 6) states that a language interacts

with language policy in dynamic and complex contexts, such that modification of one will lead to modification of the other. The contexts are complex because language and language policy are influenced by extra-linguistic factors including politics, demography, social factors, cultural, etc.

Critical theory, such as represented by the works by Bourdieu, has inspired much research on language policy (Tollefson 2007, 43). Critical language policy research focuses on structural categories, such as classes, gender and race, as well as on the imperative to pay attention to ethical and political aspects (Tollefson 2007, 44). Key ideas of critical theory research that are applied to critical language policy research are power, struggle, colonization, hegemony and ideology, and resistance (Tollefson 2007, 46-48). One of these approaches, the historical-structural approach, is adopted in this thesis. This approach investigates “the role of socioeconomic class in shaping language-policy alternatives, and its critique of ahistorical analyses that evaluate policies without regard to their role in systems of oppression and exploitation” (Tollefson 2007, 49). This approach believes that the political aspect of language policy research should be acknowledged by scholars, as politics inevitably shapes language policy. Thus, it is deemed important to consider economic, political, cultural discourses, the state and globalization when analysing the policy (Tollefson 2007, 50-51).

Throughout the 1970s through to the 1990s, scholars have grown critical towards certain assumptions about language. For example terms such as “native speakers”, “diglossia”, and “mother tongue”, have been criticised as inadequate for describing language situations in multilingual societies (Ricento 2007, 13). As Ricento points out, these terms are not necessarily neutral not necessarily neutral, objective or scientific (Ricento 2007, 14). Critics have also argued that as these terms are used in language policies, they promoted the hegemonic ideologies at the expense of the minority (Ricento 2007, 15). Many fears that such ideologies were widely accepted and turned into common sense, particularly in Western societies. On the other hand, Ricento points out that later part of this period was characterised by approaches to understanding language as scholars did not merely study processes of language shift and language contact, but also analysed discourses, ideologies and social relations. It is now widely acknowledged that sociolinguistic structures are the result of political, ideological and state-formation processes, and that multilingualism is actually more common worldwide

than monolingualism. Thus, the ideology of monolingualism is not suited to multilingual societies. In the 1990s, the spread of English and other major languages, together with the decline of minority languages, led to more research on language policy and language planning (Ricento 2007, 24).

Returning now to the Indonesian situation, after World War II postcolonial nations needed to find the best means of communication between the government and the people, in order to unite the country and to provide for the minimum needs of the population (Wright 2004, 9). Consequently, an LPLP committee would usually be established to develop the language chosen as the national language. Fishman, who conducted research on language policy in new states, points out that it was initially assumed that LPLP would be effective (Wright 2004, 9), and this was the case with Indonesia. From the times of the Dutch-Indies onwards, especially during the New Order, the government's language policy tended to create a hierarchy between regional languages and the national language. In reality, planners in postcolonial countries have to consider the fact that regional languages are part of the makeup of society (Anwar 1980, 77), and therefore efforts to modernize the national language must take this into account. Nevertheless, the view of language as science that is based on mathematical logic has been long-lasting and has had an undesirable impact on the status of regional languages and their speakers as these languages are perceived as not fitting the science mould, unlike the national language.

Applying Bourdieu's concept, we can see that the subjective dimension of the language planning process can be seen in the stipulation of language policy. The interest of Western educated Indonesian elites was to unite the country using the means that they were most familiar with, which also happened to be the most advantageous means for these elites. All efforts were put into transforming the whole society; they did this by disseminating the national language. That language was developed with the aim to bring Indonesian up to the level of a modern language capable of expressing modern concepts - an aim that is informed by western ideology of language, or more specifically, the science-based view of language, which was a view believed to be correct for language planning. However, expecting a multilingual society to give priority to one language in effect meant disregarding the logic of the existing practices in the multilingual societies. The logic of practice (Bourdieu 1990), which is the uniform common sense of a

multilingual society, was changed during the nationalization process in postcolonial countries, which took less than one century. For example, the acquisition of the Indonesian language in Indonesia was successful according to the census in 1980 (Nababan 1985). The reason for such apparent success was because citizens were urged to raise their children in the national language, which was used at school, in official speeches, national documents and also television. One of the people's efforts to comply with the doxa of the educated elites was to raise their children in the Indonesian language, even though they themselves may still be learning the national language. Most likely, the process of raising children in a non-native language continued throughout the 1970s and the 1980s, the period when critical theory in research was increasingly favoured. An important argument arising from this research, which states that science-based language policy ideology cannot be applied directly to postcolonial states, had little impact in Indonesia. This is due to the fact that the doxa, which believes that the national language has a higher status than regional languages, had already been inculcated and become durable. That is, raising children in the language that gives more possibilities for education and economic advancements has already become habitus for parents.

This view of language is illustrated in the study by Anwar on the history of Indonesian language. Anwar cited Whorf's language relativity hypothesis regarding the influence of language on the way humans express their thought (Anwar 1980, 12, Whorf 1956). Anwar argued that language is merely an instrument, not a shaper, of cognitive thought and knowledge. He stated that humans' worldview is not influenced by their native language, and opinions in connection to social relations and politics are not formed by the mother tongue. Statements such as Anwar's have been repeated many times in recent years as more Indonesian scholars recognize the relationship between language and culture (Subbiondo 2005, 150). There is an argument that non-Western cultures view the world differently from Western cultures, as non-Western cognition is based more on intuition than rationalization (Subbiondo 2005, 158). For example, a research on English speakers and Mandarin speakers on the conceptions of time showed that Mandarin speakers view time as vertical, even when they were thinking in English, a language which treats time as horizontal (Boroditsky 2001, 18). Another study showed that traditionally, Javanese people tend to see their history as a series of recurrent cycles, while Western cultures treat history as linear (Anderson 1990, 34).

As a result of having Western doxa imposed on multilingual peoples through the Indonesian language, the Indonesian language, both in the colonialist past and nationalist present, has been described as an “un-native” language, because, “It lacks the diffuse but self-evident qualities that are bound up in the ‘native’, whether it is applied to an individual or a collective [...] and does not possess a sameness of ways of speaking grounded in the transcendent sharedness of identity” (Errington 2006, 181). Further, according to Heryanto (1995), in its early days Indonesian was not a mother tongue to anybody. As an engineered language, it did not evolve from communal activities; instead, it was a product of language planning (Heryanto 1995, 6-7). Thus, early speakers of Indonesian did not acquire it from their parents, but learned it from authorised institutions and professionals. This created a gap between the speakers and the Indonesian language, because early speakers of Indonesian, and the current speakers who have Indonesian as their second or third language, continue to use the structure of their regional languages even when they are speaking Indonesian. Nonetheless, many participants in the present study included Indonesian as part of their parents’ mother tongue, because they believe so even though Indonesian is their parents’ second or third language, a belief that is due to the entrenched propaganda which stated that Indonesian language is the language of the people of Indonesia. A longer discussion on the mother tongue is provided in Chapter Five.

4.2.3. Policy on language of education

This section discusses the close connection between the policy on the language of education and the home language, with the aim of showing how the language of education policy influences parents in deciding on the language to speak with their children at home. I argue that the Indonesian policy of the language of education influences parents to choose the school language, and by doing so they in effect contributed to language shifts in society. This explains why upper-middle class parents include English at home, although English is a foreign language in Indonesia.

Policies on language education are one of the most powerful mechanisms of language management (Spolsky 2009, 90), and these policies might be in conformity or in conflict with the family language. This makes the family unit an important domain of

consideration in language policy (Spolsky 2004, 46). School reflects the ideology of the national government (Spolsky 2009, 104), and commonly, one single language is stipulated to be the language of the teaching medium (Spolsky 2004, 46). In multilingual societies such as Indonesia, language policy decides if the language of the home is to be used as the teaching medium in the lower levels of elementary school and at what level teaching should be conducted in the national language. According to Moriyama, during the New Order, regional languages were treated as an incidental part of the school curriculum (Moriyama 2012, 87-88). Although some regional languages, such as Sundanese and the languages of the island of Sulawesi, were included in the curriculum as compulsory subjects, the efforts to teach them were never serious. For example, there was a lack of good language teachers and textbooks, and these languages were excluded from the national final high school examination (*Evaluasi Belajar Tahap Akhir-Ebtanas*) (Moriyama 2012, 87).

According to Bourdieu (2006), pedagogic work started by parents at home is designed to help children survive within the education system; this effectively connects the family domain with the policies of language and of education of language. Within the family unit, the family's "language policy", that is the unwritten rules determined by parents on the language to be used at home, can also be viewed from the perspective of language practice, ideology and management (Spolsky 2004, 43, 45). According to Spolsky, in a nuclear family, parents usually determine what language their children should speak, in order to control the home language environment (Spolsky 2009, 17), and they are also the ones who decide on the best strategy for transferring the language to their children (Spolsky 2009, 18). In this sense, parents' authority, in combination with the social status of the parents and the language, are crucial in ensuring children's compliance with the family's "policies" (Spolsky 2009, 19). Needless to say, the parents' belief in the home language affects the success rate of transferring the language to their children (Spolsky 2009, 26), and this belief is influenced by the ideology of the nation-state. When one or both of the parents speak more than one language, they usually assert their authority on family members in order to manage the languages in the home (Spolsky 2009, 29). Parents would usually put priority on the standard, national or religious language over unwritten regional languages in order to help their children to be successful, both economically and socially. The ideology of "one nation, one language", use of languages in the media and social and economic pressures in the

globalized world, all motivate parents to adopt this priority. In other words, family language ideology and language practice are influenced by outside forces that include peers, school and the environment. The effectiveness of the ideology of the nation-state on language choice is to be measured by language practice within the family, a matter reflected upon in the discussion in Chapters Five and Six of this study.

4.3. The laws on language of education in Indonesia

In 1989 the Indonesian government issued Law No. 2/1989 on the National Education System. This law replaced Law No.4/1950 which stipulated that Indonesian was the sole language of education. Four years later, Law No.20/2003 was issued, and this law included English as a teaching medium in addition to Indonesian. Since the promulgation of Law 20/2003, English language schools have emerged in urban centres. The previous section discusses the changing views on language before and during the 1970s. In this section I discuss how the language policies have been influencing the choices of home language in contemporary Indonesia.

4.3.1. Laws on language of education in 20th century Indonesia

The Indonesian Constitution (*Undang-Undang Dasar 1945*) states that the Indonesian language is the language of the state, and the three Laws on National Education mentioned earlier, stipulate that Indonesian is the sole language of education. During the New Order era, the stipulations gave an advantage to children who lived in urban areas, as urban schools were better equipped in terms of teachers with a good command of Indonesian and access to learning resources. Yet, in Bourdieu's terms, the advantage given to a certain social class is "misrecognized" as a legitimate general rule as it is disguised as policy and regulations. The rule to use Indonesian at school is interpreted as an instruction to also speak the language at home. I argue that this mechanism, in which the people adhere to the language policy to speak Indonesian to their children at home, contributed to language shifts that occurred in 20th century Indonesia.

According to Edwards (1995, 7), there is a relation between the law, as the codified wish of the dominant group, and the language attitude of the citizens. We can see an

example of this in the position of regional languages in Indonesia. Regional languages are granted only limited usage by the law, because they do not represent the interests of the educated elites (the ones who stipulate the law). The educated elites who speak fluent Indonesian live mostly in the urban areas, while the people who speak fluent regional languages mostly live outside urban areas. This situation developed in Indonesia during the New Order, when the policy afforded less status to regional languages and more functions to Indonesian language. Here, we can see that language lies at the centre of a power relation between the dominant and dominated groups and reflects the social relations between the people who speak the languages.

Like social relations, the relationship between languages generates different outcomes for the language involved, such as competition and conflict which lead to, among others, the shift in language use (Edwards 1995, 8). As a result, the language used more widely in the society is perceived as having more value than languages that are less used. In reality, argues Edwards (1995, 18), every language is complex and no language is primitive, as it is sufficient for its speakers to interpret and understand the world. Human language is a system of communication equipped with arbitrary symbols fit for the community where it is spoken (Edwards 1995, 19) and is influenced by the social, political and economic changes of its speakers (Edwards 1995, 20). This means, the stronger the economic and political positions of the speakers, the stronger a language becomes. Thus as I will argue, changes in the speakers' situation can lead to a shift in usage of certain languages in a community.

With regard to home language, if children's home language is a minority one, most likely it will last to a certain point at school and then cease to be used once the acquisition of the national language becomes stronger (Spolsky 2009, 106). One example is the use of regional languages as transitional language during the New Order, meaning that these languages were used so as to help children whose first language was not Indonesian survive the early years of schooling. With reference to Bourdieu, this practice of changing the language one uses can be considered as converting one habitus into another. As formal education was conducted in Indonesian, while the citizens were multilingual and speakers of various regional languages, the school language converted the habitus and doxa of the regional languages to those of the Indonesian language.

The promulgation of Law No. 4/1950 in Indonesia marked the beginning of Indonesian as the sole medium language from the elementary school up to the university level (Dardjowidjojo 1998, 36). Below, I quote articles of each law concerning language in education, to show the clear wording of the usage of Indonesian at schools.

Law No. 4/1950 regarding Foundations on Education and Learning, Article 5, stipulates:

- (1) The Indonesian language as the language of unity is the medium of instruction at school in the Indonesian Republic;
- (2) In kindergarten and the three lowest levels of primary schools, regional language may be used as the medium of instruction.

Law No. 2/1989 regarding the National Education System, replaced Law No. 4/1950. Article 41 and 42 of the new law reassert the position of Indonesian as the language of education and specify its relation to regional and foreign languages.

Article 41

The medium of instruction in the national education is the Indonesian language.

Article 42

- (1) Regional language can be used as the medium of instruction in the early stages of education and as needed for transferring certain knowledge and/or certain skills;
- (2) Foreign language can be used as needed for transferring certain knowledge and/or certain skills.

Spolsky points out that policies on education generally stipulate that other languages can be taught in addition to the home language/mother tongue and the school language (Spolsky 2004, 46). This owes to the fact that language policies in education are aimed at developing the language capabilities of children at school, as required by society as a whole (Liddicoat 2013, 6). Usually, the scope of these policies covers official, foreign, minority language education policies and external language spread policies (Liddicoat 2013, 7). Official language education policy focuses on literacy for the speakers and on the acquisition of the official language as a second language for those whose first language is not the official one; while foreign language education policy concerns the teaching of a language that is not part of the society, which is usually the official language of other countries (Liddicoat 2013, 8).

Foreign language policy can be divided into two types: foreign language learning and second language learning. Foreign language learning involves learning a language that has no established function in the community, the aim being for the speakers to be able to communicate outside their own community. In New Order Indonesia, English was chosen as the first foreign language and was taught from year seven at high school. The Indonesian government has never adopted any foreign language as a second language of the state.

4.3.2. English language schools

According to Waters, nationalism has spread worldwide “as part of the process of political internationalization”, and globalization processes connect diverse nation-states and societies around the world (Waters 2001, 168-169, Papastephanou 2005, 534)

Lauder et al. state that there is no agreed definition of globalization, as it represents an uneven process that has no ending; however, a possible definition usually includes the following ideas (Lauder et al. 2006, 30-31):

- “transition from economies towards global ‘free’ trade and markets”;
- “declining importance of geographical, national, and cultural borders and boundaries leading to greater interdependence of people and countries worldwide”;
- “greater connection and interconnectedness through information technologies such as the internet, and cheaper transportation including shipping and air travel”;
- “more extensive global networks of companies, universities, students, migrants, faith groups, and so on”;
- “an exponential increase in global flows of goods, money, services, music, film, knowledge, people, information, ideas, tourists, and so on”;
- “more extensive and rapid diffusion of technologies, knowledge and ideas”;
- and “the compression of time and space across the planet”.

This echoes what Fitzsimmons says about popular conceptions of globalization, which characterize it as a process of enabling capitalism to spread for “the whole world to participate in the benefits of the international division of labour under the new market economy” (Fitzsimmons 2000, 505).

Harper points out that, towards the end of the 20th century, English had become “the dominant universal language used in the global marketplace and the academic worlds”, and workers who interact with global societies are expected to master English (Harper 2011, 516-518; Nunan 2003, 591). Since the 1990s, the rich, who used to be treated as the class that is antagonistic towards the lower class, now became the social class that people looked up to (Heryanto 1999, 162). It is parents from this class that can afford to send their children to study overseas. However, as mentioned, the monetary crisis that hit Asia in 1997 forced many Indonesian students overseas to return to Indonesia. To cater for the returning Indonesian students, the regulation that prohibits Indonesian citizens from attending international schools, namely, Government Regulation in Lieu of Law No. 48/1960 regarding Supervision of Foreign Education, was overridden by a new law, namely, Law No. 20/2003 regarding National Education System, which revoked Law No. 2/1989. Article 33 of Law 20/2003 allows English to be used in English language schools set up for Indonesian citizens.

Article 33 of Law 20/03 states that:

- (1) The Indonesian language as the language of the nation becomes the teaching medium in the national education;
- (2) Regional language may be used as the teaching medium within the first stage of education if needed to transfer certain knowledge and/or skills;
- (3) Foreign languages can be used as the teaching medium within certain types of schools/education institutions to support the foreign language ability of the education participants.

As seen in the wordings, stipulation for the Indonesian and regional languages remain the same within Law 20/03 as in the previous Law 2/1989. Indonesian is used as the school language, with regional languages as the interim languages in some areas. However, a foreign language is now allowed to be used as a teaching medium for Indonesian nationals, whereas previously it was forbidden.

Carder (2007) explains that at the beginning of the 20th century, international schools were founded based on “the initiative of some internationally minded groups of individuals seeking to provide education that might promote peace and international

understanding” (Carder 2007, 1), to educate the children of expatriates. An example is the International School of Geneva, established in 1924 by employees of the League of Nations and the International Labour Office, with funding from the Rousseau Institute of Education. After the Second World War, more international schools were founded in different countries due to the overseas assignment of workers from developed countries. The aim was to provide continuous education based on the curriculum of the national schools in the home country. The education provided by the French Lycées, German Gymnasias and English grammar schools is an example of this. Later in the 20th century, international schools also began to accept citizens of the host country to increase their enrolments. Although most international schools nowadays operate in the English language, there are also schools that use other languages their medium of instruction, such as German, French, Italian, Portuguese and Spanish (Mejía de 2002, 14; Carder 2007, 1-2).

English language international schools were originally set up on the initiatives of Anglo-American groups and were founded to offer a “particular educational and cultural model where students came from the expatriate community” (Mejía de 2002, 14). As the main goal of these schools was to prepare students for higher education in English-speaking countries, the first language of the non-English speakers did not enter into the list of teaching priorities. This is the case, for example, with the Djakarta International Primary School (now the Jakarta International School), founded in 1951 with the assistance of the US Embassy (Carder 2007, 1). At this school, only English is used as the medium of instruction even though the students come from different language backgrounds, including Indonesian.

By the 21st century, international schools had become more market oriented; they now try to attract students from non-English speaking backgrounds, both from the families of expatriates and the local community. English as a Second Language (ESL) is now a common subject in these schools (Mejía de 2002, 14-15). School fees are generally high, with fees for children of expatriates being either fully or partly paid for by their employers, while the parents of local students must be prepared to pay full fees (Carder 2007, 3). This situation creates inequality of access to education (Bourdieu 1998, 1986, 1974) as these expensive English-speaking schools select children based on their economic privilege early on. During New Order, elimination processes based on social

class became sharper, given at that time, English was prohibited from being used as the teaching medium in schools for Indonesian citizens. I would argue that the previous prohibition to use English as the medium of instruction in fact made access to the language of education more equal, as everyone had only the choice between sending children to private or public schools, and neither of these schools were conducted in a foreign language. In contrast, now parents have four options when considering where to send their children, in terms of the language used as the medium of instruction: a) state schools, b) private schools that use Indonesian only, c) bilingual schools that use Indonesian and English, or d) English only schools.

Carder argues that parents, teachers, examination boards and policy-makers need to understand that in English international education, many children might not have a good knowledge of English and therefore need to ensure they choose schools with a “well-developed, well-researched, credible educational programme”. At the same time they also need to keep up their children’s fluency in the mother tongue in order to operate in their society (Carder 2007, 8). According to Cummins (2000), speaking ability in the second language could be developed within two years, given that in speaking, speakers have facial expression, intonation, eye contact, and gestures as helpful resources for communicating and interpreting meaning. In contrast, academic skills in a foreign language need five to seven years to develop as “the written language involves much more low frequency vocabulary, complex grammatical structures and greater demands on memory, analysis and other cognitive processes” (Cummins 2000, 21). In other words, the development of academic knowledge and skills in a foreign language will not just take care of itself, so to speak; it “requires explicit teaching with a focus on the genres, functions and conventions of the language itself in the example of extensive reading and writing in the language” (Cummins 2000, 21, 23, 35-36, 58). Similarly, in their twenty years of research, Collier and Thomas (Collier and Thomas 2004, 5) concluded that it takes six to eight years for second language learners to reach the required academic grade level. In the face of these challenges, upper middle class parents in Indonesia include English as a home language in order to inculcate the school language early on. They thus start the pedagogic work at home so that their children are already well equipped linguistically when starting school. What is happening in urban upper-middle class households now is in fact similar to what occurred in the urban

middle class homes during the New Order, where parents inculcated the Indonesian language early on even though Indonesian might be the parents' second or third language.

Hornberger makes an important point that “a stronger mother tongue leads to a stronger second language”, suggesting that the mother tongue should continuously be maintained until it is fully developed, either during simultaneous or successive bilingualism (Hornberger 1989, 287). Cummins supports this view with his “interdependence principle”, which states that literacy development in both mother tongue and second language is important as it “increases cognitive, linguistic, and academic growth” (Cummins 2000, 37-38). Studies in the US mentioned by Carder also showed that ESL programs which do not include the students' home language may deprive children of adequate language development. Thus, a good international school is one that is “based on the richness of the languages and cultures of the students” and which “does not force them to develop solely in English” (Carder 2007, 25, 28). De Mejía draws our attention to the fact that identities develop based on life experiences and argues that “multilingual and multicultural people, now and in the future, need to construct and display identities which reflect their complex everyday reality, taking into account an extra-national focus” (Mejía de 2002, 62).

With the promulgation of Law 20/2003, schools in Indonesia were subsequently divided into monolingual and bilingual schools. Monolingual schools consist of regular and national standard schools, while bilingual schools are divided into three types: international, state and private schools (Hadisantosa 2010, 30). An international school is defined as a school run by representatives of foreign countries in Indonesia, to educate children of foreigners, and is not allowed to accept Indonesian nationals (Article 64 Law 20/03 and Article 160 of Government Regulation No. 17/2010 regarding Management and Coordination of Education (“GR 17/10”). The reason for such restriction is however not stated in the regulations.

A state bilingual school consists of Prospective International Standard School (*Rintisan Sekolah Bertaraf International* or RSBI) and International Standard School (*Sekolah Bertaraf International* or SBI). Because of its usage of English as the teaching medium and its affiliation with foreign education institutes, RSBI is considered as the

“upgraded” version of monolingual national standard schools. Upon fulfilling some requirements, RSBI can be accredited as SBI. By 2012, there were 1300 RSBI schools in Indonesia. However, following a petition from the teachers’ union and a non-government organization coalition²⁵, the Indonesian Constitutional Court decided that “the implementation of RSBI program violated the principle of education for all and had created social division among students”, and therefore the RSBI program was considered “unconstitutional and should be dissolved” (Parlina 2013). RSBI schools continued to run until the end of 2012/2013 school years. Parents who were satisfied with the RSBI/SBI schools their children attended voiced their concern about the petition, a concern stemming in part from the fact that the prohibition of RSBI/SBI meant English ceased being used as a teaching medium at public schools. These schools thus returned to their function as national schools, where English as a subject is taught from junior high school level onwards (Tribunnews.com 2013).

The category of a private bilingual school is divided into National Plus School (NP) and International School (IS) (Hadisantosa 2010, 30) (cf. Article 65, Law 20/03, Articles 161-3 of GR 17/10, and Regulation of Ministry of Education No. 18/2009 on the Implementation of Education by Foreign Education Institute in Indonesia (“RMoNE 18/09”)). Both IS and NP require international accreditation and all use the same teaching methodologies, internal policies and procedures. National Plus Schools are popular among expatriates and Indonesian nationals alike as they use both national and international curriculums, which can be applied separately or in combination. According to article 8(3) of RMoNE 18/09, National Plus Schools are obliged to teach Indonesian, religion and civic studies to Indonesian nationals using Indonesian language. Article 15 (3) and (4) of the regulation state that Indonesian nationals and non-nationals who plan to pursue higher degrees in Indonesia are obliged to take the national examinations. International Schools are more flexible in applying a curriculum, so curricula such as Cambridge, Victoria Certificate

²⁵ The groups who filed the petitions included the Indonesian Federated Teachers Union (FSGI) and several NGOs, including the Indonesia Corruption Watch (ICW), the Legal Aid Foundation (LBH), the Institute for Policy Research and Advocacy (Elsam), and the Education Coalition (Thejakartapost.com 2013).

Education (VCE) and International Baccalaureate (IB) are used in these schools (Hadisantosa 2010, 30). The word “international” in the name refers to “application of a full foreign curriculum and the students are prepared in order to continue their subsequent education abroad”.

By January 2019, the number of English language schools Indonesian citizens can attend in Indonesia are 510, which comprises 210 primary schools, 181 junior high schools and 119 senior high schools (Dikdasmen 2019). This number constitutes only 1.9% of the total 264,888 schools in Indonesia (Centre for Education and Culture Data and Statistics 2017). The data on the actual number of students attending English language schools is not available at present, but based on the number of schools, we can assume that the number of Indonesian citizens attending is very small.

To summarise, during the New Order, middle class families only had the choice between private and public schools for their children’s education. Now, with the promulgation of the Law No. 20/2003 on the Education System, parents with high economic capital can send their children to English speaking schools. As a consequence, more children from the upper layer of the middle class are now fluent in English. It remains, however, that these English speaking schools are accessible only to more affluent parents.

Closing remarks

Ideology is a system of ideas promulgated by the elites, to be applied as part of everyday social practices and accepted as universal truth. During the New Order in Indonesia, the ideology associated with raising children in the Indonesian language was entrenched; parents inculcated a positive attitude toward the Indonesian language at home to ensure that their children thrive at school and in the future. The ideology of the national language promoted by the government was successful, as evidenced by the dramatic increase in 50 years in the numbers of Indonesians who speak the national language.

The New Order language policy and its associated propaganda, which was aimed to foster a sense of national identity through use of the Indonesian language, had a differential effect on upper-middle class Indonesians. For them, language is a practical and efficient tool for improving the economic and social standard for their children. Beyond New Order, the promulgation of Law 20/2003, in which English became one of the school languages in addition to Indonesian, gave access to Indonesian children to attend English language schools, and parents who could afford the high tuition enrolled their children in such schools. I argue that parents who grew up during the New Order understand the school language as a tool for economic and social advancement. As English is now the language of the school, these parents consequently include English as a home language, for a similar reason.

In this chapter I have reviewed theories on language planning and language policy and pointed out that language planning in Indonesia was conducted with the primary aim of fostering national unity and the policy to prioritize the national language has been implemented through the education system. Planning and policy form the basis for creating parents' motivation to raise children in the school language. During the Dutch colonial era, the language of priority was Dutch, while in the subsequent periods it was Indonesian. As English became a school language in 21st century Indonesia, it too became included as a home language. For upper middle class parents, then, raising children in the school language is part of habitus.

5. School language and language shift in independent Indonesia

Overview

This chapter discusses the findings of this study, as gleaned from the questionnaire completed by participants. As mentioned in the Introduction, the participants for this study are upper-middle class Indonesian parents living in Jakarta who send their children to English language schools, with most having grown up in urban areas and been raised by their parents in Indonesian and regional languages. Now, when parenting their own children, these parents use English and Indonesian in the home. This suggests that there has been a shift in the language of the home in independent Indonesia, which, I argue, is an indirect consequence of the implementation of Indonesia's language policies over time. The language policies are primarily contained in the following laws: Law No. 4/1950 regarding the Foundations on Education and Learning, Law No. 2/1989 regarding the National Education System and Law No. 20/2003, also regarding the National Education System. As discussed in Chapter Four, the habitus (Bourdieu 1977) of raising children in the school language began in pre-independent Indonesia and continued long after independence. The aim of this chapter is to show the way the thread of habitus of raising children in the language of the school is reflected in the data.

In this chapter I also present the findings from an earlier research by Nababan (1985), based on his 1980 survey, showing the number of people who spoke Indonesian during the New Order. These findings are discussed alongside results from my own fieldwork to show the shift in the choice of home language from one generation to another. When the language policy put an emphasis on the Indonesian language and the government urged parents to speak Indonesian to their children, parents decided to include Indonesian in the home, even though Indonesian was not necessarily the parents' first language. Later, when amendments to language policy were made to allow English to be used in private schools, parents began to raise their children in English even though the government has never encouraged them to speak English to their children in the home. The findings from the present study also show that some parents have aspirations for their children to attend higher education and work overseas, which provide them

with greater motivation to include English in the home. This means that, although the choice of language changes from generation to generation, the habitus of raising children in the school language has been sustained.

5.1. Definitions of mother tongue and language shift

In the following, I discuss the data that shows participants treat a regional language and Indonesian language as their parents' mother tongue, despite their parents learning Indonesian only later in life. I will first discuss the different definitions of mother tongue to understand how the participants talk about their parents' languages may fit into the current definitions in the literature. In Table 1, I grouped the definitions from Garcia (2009), Skutnab-Kangas (1981) and Baker (2000) into four categories.

No.	Category	Definition
1	Sequence	The language(s) one learnt first (Skutnab-Kangas 1981, 58; Garcia 2009, 58); the language learnt from the mother, the first language learnt, irrespective of "from whom" (Baker 2000, 181)
2.	Strength	The language(s) one knows best (Skutnab-Kangas 1981, 58; Garcia 2009, 58); the stronger language at any time of life (Baker 2000, 181)
3.	Frequency of use	The language(s) one uses most (Skutnab-Kangas 1981, 58; Garcia 2009, 58); the language most used by a person (Baker 2000, 181)
4.	Internal and external affiliation	The language(s) one identifies with; the language(s) others identify one with (Skutnab-Kangas 1981, 58; Garcia 2009, 58); the language to which a person has the more positive attitude and affection, the "mother tongue" of the area of country (Baker 2000, 181)

Table 1. What is a mother tongue?

In Table 1, Skutnab-Kangas and Garcia define mother tongue as the language that one learnt first, knows best, uses most, identifies with and is identified by. Baker offers a

slightly different definition. For him, mother tongue is the language one learnt from one's mother or the first language learnt from whomever, the stronger and most used language, the language that creates a positive attitude and the predominant language in an area of a country.

According to Gal (1979, 1), although there are societies that have been bilingual for centuries, a bilingual society that replaces the habitual use of one language with another language is experiencing a language shift. Similarly, Baker defines language shift as “a change from the use of one language to another language within an individual or a language community, [which] often involves a shift from the minority language to the dominant language of the country” (Baker 2000, 178). This could happen because, according to Grosjean (1982, 120), contact between languages will create the concept of prestigious and less prestigious languages. The data from my fieldwork below show that participants considered Indonesian as their parents' mother tongue, most likely because they see it as the language that their parents have the strongest ability in, used often, and identified with. The data also show that most of the participants' parents who have a regional language as their stronger language raised their children (i.e. participants of this study) in Indonesian. This shift is also reflected in Nababan's 1980 Bilingual Survey.

The classic pattern of language shift is that a community that was once monolingual “becomes transitionally bilingual as a stage on the way to the extinction of its original language” (Romaine 1989, 39). This occurs when the new language is dominant and seen as not only providing “linguistic practicality, communication efficiency, social mobility and economic advancement” (Edwards 1995, 115), but also as “more beautiful, more expressive, more logical and better able to express abstract thoughts” (Grosjean 1982, 121). Urbanization, modernization and mobility, or “a decline in the existence and attractions of traditional lifestyles also entails a decline in languages associated with them, [which has] caused language shift and will continue to do so” (Edwards 1995, 115). In previous decades, nationalism was understood as practically equivalent to monolingualism, and the national/official language was rigorously promoted as there was fear that “regional languages will divide the nation [via] request[s] for independence of the region or annexation” (Grosjean 1982, 26). Thus, the promotion of national or official language favours a shift away from regional languages in every

aspect of life, in the direction of a temporary bilingualism where the national/official language is used in formal settings and regional languages are reserved for informal purposes. This transitional phase precedes a more complete shift to the national/official language.

5.2. The spread of Indonesian language during the New Order

5.2.1. Implementation of Law No. 4/1950 regarding the Foundations on Education and Learning, Law No. 2/1989 regarding the National Education System

The data that show the pattern of language shifts in independent Indonesia are, I argue, an indirect consequence of the stipulation of the policies that determine which languages are to be used as the teaching medium. Article 5 of Law No 4/1950 regarding the Foundation on Education and Learning stipulated that the language of the education system would be Indonesian and that regional languages were allowed to be used as a medium of teaching only from kindergarten until the third grade of primary school. This Law was replaced by Law No. 2/1989 regarding the National Education System. Article 41 of this law regulates the same for Indonesian and regional languages. The difference is that it also includes foreign languages as languages that can be used at school when required.

In the early years of the Republic of Indonesia, although Dutch was still used as the language of instruction at the University of Indonesia in Jakarta (Anwar 1980, 79), the Indonesian language became the sole language medium from elementary school up to university level (Dardjowidjojo 1998, 36). As the government's focus was on national unity and Indonesian language was promoted as the unifier, some saw the hundreds of regional languages of Indonesia as "reminders of diversity" and therefore there has generally been a "feeling of indifference" from the officials towards the development and cultivation of regional languages (Sneddon 2003, 196, 207). Yet in areas of Indonesia where most students had acquired regional languages as their mother tongue, (e.g., Javanese or Sundanese languages, as mentioned in Chapter Four), regional languages were used during the first three years of elementary school to ease the transition to Indonesian language (Nababan 1991, 121; Sneddon 2003, 207). This

situation gave rise to bilingualism among children. During the three years when regional languages were taught, their functions were limited to two functions. First, they had an integrative function; that is, proficiency in a regional language was considered a symbol of ethnic identity, with integrative function in this case referring to the fact that “the language is necessary to make oneself accepted as a member of the group using the language as a symbol of identity” (Nababan 1991, 121). Second, regional languages serve a cultural function: students learn less immediate values and features of regional cultures through formal language lessons in elementary schools (Nababan 1991, 122). Regional languages were associated with less immediate values and features only when compared with Indonesian, a language promoted as having more immediate values and the vehicle of national culture.

In contrast, according to the 1984 language curriculum, the Indonesian language had four educational functions (Nababan 1991, 122). The first was the cognitive function (Indonesian was the medium of instruction at all levels); the second was the integrative function, because knowledge of Indonesian turns the learner into a full member of Indonesian society. The third was the instrumental function. Indonesian opened up employment opportunities to the students, as it is the language in which students acquired knowledge and technological skills that prepare them for employment. Indonesian was also the key to better jobs, as competence in Indonesian was a requirement for civil service positions, from the low level clerk to the highest government post. The fourth function of Indonesian was cultural. Having competence in the language could lead a person to gain better understanding of Indonesian national and regional cultures.

Since many Indonesians at that time spoke regional languages as their first language, an increasing number of Indonesians²⁶ in everyday life became bilingual (in Indonesian and a regional language) (Nababan 1991, 129). That said, use of these languages was divided into very clear domains; people used Indonesian “in the more modern and public activities and the regional language in the more traditional aspects of life” (Nababan 1991, 129). Nevertheless, I would argue that the two Laws of the time,

²⁶ Based on 1980 census, the total Indonesian population was around 148 million, with 62% living in Java and speaking mostly Javanese, Sundanese and Madurese (Nababan 1985, 1).

namely, Law No. 4/1950 regarding the Foundations on Education and Learning and Law No. 2/1989 regarding the National Education System, gave a priority to the Indonesian language. In practice, these laws pushed regional languages to the periphery, while promoting the use of Indonesian language across the nation.

In urban areas like Jakarta, as illustrated by Sneddon (2003, 201), children's usage of the regional language was limited to the home setting; beyond this setting they spoke Indonesian. Sneddon points out that children who limit the use of regional language in the home would most likely speak to their own children later on in a bilingual mode (Indonesian and a regional language). This would then create a passive acquisition of the regional language, while Indonesian remains the school language and the language they speak outside the home more generally (Sneddon 2003, 202).

According to Alisjahbana, the planning of Indonesian is an experiment in shaping new ideas and culture whereby, if it is done rationally and with discipline, the Indonesian language could have "the chance to become the most regular and efficient of all modern languages" (Alisjahbana 1986, 46). From this perspective, Indonesian language education is only meaningful if Indonesians develop the ability to think in the Indonesian language, as this will enable them to be fully immersed in the language and culture of Indonesia and in the world society at large. Alisjahbana saw this view as one that demonstrates the close relationship between language, ideas and culture (Alisjahbana 1986, 47). Alisjahbana's idea was similar to that of Nababan, who described four relations between language and culture. According to Nababan, (a), language is the central part of a whole, in the sense that it is socially inherited, with its system of rules and habits; (b), language exists in culture, meaning that the understanding of a language involves the understanding of the culture; (c), language has meaning only in culture, so words and phrases have meaning only in relation to the culture in which they are used; and (d), language is the key to understanding a culture. As he states, "It is possible to study a certain culture through a language other than the

one spoken in the culture, but it is very difficult to know the culture well without learning a great deal of the language”. Given these functions, language can thus be used as a medium of enculturation (Nababan 1974, 21-2).²⁷

5.2.2. 1980 Survey on Indonesian language

In this section I discuss the 1980 survey on bilingualism in Indonesia to show the connection between the implementation of the laws of language in education and the shift in language use in the home. More specifically, this section shows that the implementation of Law No. 4/1950 and Law No. 2/1989 on the use of Indonesian as the language of education resulted in a shift in the first language of children, from a regional language to Indonesian. In 1980, the government conducted a survey to collect data on bilingualism in Indonesia, to show an increased use of Indonesian as first language in its 13 provinces (Nababan 1985, 6). This, I argue, is the first shift of home language that occurred in independent Indonesia. The results of the 1980 Bilingualism Survey also serve as evidence of the effectiveness of the juridical field and the government’s propaganda on language (Bourdieu 1986-1987), as pointed out in Chapter Two.

Participants of the 1980 Bilingualism Survey were categorised into two: adult and child. An adult is defined as a person aged 25 and above who worked as employees, executives or were self-employed. One of the aims of the survey was to determine how many people were bilingual. The design of the Bilingualism Survey was based on the assumption that a growing number of Indonesians were bilingual in regional and Indonesian languages. It was also assumed that Indonesian language was used in modern settings as an emblem of national identity, while regional languages were used in a more traditional way as a symbol of ethnic identity (Nababan 1985, 6). The survey gathered data collected from 1,438 participants located in Large Urban Centres (LUC) and Small Towns (ST), as shown on Table 2 below.

²⁷ However, what it means by Indonesian culture has never been defined clearly. During Sukarno’s government, “peaceful ethnic expression, the development of traditional artistic forms, for which a pan-Indonesian role was foreseen”, was encouraged (Schefold 1998, 269), with the aim of having “a national culture free from the feudal past” (Barker 2008, 528). Yet such ethnic expressions and traditional arts are not Indonesian culture itself and thus, during the Sukarno era, Indonesian society was strong with regionalism without yet having any real definition of being Indonesia.

13 provinces	Town	First language		Second language			N
		Ind	Reg	Ind lang	Reg	No 2 nd	
	LUC	5.2%	94.7%	78.5%	13.6%	7.8%	848
	ST	3.2%	96.8%	82.9%	13.5%	3.6%	590

Table 2. Results of 1980 Survey - first and second language, adult category

(Table adapted from Nababan (1985, 8-9) ²⁸)

Notes: All terms and abbreviations are from Nababan's

LUC – Large urban centre (the provincial capital)

ST – Small town (district capital)

Ind - Indonesian language

Reg – Regional language

N – Number of participants

No 2nd lang – No second language

In both LUC and ST, most adults have a regional language as their first language, and only a small percentage of adults have Indonesian as their first language. Although the percentage of the first language and second language differ between LUC and ST, the 1980 Bilingualism Survey shows that most adults were bilinguals in Indonesian and a regional language. The same survey also provides the first and second language of children in 13 provinces (Nababan 1985). The category “child” includes students from Primary and Junior High Schools, aged between 7 and 15 years old.

²⁸ Nababan's original table named all 13 provinces (North Sumatra, Riau, South Sumatra, Jakarta, West Java, Central Java, South Kalimantan, Bali, Lesser Sunda Islands, South Sulawesi, North Sulawesi, Maluku and West Irian) and divided the regional languages into local and non-local vernaculars.

Table adapted from Nababan (1985, 10-11)

13 Provinces	Town	First language		Second language			N
		Ind	Reg	Ind	Reg	No 2 nd lang	
	LUC	23.4%	76.5%	69.1%	26.2%	4.6%	431
	ST	12.4%	87.6%	69.4%	15.7%	14.9%	307

Table 3. Results of 1980 Survey on language as first and second language, children category

(Table adapted from Nababan (1985, 10-11))

Notes: All terms and abbreviations are taken from Nababan's

LUC – Large urban centre (the provincial capital)

ST – Small town (district capital)

Ind - Indonesian language

Reg – Regional language

N – Number of samples

No 2nd lang – No second language

The Nababan Survey results also include data on the home language of families residing in Jakarta, shown in Table 4 below.

Jakarta	Indonesian	Other than Indonesian		Total population
		Able Ind	Not able to speak Ind	
Total population	5,937,533 (92%)	509,425 (8%)	33,696 (0.5%)	6,480,654

Table 4. Language used at home in Jakarta in 1980

(Table adapted from Nababan (1985, 2)²⁹)

²⁹ Nababan's original table shows languages used at home of people living in cities in Java, the islands of Sumatra, Kalimantan, Sulawesi and other islands.

Notes:

Indonesian – Indonesian as language used at home

Other than Indonesian – Language other than Indonesian as language used at home

Able Ind – Samples were able to speak Indonesian

Not able to speak Ind – Samples were unable to speak Indonesian

Table 4 shows over 90% of the Jakarta population spoke Indonesian at home in 1980.³⁰ In the following section, I further discuss this survey data in relation to the data from my fieldwork.

5.3. The shift of home languages in urban areas

The questionnaire data collected for this study was collected between January and July 2014. As mentioned in the Introduction, the questionnaire was distributed to participants through an online survey tool. This questionnaire asked participants about their family background, focusing on the languages of the participants' parents, the participants' mother tongue(s) and the language(s) they use when speaking to their children.³¹ These questions were formulated based on one of my hypotheses that there are two language shifts that have occurred in urban Indonesia. As discussed, the first shift occurred during the New Order regime (between 1966 and 1998) and the second shift, after the New Order (roughly from 1998 onwards). Participants were all Indonesian citizens and born between the 1960s and 1980s.

³⁰ Low quality textbooks and less than qualified teachers became the central problem of the teaching of Indonesian (Nichterlein 1974, 235). Ideally, teachers should have sufficient knowledge of the grammar and vocabularies of the regional languages spoken by their students to be able to teach effectively. The absence of such, in addition to low quality textbooks, lowers the quality of pedagogy overall. However, the children were still shifting to Indonesian nonetheless.

³¹ This means that I did not directly ask the questions to participants' parents or children. This is because my focus is on the participants and how they perceive the meaning of mother tongue.

5.3.1. Regional languages: mother tongue of participants' parents born between the 1920s and 1950s.

The age of the participants' parents is calculated based on the age of the participants. As the participants were born between the 1960s and 1980s, it can be assumed that their parents were born, roughly, between the 1920s and 1950s. The range in birth years put participants' parents into the category of the first speakers of standardized Indonesian. This means they learned Indonesian within a formal setting (such as through language courses provided by the government or private channels), as directed by several language committees first established in 1947 (Dardjowidjojo 1998, 39,40). In other words, the participants' parents did not acquire Indonesian from their parents but learned it as their second or third language (their first language was a regional language).

Participants were asked what they thought their parents' mother tongue was, mother tongue being defined along the lines of the criteria provided earlier in Table 1. Choices of answers provided in the questionnaire³² include regional languages, Indonesian, English and other foreign languages. Participants may give more than one answer and if the answer was Regional and/or Others, they were asked to provide the name of the language. Their answers showing their mothers' mother tongue are given in Table 5, while answers showing their fathers' mother tongue are given in Table 6. I distinguish between the mothers' and the fathers' mother tongues because the participants' mothers and fathers may have come from different language backgrounds.

Mother tongue of participants' mothers	Nominal	Percentage
Regional	6	11%
Regional, Indonesian	26	48%
Indonesian	15	28%
Indonesian, other languages	4	7%
Regional, Indonesian, Mandarin	1	2%
Regional, Indonesian, English	1	2%
Regional, Indonesian, English, Dutch	1	2%
Total	54	100%

Table 5. Participants' perceptions of their mothers' mother tongue

³² See Appendix of this thesis.

Mother tongue of participants' fathers	Nominal	Percentage
Regional	10	19%
Regional, Indonesian	26	49%
Indonesian	10	19%
Indonesian, other languages	4	5%
Indonesian, English, Mandarin	1	2%
Regional, Indonesian, Dutch	1	2%
Regional, Indonesian, English	1	2%
Regional, Indonesian, English, French	1	2%
Total	54	100%

Table 6. Participants' perceptions of their fathers' mother tongue

From Tables 5 and 6, it can be concluded that most participants considered their parents' mother tongue to be regional languages and Indonesian. Tables 5 and 6 mirror the 1980 Bilingualism Survey on adult languages in 13 provinces³³ (Nababan 1985). It is clear from the data on the mother tongue of participants' mothers (Table 5) and participants' fathers (Table 6), that most of their parents are bilingual. This is in accordance with the language profile of adults in the 1980 Bilingualism Survey, which shows that nearly all adults are bilingual. Beyond being bilinguals in Indonesian and regional language(s), Tables 5 and 6 also show participants' parents' ability in speaking English, Mandarin, Dutch and/or French. What this means, then, is that the participants' interpretation of their parents' bilingualism is accurate; that is, it reflects what their parents would have reported had they been asked the question³⁴.

Relating the data on the mother tongues of the participants' parents (Tables 5 and 6) with the definition of mother tongue put forth by various scholars summarised in Table 1, we can see that the participants regard regional language(s) as one of their parents' strongest, most used language and towards which they had a positive attitude. At the same time, the regional language can be seen as a marker of their ethnic identity, which

³³ The 13 provinces included in the 1980 census were North Sumatra, Riau, South Sumatra, Jakarta, West Java, Central Java, South Kalimantan, Bali, Lesser Sunda Islands, South Sulawesi, North Sulawesi, Maluku and West Irian.

³⁴ Note: The participants of this study were parents whose children attend English language schools; however, data on their occupations were not collected, while the participants in the 1980 Bilingual Survey consisted of adults whose occupations were specified as either employees, executives or self-employed. This means the participants of the 1980 Bilingual Survey may come from a broader socio-economic background than those who participated in this study.

is also one of the criteria of a mother tongue. As Nababan mentions, language has a cultural function; it enables people to understand and appreciate culture (Nababan 1991, 121) and communicate with others within one's ethnic community (Nababan 1985, 5). Based on the data shown on Tables 5 and 6, it can be assumed that participants consider Indonesian to be also the mother tongue of their parents. This, I would argue, is a result of the government promotion of Indonesian as the national language, which contributed to the participants' belief that Indonesian must be the mother tongue of their parents, even though in reality it is often spoken as the parents' second or third language. The parents of the participants did not learn (standardized) Indonesian as their first language because their own parents did not speak it (given that, as discussed in Chapter Four, Indonesian only began to be promoted after independence in 1945). They might have spoken some variety of Malay, but not Indonesian. In those cases where the participants' parents were born between the 1920s and 1950s, it can be assumed that they were firstly raised in one or two regional languages (or some variety of Malay) by their parents. It was only later, when the Indonesian language was well disseminated in society through everyday use at school, through language courses and the media, that the participants' parents began to learn Indonesian formally as their second (or third) language.

Further evidence that the participants' parents' first language was a regional language comes from the 1980 Bilingualism Survey (Nababan 1985, 5). Typically, regional languages were spoken by the participants of the 1980 Bilingualism Survey to communicate with others within their ethnic community, while Indonesian was spoken when communicating with those outside their ethnic community. This situation is illustrated in Table 7 below, which shows that people born before 1920 would have spoken a regional language as their first and probably second languages, with the possibility of Dutch fluency if they were part of the elite class. When this generation became parents, they would have raised their children (born between the 1920s and 1950s) in a regional language as well. Later in their life, people born between 1920 and the 1950s would have learned Indonesian through formal education.

Participants’ grandparents (born before 1920)	Language the participants’ grandparents speak to their children	Participants’ parents (born between 1920-1950)
1 st language = Regional 2 nd language = Regional (sometimes with Dutch)	Regional	1 st language= Regional 2 nd language = Indonesian (sometimes with Dutch)

Table 7. Bilingualism participants’ parents as perceived by participants

If we relate Table 7 with the data on the languages the participants consider as their parents’ mother tongue, it is reasonable to assume that these participants would have heard their parents speak both Indonesian and one or more regional languages on a daily basis when they grew up. This then would have guided the participants in thinking that the languages they heard are their parents’ strongest languages as well. Moreover, participants also witnessed that these languages were part of the ethnic identity of their parents, while Indonesian gave them a sense of national identity. These are possibly the reasons why the majority of participants answered “Indonesian” and “Regional” to the question about their parents’ mother tongues.³⁵

5.3.2. Home languages of Indonesians growing up during the New Order

The data in this section show the entrenchment of the national language ideology during the New Order. This can be seen from the language choice of the participants’ parents when speaking the (standardized) Indonesian language with the participants when they were children, although Indonesian is not their parents’ first language. Unlike the previous section, which shows the participants’ perception towards their parents’ mother tongues, this section focuses on the self-reported use of languages between the participants and their parents. Participants were asked the following question: “What

³⁵ As stated earlier in this chapter, information on the grandparents’ mother tongues were collected for background purposes only. Grandparents were not the focus of this research. Questions regarding the mother tongue of grandparents were asked to the participants alone to elicit their understanding of what constitutes a mother tongue.

language(s) did your mother speak to you when you were growing up?” The questionnaire provides the same choice of answers as for the questions aimed to elicit information about the mother tongue of the participants’ parents.

Participants’ mothers’ home language³⁶	Nominal	Percentage
Regional	6	11%
Regional, Indonesian	15	27%
Indonesian	29	53%
Indonesian, English	2	3%
Regional, Indonesian, English	1	4%
Indonesian, other languages	1	2%
Total	54	100%

Table 8. Participants’ mothers’ language use as reported by participants

Table 8 shows that two of the participants’ mothers spoke Indonesian and English to the participants (3%), while another six spoke a regional language only (11%) and fifteen participants reported that their mothers spoke a regional language and Indonesian to them (27%). The majority, 29 mothers, spoke Indonesian only to the participants (53%). In Table 9, only one father (2%) spoke a regional language, Indonesian and English to his children (2%) and another spoke Indonesian, English and another language (not specified). Four fathers spoke solely a regional language (7%); twelve spoke a regional language as well as Indonesian (22%); nine spoke Indonesian and English (17%) and half (n=27) spoke solely Indonesian (50%). Thus, it can be concluded that most participants’ parents spoke solely Indonesian to respondents when they were growing up.

³⁶ The data collected during the fieldwork concern the languages the participants’ mothers and fathers used when they were growing up. The responses were then compared to the ones participants gave concerning what they considered as their mother tongues. Discussion on the participants’ perceptions of what constitute a mother tongue is given in Chapter 5, section 5.1.

Participants' fathers' home language	Nominal	Percentage
Regional	4	7%
Regional, Indonesian	12	22%
Regional, Indonesian, English	1	2%
Indonesian	27	50%
Indonesian, English	9	17%
Indonesian, English, other languages	1	2%
Total	54	100%

Table 9. Participants' fathers' language use as reported by participants

As stated by Heryanto (Heryanto 1995, 5), Indonesian is an engineered language, which means that the pioneer speakers had to learn it from authorized institutions and professionals, because their mothers did not speak it to them. This suggests that the participants of the current study, who were raised during the New Order, grew up in an environment in which the second language of their parents (Indonesian language) was used. The second language environment would start at home (if their parents spoke Indonesian with them) and extend to school (Indonesian was used as a teaching medium in most of the school years). If the participants' parents raised them in their first language (a regional language), the participants would begin to learn Indonesian when they started schooling and they would subsequently become bilinguals (see discussion on bilingualism in Chapter Six). The data collected for this study confirmed that the language policy of the New Order created a situation in which the participants received instruction in the second language of their parents (Indonesian language) from either their parents, or teachers, or both. This illustrates how the language policy introduced by the New Order government was efficiently implemented, resulting in the spread of Indonesian language across the archipelago, pushing regional languages out to the periphery (Sneddon 2003, 196, 207). The results of this study show that in Jakarta, a language shift occurred; people who previously used mainly a regional language shifted to using a regional language and Indonesian (two languages). A further shift subsequently occurred whereby bilingualism turned into monolingualism as children grow up speaking only Indonesian (Sneddon 2003, 202).

5.3.3. Mother tongue of people growing up in the New Order

Continuing on the subject of national language ideology during the New Order, Table 10 shows the language(s) that participants consider as their mother tongue(s).

Participants' mother tongues	Nominal	Percentage
Regional	4	7%
Regional, Indonesian	23	43%
Regional, Indonesian, English	4	7%
Indonesian	20	37%
Indonesian, English	2	4%
Indonesian, English, other languages	1	2%
Total	54	100%

Table 10. Participants' self-reported mother tongue(s)

As mentioned, most of the participants' parents raised the participants in Indonesian only. Table 10 shows that most participants reported Indonesian and regional languages as their mother tongues, with Indonesian as their first language and a regional language as their second language. Based on this data, Table 11 was created to show the dominant languages, and their shifts, from one generation to the next.

Participants' grandparents (born before 1920)	Language participants' grandparents speak to their children	Participants' parents (born 1920-1950)	Language participants' parents speak to their children	Participants (born 1960-1980)
1 st and 2 nd = Regional	Regional	1 st = Regional 2 nd = Indonesian	Indonesian	1 st = Indonesian 2 nd = Regional

Table 11. Language shift before and during the New Order

According to Spolsky, it is generally the choice of language in the family home that actually determines if a language is maintained or lost (Spolsky 2004, 55). The data show that most parents of participants maintain their mother tongues (regional language) to a certain extent. This means that the perception that people living in Jakarta are monolinguals (Sneddon 2003, 205) only applies when the strict definition of bilingualism, which says that a bilingual person should have equal competence in two languages, is used (Macnamara 1967, 59-60). A less strict understanding on bilingualism includes also those who understand some words of the language without being able to speak it fluently (Edwards 1995, 55). Such an understanding of bilingualism is in conformity with the self-reported language use of participants, who mostly consider Indonesian as their first language and a regional language as their second. Within this view, as transmigration and urbanization programs pursued by the

Indonesian government increased interaction among ethnic groups (in which every group has its own regional language), most Indonesians are then, at the very least, bilingual in Indonesian and one regional language. This is due to the fact that regional languages are still widely used as part of everyday language. For example, bilingual Bugis people in South Sulawesi use Bugis-Indonesian, Chinese-Indonesians in Surabaya switch between Javanese and Indonesian (Mahmud 2008, 68) and the Sasak in Lombok use different varieties of the Sasak language and Indonesian (Austin 2012, 1). In Jakarta, many people speak Betawi as well as Indonesian. (Schefold 1998, 275). My own experience from partly growing up in Jakarta during the New Order era is that the language used in family gatherings is usually a regional language, thereby exposing the children in the family to the regional language spoken by the parents. Although the parents might speak exclusively Indonesian to their children, regularly attending family gatherings helps the children to acquire the language passively.

Children are also exposed to different languages through television. Indonesian television programs often include series with characters that code-switch between two languages. For example, puppet drama *Si Unyil* (The Little Boy), which aired for more than a decade during 1980s and 1990s, included bilingual adult characters such as Bu Bariah and Engkong. Bu Bariah spoke Indonesian mixed with Madurese while Engkong mixed his Indonesian with Chinese. Although the characters often made fun of “deviant accents or ... regional dialect” in order to “legitimate the dominance of Indonesian”, children are nonetheless exposed to some words of different languages in these ways (Kitley 1999, 146-7). From 1991, private television stations were allowed to operate. Initially, the restriction on programs broadcast remained the same: that is, the language should be standard Indonesian and regional language was to be used only “when suitable for a particular program” (Sen and Hill 2000, 119). However, as it was difficult for state and private stations to maintain viewers in the region, programs that included local language were also aired, despite this being against regulations (Goebel 2008, 50). For example, RCTI station aired *Si Doel Anak Sekolahan*, a drama series about an educated indigenous youth of Jakarta, and *Lenong Rumpi*, a comedy series based on traditional Jakarta performance. The main characters in both these series speak in Betawi. The state owned station in Yogyakarta also aired its regular *wayang* and *ketoprak* during peak hours (Sen and Hill 2000, 124-5). From 1997 regional television was allowed more autonomy in preparing their own programs.

If we relate the situation in Indonesia to Bourdieu (1998, 44-7), who states that journalism, including television, controlled by the state broadcasts the ideology of the elites, we can see that in multilingual Indonesia, the government, ironically, still needs to include regional languages in television programs to make their propaganda effective. This is similar to allowing regional languages to be taught up to a certain level of primary schooling, to ensure that the acquisition of the Indonesian language proceeds smoothly.

With regard to Sneddon's claim that "in cities, especially in Jakarta, there is a growing shift to monolingualism in Indonesia" (Sneddon 2003, 205), I would suggest that this is not completely accurate. People in Jakarta have knowledge of Indonesian as well as regional languages through the aid of television programs,³⁷ as well as through contacts with other ethnic groups during family gatherings or everyday interactions with neighbours. They might not be able to speak, read and write fluently in both languages, but they are bilingual nevertheless, given that they at least understand many words of other (regional) languages. This means that even Indonesians who were raised only in the Indonesian language during the New Order can understand some words from regional languages through the media and social interaction. Even people living in areas where a regional language is dominant are educated in that regional language only for the first three years of their primary school, in accordance with Law No. 2/1989 of the National Education System. In the light of all these, it would be hard to find Indonesians in Indonesia who have no knowledge whatsoever of any regional language.

5.3.4. Urban areas: Home of the middle class

With regard to childhood bilingual acquisition, Sneddon (2003, 202) states that Indonesian families who move to the city were most likely to use a regional language at home while the children acquire Indonesian at school. Families from Malay speaking cities such as Palembang, Medan, Manado and Ambon, who move to a Javanese speaking area, will have children who receive education in both Javanese language and Indonesian language, while also acquiring Javanese from the environment and through

³⁷ Such television programs include *Si Doel Anak Sekolah*, a drama series about educated indigenous inhabitants of Jakarta, and *Lenong Rumpi*, a comedy series based on traditional Jakarta performance, and both are peppered with the regional dialect *Betawi* (Sen and Hill 2000, Kitley 1999).

exposure to local mass media (Sneddon 2003, 202), a situation which enables these children to become Malay-Indonesian-Javanese trilinguals. Further, children moving from Jakarta to Palembang might not encounter much difference in the medium of language at school, but most likely they will be immersed into the local Malay dialect through interaction with the local people. As for those growing up in Jakarta, they typically acquire regional language knowledge either from hearing different regional languages through regular interaction with friends and families from different ethnic backgrounds and the mass media, or both from the environment and from the parents. Given the diversity in Indonesia, one of the questions asked was where participants grew up. The responses are shown in Table 12.

Cities where participants grew up	Nominal	Percentage
Jakarta	23	42%
Jakarta, other cities in Java	5	9%
Jakarta, outside Java	4	8%
Jakarta, other cities in Java, outside Java	6	11%
Jakarta, other cities in Java, overseas	1	2%
Jakarta, overseas	2	4%
Other cities in Java	6	11%
Outside Java	5	9%
Other cities in Java, overseas	1	2%
Jakarta, other cities in Java, overseas	1	2%
Total	54	100%

Table 12. Places where participants grew up

Table 12 shows that most respondents were raised either in Jakarta only, or in Jakarta and other cities, and also that respondents grew up mainly in an urban context, particularly large cities. Data on the choice of home language of the participants' mothers and fathers show that most participants spoke Indonesian with their parents and likewise, data on the choice of language at home show Indonesian as the most spoken language. Both the fieldwork data and the data from the 1980 Population Census show that the majority of respondents/samples in Jakarta speak Indonesian at home.

Participants who grew up in Jakarta mostly answered the question on their mother tongue as Indonesian, although some of them were raised in a regional language. It is then reasonable to conclude that the language contact between Indonesian and regional languages during the New Order created a perception that one language is more

prestigious than the other. As the official language with multiple functions in society, Indonesian was perceived as more prestigious than regional languages, whose functions were reduced. The bilingual parents of the participants used regional languages to speak to other people within their ethnic groups and spoke Indonesian at home with their children (i.e., the participants). Participants who were raised only in Jakarta received education in the Indonesian language only, while those raised in other cities where a regional language was the main language, received formal tuition in that language for the first three years of schooling only.

In chronological order, the language shift during the New Order can be described as follows: the participants' grandparents, who were born before 1920s, were fluent in one or more regional languages, with Indonesian of course not being part of their linguistic repertoire, as it had not yet been developed (but Malay was, of course, in existence). The parents of participants who were born between the 1920s and 1950s learned regional languages from their parents before learning Indonesian later in life from a language institution. In their adulthood, the participants' parents used Indonesian and regional languages almost equally, though for different purposes. Later, when participants' parents had children (i.e., the participants), the hegemonic functions of Indonesian motivated them to use Indonesian when raising their children.

5.4. Language shift after the New Order

5.4.1. English as part of the home language

This section discusses the part of the questionnaire in which participants were asked their choice of language to speak with their children in the home.

Participants' home language	Nominal	Percentage
Regional, Indonesian	2	4%
Regional, Indonesia, English	3	5%
Regional, Indonesian, English, Others	1	2%
Indonesian	12	22%
Indonesian, English	34	63%
Indonesian, English, Others	2	4%
Total	54	100%

Table 13. Participants' choice of home language(s) to speak with their children

The data on Table 13 show that most participants raise their children as Indonesian-English bilinguals. The participants' inclusion of English as the home language reveals a habitus similar to their parents, that is, opting for the dominant language which is also the school language. The participants were asked, "What languages(s) do you use with your children?" The answers show that, next to Indonesian and regional languages, English is included as a home language. This shows another language shift occurring; the participants, who are fluent in Indonesian, are now creating Indonesian-English bilingualism in the home. The inclusion of English as a home language also demonstrates the participants' desire to support their children so they can be successful at school. In Chapter Six, it will also be shown that their choice of school is influenced by their view that English is the language that will aid their children to have access to higher education overseas and probably to work overseas as well.

5.4.2. Aspirations for children's higher education

In the questionnaire, I asked participants where they had studied and received their higher education degree.

Countries of participants' higher education	Percentage
Indonesia	60%
Overseas	13%
Both	27%

Table 14. Location of participants' higher education

Table 14 shows that most participants obtained their higher education degree solely in Indonesia and only a small percentage studied overseas. I also asked participants their expectations of the location of their children's higher education. The participants responded that they have aspirations for their children to study overseas or both overseas and in Indonesia, even though they themselves went to universities in Indonesia.

Countries of participants' children's future higher education	Percentage
Indonesia	11%
Overseas	45%
Both	44%

Table 15. Participants' expectations of their children's higher education location

Enrolling their children in schools that use English, parents have high expectations that their children get their degree from a university overseas, or a combination of universities in Indonesia and overseas, as shown on Table 15. Some big universities in Indonesia now have cooperation with universities overseas, offering so called dual-degree programs. This enables students to spend half their university years in Indonesia and the other half overseas. This way, participants have options to either send their children to study overseas from the beginning, or to let their children spend longer living at home before going overseas at a later age.

Closing remarks

Habitus is a set of dispositions where a particular practice becomes so ingrained that people engage in the practice as if it is second nature, that is, without consciously thinking about it. This chapter has shown that there has been a shift of language in urban Indonesia. I have presented data showing that during the New Order period, parents included Indonesian as the language of the home (next to regional languages), while beyond New Order, in 21st century Indonesia, parents include English (next to Indonesian). Parents in the 21st century have Indonesian as their first language and regional language as their second. This study shows that parents raising their children in the school language during New Order were significantly influenced by the government persistence in urging them to raise their children in Indonesian. In the 21st century, when the New Order government is no longer in power, parents, like their parents before them who spoke the school language at home, pursue this same habitus to the present day.

This chapter has presented data from the 1980 Bilingualism Survey and from my own fieldwork to support the argument that there has been a continuing process of language shift. Both the Survey and the data support the argument that the promulgation of the language policies during and after the New Order created the shift in the language used in the home. Indonesian, which was the school language in Indonesia during the New Order, now has English as a “competing” language. The majority of parents during the New Order raised their children in Indonesian or Indonesian and regional languages, while parents nowadays raise their children in Indonesian and English.

6. Bilingualism and code-switching in family conversation

Overview

This chapter discusses the strong motivation of most parents to include English in the home as part of their efforts to support their children at school and argues that the inclusion of English adds to the children's linguistic repertoire. I examine code-switching between two or more languages to show the process of inculcating English language from early on in the home and that enrolling children at English language school is driven by the participants' desire to ensure that their children will survive living in Indonesia and overseas (1977, 2001).

A further aim in this chapter is to show that, despite the increasing trend to use English as the language of the home, parents also value Indonesian as the language of the family. As will be demonstrated, while most participants (i.e., the parents) are eager to speak English to their children, they mostly code-switch between English and Indonesian, with one parent also including French in the mix. Some parents do, in fact, speak to their children solely in Indonesian, while one parent code-switches between Javanese and Indonesian. Chapter Five showed that parents continue to consider Indonesian as an important language, and this is consistent with the video/audio data from 17 families and their answers in the questionnaire shown in this chapter. Code-switching is a strategy parents adopt to make their children experience English not as a foreign language. In addition to sending their children to an English language school, speaking English at home is a way of instilling the idea and habit that English is part of the home language.

By discussing types of code-switching between the participants (henceforth, parents) and their children (Grosjean 1982, Milroy and Gordon 2003, Romaine 1989) and relating these to the parents' backgrounds, I show the eagerness of the parents to support their children's English development, even though they themselves did not grow up in an English speaking environment. These parents believe that including English in the home is the most effective way to improve their children's English,

although not all of them speak English fluently. At the same time, as English becomes the global language, most parents wish for their children to study and work (partly) overseas, so that their children can participate in the globalized world as global citizens.

6.1. The influence of the globalized world towards parents' aspirations

As discussed in Chapter Five, the participants of the present study grew up in multilingual environments. Even though their strongest language might be Indonesian and their parents might have raised them in Indonesian language only, they still heard regional languages spoken by people around them, as for example during family gatherings, on television or in everyday interactions overhearing other people conversing in those languages. Now, as parents, participants include English as their home language next to Indonesian, despite the fact that all of them grew up speaking in Indonesian and did not have English as their mother tongue/first language.

In Chapter Three, it was discussed that among the different definitions of bilingualism, early studies saw bilingualism as a negative phenomenon, as these studies were largely conducted on newly arrived immigrants in the US, while later studies saw bilingualism as a positive quality, as they were conducted on bilingualism in high-status languages. There are different reasons for bilingualism, among others, movement for political, social or economic reasons; political federalism and nationalism; and, since the late 20th century, the growth of international organizations in politics, business, academia and education worldwide (Grosjean 1982, 30; Meija 2002, 3). The fact that a given country is officially bilingual does not mean that everybody uses two languages regularly, and similarly, many officially monolingual countries may have bi- or multilingual speakers. For example, the Indonesian language is the official lingua franca for its multilingual society, while officially bilingual Canada has only 13% of the population using both French and English on a regular basis (Harding-Esch and Riley 2003, 30-31; Grosjean 1982, 16).

6.1.1. Reasons for the inclusion of English as home language

This section shows the participants' motivations in choosing Indonesian and English as part of their home language. It is argued that including the school language as a family language, even though it is not the parents' first language, has always been driven by economic and social factors. This is in conformity with the arguments of Edwards (1995), who proposed that a language's life span is influenced by the economic and political positions of the speakers. Language with politically and economically stronger speakers will be seen as more attractive to acquire, as it facilitates the speakers' economic advancement. In the discussion of these issues that follows in this chapter, all names have been changed to preserve the anonymity of participants.

The questionnaire includes the question, "In your opinion, what language should your child acquire at this time? Why?" From 50 responses,³⁸ 36 participants included Indonesian and English, while the rest did not include Indonesian. Participants gave various reasons for their choice of language, as shown in Table 16.

Indonesian	English
Mother tongue	School
Globalization	Globalization
Living in Indonesia	Work overseas
	Job security
	International living

Table 16. Participants' reasons in choosing English and Indonesian

Below are some examples of the responses. I present these examples by showing the original texts in Indonesian, followed by the English translation, along with some background information of the participants.

³⁸ Although there were 54 participants, not all participants answered the questions. All participants answered the first part of the questionnaire (family background), but some left the last part about language choice blank.

Example 1. Indonesian and English for academic reasons

Bahasa Indonesia dan bahasa Inggris karena keduanya dibutuhkan untuk menunjang belajar di sekolah ...

‘Indonesian and English, because both [languages] are needed to support [children’s] study at school ...’ (Massa, December 2014).

Massa teaches at a bilingual school, using both English and Indonesian at work, and her child attends the school in which she teaches. She deems both Indonesian and English important and gave “to support study” as the reason for speaking English to her child. She began to speak both languages to her child when the child started kindergarten.

Example 2. English for academic reasons and non-formal Indonesian for everyday

... bahasa Inggris untuk keperluan akademis dan bahasa Indonesia non formal untuk keperluan berbicara sehari-hari.

‘English for academic purposes and non-formal Indonesian for everyday use.’ (Rez, February 2014).

Rez works in a company that requires her to speak English when dealing with clients and colleagues overseas, while with her colleagues in Jakarta, she uses Indonesian. Her child goes to international school and she sees Indonesian as important for everyday use and English as important for education.

Example 3. Indonesian as mother tongue and English as global language

Bahasa Indonesia dan bahasa Inggris. Kalau bahasa Indonesia tentu wajib karena merupakan bahasa ibu sedangkan bahasa Inggris merupakan bahasa global yang digunakan di seluruh dunia.

‘Indonesian and English. Surely Indonesian is obligatory because it is the mother tongue, while English is the global language used all over the world.’ (Am, February 2014).

Am runs her own business. At her workplace, she sometimes speaks English and sometimes Indonesian with her staff. She sends her children to an international

school, as she plans to send them overseas for higher education, and the teaching at her children's school is mostly conducted in English. She sees Indonesian and English as having different functions, and thus being equally important.

Example 4. Indonesian as the language of residential place and English for education

... bahasa Indonesia karena dia tinggal di Indonesia, keluarga, teman dan orang dekat, pergaulan sehari-hari semuanya berbahasa Indonesia. Bahasa Inggris untuk pendidikannya ...

'Indonesian because he (the child) lives in Indonesia; family, friends and close relationships, his circle for daily activities all speak Indonesian. English for his education.' (Riaman, November 2014).

Riaman works in a place where she needs to use both English and Indonesian when dealing with clients. Her child goes to an international school, while she and her daughter live with her parents, who speak only Indonesian. For that reason, she sees the Indonesian language as important for her daughter, because she lives in Indonesia and people there speak Indonesian. Riaman sees English as primarily for education purposes.

Example 5. Both Indonesian and English for global competition

... bahasa Indonesia dan bahasa Inggris untuk menghadapi persaingan global di masa mendatang ..

'Indonesian, and English for the future globalized world' (Svjt2, April 2014).

Svjt2 works in a company where Indonesian is the official language and uses English only when communicating with some of the expatriates. He sends his children to a religion based bilingual school. According to him, both Indonesian and English are important for his children's lives in the globalized world.

Similar to what happened during the New Order era, in which urban citizens opted for Indonesian as the home language, Table 16 shows that the reasons parents include

English as one of the languages at home is linked to their children’s future economic and social advancement. This suggests that raising children in the school language has become the habitus of parents in Indonesia.

6.1.2. Aspirations for their children’s languages in the future

In response to the question in the questionnaire, “In your opinion, what language(s) should your child acquire fluently in the future? Why?”, from 50 answers, 16 participants included Indonesian, 21 participants did not include Indonesian and the rest included Indonesian and English in their answers.

Indonesian	English	Asian languages	European languages
Roots	Globalization	Business	Uniqueness
Job	Job	Technology	Most used
		Economic power	Talent enhancer
		Talent enhancer	

Table 17. Participants’ aspiration for their children’s languages in the future

Below are some examples of the responses.

Example 6. Indonesian to keep the root and English to become global citizens

Bahasa Indonesia dan bahasa Inggris. Bahasa Indonesia karena supaya dia tidak melupakan akar budaya dan juga kalau dia bekerja di Indonesia. Bahasa Inggris karena sudah globalisasi jadi semua negara bebas masuk dan bekerja di Indonesia

‘Indonesian and English. Indonesian so that he does not forget his roots and also in case [later on] he works in Indonesia. English because [the world becomes] globalized thus [citizens of] every country can enter and work freely in Indonesia’ (Sydt1, April 2014).

Sydt1 hopes for her children to study overseas to gain higher education qualifications and indeed, she herself spent some of her university years overseas. Nonetheless, she sees her children's Indonesian as important for them to remember where they come from. English is important as, even though her children work in Indonesia, the globalized world makes every national free to enter and work in Indonesia. My understanding is that she wants her children to be able to compete with expatriates and thus, English fluency is a must for their future.

Example 7. Asian languages for business and technology, European languages for aesthetics

Kalau dari Asia: bahasa Cina atau Jepang karena banyak trading dan teknologi yang bisa dilakukan dan dipelajari dari negara tersebut. Kalau Eropa: French atau Italy karena pengucapan dan tutur kata yang unik.

‘Asian: Chinese or Japanese as there is a lot of trading and technology that can be learned and conducted with those countries. European: French or Italian because of their unique pronunciation and vocabularies.’ (Lazw, November 2014).

Lazw wants her children to live and work in Indonesia and also conduct travel overseas for business purposes. For higher education, she wants them to take the dual program, where part of it is conducted in Indonesia and the other part, overseas. The languages that she wishes her children to speak fluently are based on aesthetic features (French and Italian) and business and technology (Chinese or Japanese).

Example 8. English the international language, Mandarin the language of economic power, Spanish the most used language

Inggris – karena bahasa internasional. Mandarin-Cina sebagai kekuatan ekonomi masa depan. Spanyol – salah satu bahasa asing yang juga banyak digunakan di dunia.

‘English, because it's international. Mandarin Chinese as an economic force in the future. Spanish, one of the most used foreign languages in the world.’ (JWSat, March 14).

JWSat's children attend an international school, as he sees the system of teaching as suitable for his children. He plans for his children to attend university partly in

Indonesia and partly overseas. JWSat himself went to university in Indonesia. In terms of living and working in the future, he wants his children to be overseas in order to have a better life. With those plans in mind, JWSat thinks the important languages for his children's future are English, Mandarin and Spanish, as those are the languages most used in the world.

Example 9. French or Mandarin as third language to enhance talent in language

Selain bahasa Inggris dan bahasa Indonesia, saya ingin agar anak saya juga menguasai bahasa ketiga, seperti bahasa Prancis atau Mandarin. Menurut saya, anak kami memiliki kemampuan penguasaan bahasa yang tinggi dan saat ini sudah bilingual, jadi sudah selayaknya ia mencoba mempelajari bahasa ketiga.

'Other than English and Indonesian, I hope my child acquires a third language, such as French or Mandarin. In my view, our child has a high language learning ability and currently [he is] already bilingual, so it is a good idea that he learns a third language' (Btb, February 2014).

Btb has a plan to send her child overseas for her university years, and she herself did her bachelor's degree in Indonesia and PhD overseas. She hopes for her child, who speaks fluent Indonesian and English, to work and live in Australia. Btb thinks a third language, such as French or Mandarin, will be a good addition, as her daughter has high ability for language learning.

6.1.3. Aspirations for their children's residential locations

In response to the question, "In your mind, where will your children reside and work in the future?", from 47 replies, 13 participants answered "Indonesia". A further 16 participants gave various countries that can be categorized as "overseas", such as the US, Singapore, Australia and the United Kingdom. Answers from six participants can be categorized as including both Indonesia and overseas, while another 12 answers can be categorized as "Do not know yet".

Future residential locations	Numbers of families
Indonesia	13
Overseas	16
Both Indonesia and Overseas	6
Do not know yet	12
Total	47

Table 18. Future country of residence of participants' children

Below are examples of the answers. As in the previous section, the background information on the participants was gathered through other questions in the questionnaire.

Example 10. Indonesia or Singapore

Indonesia/Singapura

'Indonesia/Singapore' (Yutyo, December 2014).

Currently living with his family in Depok, a suburb integrated with Greater Jakarta, Yutyo grew up in Bandung and Jakarta. He hopes his children will follow higher education both in Indonesia and overseas, and for their place of work, Yutyo specifically stated he would like them to either stay in Indonesia or, if overseas, work in Singapore.

Example 11. Indonesia or South East Asia

Di Indonesia atau negara tetangga seperti Malaysia, Singapore, dll

'In Indonesia or neighbouring countries such as Malaysia, Singapore, etc.' (Lazw, November 2014).

Lazw grew up in Indonesia, in the province of West Sumatra. She and her children live in Depok, West Java, which is an integral part of Greater Jakarta. She wishes for her children to be overseas, but in neighbouring countries so that it is easy for her to visit and vice versa.

Example 12. Asia and Europe, but also wishing that her son develop rural Indonesia

Singapura atau negara-negara Eropa. Sekiranya dia bekerja di Indonesia, saya berharap dia tidak bekerja di Jakarta, tapi lebih mengembangkan daerah tertinggal dan mungkin bekerja sama dengan lembaga-lembaga dari luar negeri.

‘Singapore or European countries. If he works in Indonesia, I wish him to work in Jakarta to develop the isolated areas and perhaps be collaborating with overseas bodies’ (Doja, February 2014).

Doja, a freelance journalist, grew up in Jakarta, Indonesia. She and her family live in Serpong, South Tangerang, which is an integrated suburb of Greater Jakarta. Doja has a very particular wish for her kid: either to work overseas or, if in Indonesia, to work in underdeveloped areas.

Example 13. Legal resident of Indonesia, working in Europe

Berdomisili hukum di Indonesia, namun bekerja di Inggris atau Jerman.

‘Have legal resident of Indonesia, but work in England or Germany’ (KKHad, November 2014).

KKHad, a litigator, grew up in three cities in Indonesia (Bandung, Medan and Jakarta). He and his wife and two sons live in Depok, West Java, an integrated suburb of Greater Jakarta. KKHad wishes her children to remain as residents of Indonesia, although working in Europe.

Example 14. Overseas or Indonesia is not important. Daughter needs to be able to live anywhere.

Tidak tahu dan tidak penting. Di dalam dan di luar negeri sama saja. Anak saya harus mampu tinggal di mana saja ia mau.

‘I don’t know and it’s not important. My child should be able to live where she wishes’ (SSHD, February 14).

SSHD, an academic and part-time musician, grew up in Jakarta, Indonesia. Both of his parents come from a village in South Sumatra. Together with his wife and

daughter, he lives in Ciputat, South Tangerang, an integrated suburb of Greater Jakarta. He gives freedom to his daughter to choose where to live.

Example 15. Depends on the wish of the child

Di mana saja sesuai keinginan anak saya.

‘Where my child wishes’ (Alyul, February 2014).

Raised in South Sumatra, Alyul and her family live in the centre of Jakarta. She sends her children to bilingual school and aims to have them continue on to university both in Indonesia and overseas. To her, the location of her children’s workplace is not for her to decide.

6.1.4. The globalized world

The data I collected show that participants want their children to be part of the globalized world, and that they believe their children will achieve such a goal by both making sure that they acquire more than one foreign language and by working overseas. In Chapter Four, I discussed the process of how nationalism transformed into globalization. In this chapter, I discuss hybridity to get an understanding of the reasons why participants wish their children to acquire multiple foreign languages. Hybridity, according to Spencer and Wollman (2002, 159-162), is a fluid state of multiple and mixed identities that changed constantly. Appadurai, extending Anderson’s *Imagined Communities*, describes hybridity through different scapes, including: “a), ethnoscapas, referring to flows of immigrants, refugees, exiles, guest workers and tourists; b), technoscapas, referring to the rapid movement of technology across boundaries; c), financescapas, referring to rapid flows of money via stock exchanges and other resources; d), mediascapas, referring to flows of images and information via consolidated media; and e), ideoscapas, referring to flows of ideas, largely emanating from the west, which typically espouse an enlightened worldview”. In the 21st century, many persons live in those ‘scapes’ or worlds “and thus are able to contest and sometimes even subvert the imagined world of the official mind and the entrepreneurial mentality that surrounds them” (Appadurai 1996, 4, 8, 22, 33-37; Higgins 2011, 3, 5). This creates: “a), individualization, seeing a person as a complete whole, not a subordinate; b), internationalization, the multiplication of inter-state interdependencies

and arrangements; c), societalization, the establishment of the modern nation-state as the only possible form of society; and d), humanization, the global establishment of the view that humanity cannot be differentiated by race, class, gender, etc., in terms of its possibilities and rights” (Roberston 1992, 25-31; Waters 2001, 183-184).

Higgins points out that globalization “requires us to take a deeper look at how identity is formed in relation to mobility and the transgression of modernist boundaries” (Higgins 2011, 1, 2). For example, additional language learning might give rise to new identities that are not tied to traditionally defined ethnolinguistic, national, or cultural identities, and in the globalized world, the continual flows of global and local influences change the linguistic landscapes (Higgins 2009, 149). Even in countries like Japan, where foreign languages used to be treated as firmly separate from Japanese, nowadays the mixing of English and Japanese is common (Higgins 2009, 150).

As discussed in Chapter Two, Bourdieu (2001, 3) sees globalization and what comes after in a less positive light. He argues that the US has gained advantages in many fields (such as finance, politics and culture) through the widespread use of English. The countries with weaker economic capitals could only follow the rules stipulated by the stronger economy and are forced to let foreign economy enter their national border (Bourdieu 2001, 2) and dominate in every field. Upper-middle class urban Indonesians who can afford the tuition fee of the international schools or bilingual schools send their children to such schools to ensure their fluency in English. In this way, parents hope their children can reap the benefit of globalization; in other words, they hope their children can be Indonesians who can survive beyond the national border.

6.1.5. Definitions of code-switching and borrowing

To find out about the languages that are used when the participants and their children interact in the home, I requested that participants record their family conversations using their own devices. The recordings are meant to be used for triangulation, to prove that the data provided by participants in the questionnaires are represented in their daily family conversations. Of the total number of 54 participants, 26 gave their consent to do audio and/or video recordings. In total, there were 28 audio recordings collected on conversations between either one or both parents, and their children. The participants

recorded up to 3 videos/audio per family, with each recording varying between 5 and 20 minutes in length. A total of 32 video recordings, which were done mostly at home and in the family car, were collected. The recordings were made using a smart phone owned by the parents and recorded by these parents themselves, or by another family member, without my presence. The recordings show that 11 parents code-switch between Indonesian, English and other foreign languages.

Languages used by participants	Numbers of families
Indonesian	4
Indonesian and Regional	1
English and Indonesian	5
Engl, Ind and another foreign language	2
Mostly Engl and some Indonesian	4
English	1
Total	17

Table 19. Home language participants speak with their children

Code-switching refers to the phenomenon in which bilinguals talk to each other using both languages (Harding-Esch and Riley 2003, 63). The motivations for code-switching are mainly contextual, situational and personal, as shown in the examples below (Hoffmann 1991, 115). Grosjean points out that code-switching is a very useful practice in bilingual communication in situations where the speakers cannot find a suitable word or expression in one of the languages available to them (Grosjean 1982, 148-150).

Romaine identifies three types of code-switching: tag switching, intersentential and intrasentential switching (Romaine 1989, 112-113). Tag switching involves inserting a tag in one language into another language. For example, a case of English-Indonesian tag switching would be, “We will go to the zoo, *kan?*” (“We will go the zoo, right?”). Intersentential switching requires more fluency in both languages, as the switch that occurs at a clause or sentence boundary “must follow the rules of both languages”. Consider the following example, from an Indonesian-English bilingual: “*Ceritanya mengharukan sekali*, brought tears to my eyes” (“The story is touching, it brought tears to my eyes”). Intrasentential switching demands the most fluency of speakers, because

it “occurs within the word, clause or sentence boundary”. The following is an example from an Indonesian-English bilingual: “Why are you laughing? Use your brain *deh supaya* not get punished by *ibu guru*” (“Why are you laughing? Please use your brain so that you won’t get punished by the female teacher”) (Romaine 1989, 112-113). Lastly, Hoffman suggested that phonological code-switching may take place where the speakers change from normal pronunciation patterns. An example would be, “This is *Vincent*, my cousin”, where the pronunciation of Vincent switches to the French pronunciation (vẽsã) in the middle of an English sentence.

Code-switching is often seen as a sign of linguistic incompetence and thus may be stigmatized (Hoffmann 1991, 211, Milroy and Gordon 2003, 109). This perception may partly be due to the ideology of linguistic purity, as manifest in the aforementioned early research on bilingualism in the United States on newly arrived immigrants whose competence in English is low. Since many monolinguals see code-switching as a “grammarless mixture of two languages, jargon or gibberish violating monolinguals’ own rule-governed language”, bilinguals tend to only code-switch with like-minded fellows (Grosjean 1982, 145-146). Bilinguals themselves have different attitudes towards code-switching (Hoffmann 1991, 113). Some see it as part of being bilingual, while others see it as laziness and thus try to avoid it.

Interestingly, bilingual speakers are not necessarily aware that they code-switch during conversation (Milroy and Gordon 2003, 210) and, more generally, bilinguals do not always report accurately on their language behaviour (Milroy and Gordon 2003, 211). This owes largely to the fact that people tend to claim the use of the more prestigious language than the less prestigious one. This attitude shows that code-switching constitutes “a habitual and often necessary part of social interaction among bilinguals” (Hoffmann 1991, 116). The possible inaccuracy of the participants’ self-reporting in the current research, in this case the questionnaire, must therefore be cross-checked with observation, which, in the case of this study is through the audio/video recording method.

It is also worth noting that Harding-Esch and Riley (2003) distinguish code-switching from borrowing. Borrowing is “a situation where a word or expression from another language is ‘naturalized’ and used in the other”, as for example in the phrase, *ik heb een geprint boek besteld*, where the English word “print” is given the

prefix *ge-* in order to say, “I have ordered a printed book” in the Dutch language. Language choice is also another term used in this context, meaning that the speaker changes from one language to another according to the person she’s speaking to (Harding-Esch and Riley 2003, 63). As an example, a trilingual Indonesian-French-English female may use Indonesian when addressing her mother, switch to French when speaking to her paternal grandmother and then immediately use English to explain everything to her British cousin during a family gathering (Harding-Esch and Riley 2003, 63).

The sections below present transcriptions of some of the video/audio recordings from this study. The recordings show that, even though parents want their children to speak fluent English and include it as one of the languages in the home, they nonetheless continue to include Indonesian in conversation with their children.

6.2. Parents who do not use English

6.2.1. Speaking Indonesian

The following is an example of a transcription of conversation between parents and their child, showing the parents speaking solely Indonesian and the child responding in Indonesian. The example is taken from a family conversation between the mother, Doja, the father, JWSat, and their six year-old son, Ramon, recorded in September 2014. When this conversation was recorded, Ramon was attending a bilingual school and his parents planned to move him to a regular Indonesian school once he commenced elementary school.

Conversation 1. The magic airplane³⁹

Speaker	Example
Doja	<i>Terus ... gimana dia hidup .. hidupnya gimana ... bagaimana dia bisa tetap hidup?</i> ‘Then .. how does he live? How is his life? How come he stayed alive?’
Ramon	<i>Euuuh ... Masih bagus.</i> ‘euh .. still good.’
Doja	<i>Masih bagus? Bagaimana dia bisa keluar dari pesawatnya itu pesawatnya udah pecah 2 gitu tadi?</i> ‘Still good? How did he get out of the plane while it was broken into two pieces?’
Ramon	<i>Karena</i> ‘Because ...’
JWSat	<i>Bagaimana mereka bisa menyelamatkan diri?</i> ‘How did they save themselves?’
Ramon	<i>Karena lagi gini jadi ... pintunya lepas di airport. Jatuh ke jalan airport.</i> ‘Because of this ... the door was taken off at the airport. [It] fell on the street of the airport.’
JWSat	<i>Jalan airport namanya apa?</i> ‘What is airport street called?’
Ramon	<i>Landasan. Jatuh ke landasan pintunya. Terus seluncurkan balon keluar terus selamat. Tapi ada yg terbakar di belakang.</i> ‘Runway. The door fell onto the runway. Then the safety balloon popped out then [all were] saved. But there was something burnt at the back.’

The example shows that Doja and JWSat consistently speak Indonesian to Ramon. Based on the questionnaire answer, her decision to speak solely Indonesian to her son is based on her belief that a child should acquire the mother tongue properly, as it

³⁹ As my study focuses on showing the code-switching practice in the home without any in-depth linguistic analysis, the transcription in this chapter does not follow any specific transcribing protocol.

will make it easy for him to learn another language. Here, we can see that Doja consciously focuses on using Indonesian. This is consistent with her questionnaire answer, in which she stated that she speaks solely Indonesian to their son. The father, JWSat, stated in the questionnaire that he speaks mostly Indonesian and sometimes English to his son, because people around the house speak Indonesian and the (bilingual) school also uses Indonesian. JWSat uses English with his son once in a while to help with school work. The conversation also shows that Ramon consistently speaks Indonesian, following the examples given by his parents. The mother, Doja, and the father, JWSat, were both raised in Jakarta. They grew up with both parents speaking Indonesian to them and went to university in Indonesia.

6.2.2. Code-switching with a Regional Language

In the following example, the father, Dodo, and the mother, Reni, raise their children, Ambi and Maman, mainly in Indonesian. Dodo sometimes addresses their children in High Javanese, but Reni speaks only Indonesian with their children. This excerpt of transcription shows a conversation between Dodo, Reni and their two sons who attend elementary schools. The example shows how Dodo includes High-Javanese within his Indonesian sentence (intersentential code-switching). The High-Javanese words are written in bold.

Conversation 2. Let me hold it for you

Speaker	Example
Reni	Imo <i>kejedot</i> nggak tadi? 'Imo, did you knock your head just now?'
Ambi	<i>Hah?</i> 'Huh?'
Reni	<i>Kejedot</i> nggak? 'Did you knock your head ?'
Ambi	<i>Nggak.</i> 'No.'

- Dodo Mo, *papa pegangin terus yok biar nggak **kejedot**. Hanya **iku ku kejedot**.*
 ‘Mo, let me hold it for you to prevent you **from knocking your head**. You know **you can knock your head**. ’
- Maman ... *atau di belakangnya*.
 ‘... Or at the back ...’
- Dodo *Belakang*.
 ‘At the back.’

Dodo was raised in Indonesia, in the cities of Bandung, Medan and the capital, Jakarta, and his parents spoke High Javanese and Indonesian during his formative years. Reni was raised in Indonesia, in the cities of Bandung, Bukittinggi, Tapaktuan, Semarang and Jakarta, but unlike with her brother, her parents only used Indonesian to speak with her during her formative years. They send their two sons to a bilingual school, for religious, mother tongue and nationalism reasons. Both Dodo and Reni went to universities in Indonesia and deem Indonesian and English as equally important for the future of their children. As stated in the questionnaire, the father wishes the children to later work and live in Europe, while the mother does not have any specific wishes as to her children’s future residence. Nevertheless, they choose to focus on Indonesian and Javanese in the home and let their children acquire English at school.

6.3. English as a home language

6.3.1. Code-switching in English, French and Indonesian

The example below shows a transcription of a conversation between the mother, DRz, and her two children, recorded in November 2014. DRz speaks English, Indonesian and French. Brin, the daughter, is 7 years old and the son 3 years old. The daughter attends a French school that uses mostly French in the classroom. The example shows that they speak mostly English, with occasional switches to French and Indonesian here and there. Jarva, the 3 year-old son, did not say a word in this conversation. However, his behaviour induced DRz to code-switch between the three languages.

Conversation 3. When Jarva dropped something

Speaker	Example
DRz	Noooo ... come on come on ... let's play one or two.
Brin	Aaah ... something beginning with ...
DRz	Begins with what?
Brin	Begins with c.
DRz	<u>Ca va, Jarva? Arreter.</u> ' <u>Are you ok, Jarvis? Stop it.</u> '
Brin	Beginning with C, daddy.
DRz	It begins with C. <u>Oh lala</u> , Jarva, <u>tomber</u> <i>deh itunya</i> ... <i>apa?</i> ' <u>Oh my</u> , Jarvis, it <u>fell</u> ... what?'

The example shows that DRz speaks mostly English, with French appearing when she addressed and warned Jarva. The switching between the three languages occurred towards the end due the unexpected fall of Jarva's water bottle. The word Oh la la was pronounced in French (oh lah lah), before she inserted the French word tomber and the Indonesian intrasential switching *deh itunya*, then finished the sentence with the tag switching *apa*. This code-switching with more than two languages could happen because DRz was raised in Indonesian language by her mother, and in a mixture of Indonesian, English and French by her father, such that switching as a mode of speaking is habitual for her. She spent her childhood in Indonesia and went to University in Jakarta. DRz has their daughter enrolled in a French school to prepare her to become a global citizen and said French is the most important language for her daughter because of the school. As a global language, English is also important, and she wishes for her daughter to work and live in New York, France and Indonesia. Although when answering the questionnaire DRz does not include Indonesian as the language she expects her children to speak, as trilingual herself she instinctively uses Indonesian when reacting to Jarva's falling bottle.

6.3.2. Mother and daughter code-switch fluently

The example below shows a family conversation between the mother, WP, and the father, Alim, taken in November 2014. Their two daughters, Syd and Kay, also join

the conversation. The example shows intersentential code-switching between English and Indonesian being done by WP and Syd. Alim, meanwhile, speaks English throughout. All the children attend an international school where English is the sole teaching medium, because Alim and WP want to ensure the continuity of education that their children receive while they were living in the US.

Conversation 4. Handstand was in the past

Speaker	Example
WP	<i>Kenapa ngga di ubin aja?</i> 'Why not on the floor?'
Kay	I did that.
WP	<i>Di ubin. Bisa kan?</i> 'On the floor? You can do it, can't you?'
Kay	I can't.
WP	<i>Kenapa?</i> 'Why?'
Kay	<i>Ketakutan jatuh</i> 'I'm afraid to fall.'
WP	<i>Kenapa? Kan bisa balik lagi</i> 'Why? You can turn yourself back, can't you?'
Kay	I know. It's done.
WP	<i>Takut jatuh</i> 'Afraid to fall.'
Alim	Can't you do it on the mat?
Syd	Remember <i>lagi kecil</i> I <i>bisa kan</i> rolled and do handstand? 'Remember when young I could do rolling and handstand?'
WP	Ya.
Syd	And you know that it's really hard.
WP	<i>Memang susah banget tapi kamu dulu</i> do it all the time. 'It is indeed hard, but you used to do it all the time.'

The conversation shows that WP speaks Indonesian to Kay, but Kay replies always in English. When Alim joined the conversation in English, and Syd began to code-switch

in Indonesian and English, WP also replied with code-switching. Syd and WP demonstrated intersentential code-switching. From the choice of wordings and grammar, we can see that both of them speak both languages fluently. This might be due to the fact that, unlike other participants, who all went to universities in Indonesia, Alim and WP went to universities in the United States for their undergraduate degrees. Their parents raised them in the Indonesian language and they always lived in Indonesia until they graduated from high school. Interestingly, as stated in the questionnaire answer, Alim considers Indonesian and regional languages as his native languages. This might be because his parents speak the regional languages and thereby exposed him to them while he was listening to his parents speaking with each other. WP and Alim enrolled their children in an international school with an eye to the globalized world. Both wish for their children to be fluent in Indonesian and English, as Indonesian is their mother tongue while English is an international language, and they also hope their children will acquire Mandarin, the next important language of the world. They do not have any particular wish as to where their children should reside during their adulthood.

6.3.3. Suffix borrowing when speaking with son

The example below shows a conversation between a father, Fach, and his son, Berry, who attends a bilingual school. In the conversation, Berry was amazed by a fake cake and Fach gave an explanation. The example shows that Fach mostly code-switches between English and Indonesian, while the son speaks mostly English. On one occasion, the father code-switched and borrowed an Indonesian suffix *-nya* (possessive suffix) and combined it with an English word ‘inside’.

Conversation 5. The fake cake

Speaker	Example
Fach	<i>Itu dummy</i> ‘That is a dummy.’
Berry	Dummy? What is dummy?
Fach	Dummy <i>itu artinya</i> ... it’s aaa.... <i>Kue palsu</i> . ‘Dummy means ... it’s euh .. fake cake.’

Berry Huuuh?

Fach It's not a real cake.

Berry But when I try the cake ... like this one ... this one is a real one...
sugar...

Fach Some part of the cake is real, *tau*. Other part is not. Most of it is not
real. *Tuh kan ketuk2 ... bunyinya*. What is that?
'Some part of the cake is real, you know. The other is not. Most of
it is not real. See, try to knock it ... listen to the sound. What is
that?'

Berry You're right. The most inside is not real.

Fac *Apa most insidenya?*
'What's mostly in the inside?'

Berry *Ini*
'This.'

Fach *Itu terbuat dari apa?* What is that?
'What is it made of? What is that?'

Fach code-switches throughout the entire conversation. The reason might be that both Indonesian and English are used at Berry's school. In the questionnaire answer, Fach stated that he sees English as an international language and Indonesian as the mother tongue, and this might be the reason he uses both languages. Although Fach uses mostly English, he switched to Indonesian when he tried to describe what fake cake means, with the hope that Berry would understand. When Berry did not understand the Indonesian translation of fake cake, Fach described it in English. Next to intrasentential and intersentential switching, Fach also used tag switching when inserting the Indonesian word *tau* at the end of an English sentence. At one point, Fach used both intrasentential and suffix borrowing when saying, "*Apa most inside-nya*". Fach grew up with both parents speaking Indonesian to him. He was raised in Indonesia and went to university in Bandung, the capital of West Java, Indonesia.

6.3.4. Inaccurate translation and phonological switching

In the next example, the mother, Fardin, is a teacher at a bilingual school who uses English when teaching. Below is an example of a conversation between Fardin and her

daughter, Eki, at home, in which she tries to explain that honeydew is the English translation of the Indonesian word *melon*. Eki is seven years old and attends first grade. The example shows that they speak English all the time, and the daughter speaks broken English on some occasions.

Conversation 6. Honeydew is different from melon

Speaker	Example
Fardin	What about this one .. what is this?
Eki	A pizza.
Fardin	Oooo I love pizza.
Eki	And this I drink <i>kopi</i> , and this a drink juice, and this a drink flower... so many and this a drink melon.
Fardin	Oh, honeydew?
Eki	No, melon.
Fardin	Melon? What is melon?
Eki	Honeydew!
Fardin	Hehe honeydew.

Fardin and Eki were reading a book together, pointing at the pictures while naming the objects, and using solely English during the conversation. There was a time when Eki confused the Indonesian word *kopi* ‘coffee’ as an English word and used it in her sentence. Eki speaks English with grammar that is not yet well developed, which is especially obvious when she is saying, “And this I drink *kopi*, and this a drink juice, and this a drink flower... so many and this a drink *melon*”. When Eki pointed at a picture while saying, “...and this a drink *melon*”, Fardin was saying, “Oh, honeydew”. The word *melon* is also an Indonesian word meaning ‘cantaloupe’. Here, Fardin incorrectly taught her child that *melon* is not the right word in English; she was saying the word *melon* with a different pronunciation—/melə’n/—assuming it was the right way to Anglicize the pronunciation of a word she thought was Indonesian, and then incorrectly translated the word to “honeydew”. In the questionnaire, Fardin and her husband, Nasr, answered that Nasr speaks solely in Indonesian and Fardin speaks English to their child. The reason that they include English in their home language is because of its “universal nature”. Fardin and Nasr both grew up and went to university in Indonesia and their

parents spoke Indonesian to them during their formative years. They hope their daughter will live in the UK when she is grown up. Their daughter attends a bilingual school, as they believe that she will develop better there, both intellectually and emotionally, than in other types of school.

6.3.5. Daughter code-switches using mostly Indonesian

In this example, the mother, Imbat, the father, Sukas, and their daughter, Syana, were in the car when this conversation takes place. The three of them were negotiating how the daughter, who attends a bilingual school, will get home if their driver, Pak Kasmu, is not back in Jakarta by the time school starts.

Conversation 7. When the driver is not in town

Speaker	Example
Imbat	<i>Terus gimana kalau Pak Kasmu belum datang?</i> 'Then what shall we do if Pak Kasmu is not back yet?'
Syana	I can't go to school.
Imbat	<i>Ya bisa dong masa hanya gara-gara nggak ada Pak Kasmu</i> 'Of course you can. Don't make excuses out of the absence of Pak Kasmu.'
Sukas	Ah ya she has to accept that.
Syana	<i>Pak Kasmu nggak mau balik?</i> 'Will Pak Kasmu never return?'
Imbat	<i>Iya tapi mungkin dia telat.</i> 'He will but might be late.'
Syana	I actually want to go to school.
Imbat	<i>Kamu pulang dengan Basha aja.</i> 'You can go home with Basha.'
Syana	<i>Aku naik taksi aja.</i> 'I prefer to take a taxi.'

The example shows Imbat always speaking Indonesian, Sukas speaking English and the daughter replying mostly in Indonesian. This is interesting because Syana grew up

partly in Australia, while her parents were taking graduate degrees. Yet Syana is willing to reply to the mother in Indonesian, with grammar that shows she speaks the language fluently. Imbat and Sukas grew up in Indonesia, with their parents speaking Indonesian to them, and studied for their bachelor's degrees in Jakarta and postgraduate degrees overseas. They use both English and Indonesian in the home, because, as answered in the questionnaire, they deem both languages important.

6.3.6. Code-switching by inserting one word

Dria is a single mum with a daughter who was born in 2005. The daughter, Feba, goes to an international school where English is the main language for learning and teaching. The conversation below took place at home in December 2014. The daughter was reading a comic book where the characters were on an expedition to the moon and were overwhelmed by a crater created by falling meteors.

Conversation 8. The falling meteor

Speaker	Example
Dria	<p><i>Ini bekas meteor. Meteor kalau jatuh di bulan begini karena dia nggak ada water, kan. There is no water. Jatuh di bulan seperti begitu meteornya.</i></p> <p>‘This is from a meteor. This is how a fallen meteor looks like on the moon because there is no water. Having fallen on the moon, that is how a meteor looks like.’</p>
Feba	<p><i>Jadi pas kalau di earth kayak gini?</i></p> <p>‘So does it look like this on earth?’</p>
Dria	<p><i>Nggak. Kalau di earth kan kayak bintang jauh. Ada air jatuh ke air. Ini kalau di bulan nggak ada air. Jatuh ya jatuh ke dirt, ke tanah. Jadi bolong nih tanahnya kan. Tanahnya bolong</i></p> <p>‘No. When on earth, it looks like a fallen star. If there is water, it will fall into the water. While there is no water on the moon. So when it falls, it falls into the dirt, to earth. So the earth becomes hollow.’</p>

Feba	<i>Dan in kenapa ada question mark?</i> 'And why there is a question mark over here?'
Dria	<i>Dia kaget kok tiba-tiba kok ini ... ada sumur kan. Lagi jalan-jalan kok ada sumur dalam begitu. Apa ini? What is that?</i> 'He was surprised because suddenly there is a well. When walking, suddenly there is a deep well. What is this? What is that?'

In the conversation, Dria mainly spoke Indonesian, with some intrasentential code-switches to English. Feba replied in Indonesian, where she inserted English nouns “earth” and “water” in between her complete Indonesian sentences. Dria code-switched in a similar way to her daughter. She inserted the English nouns “water”, “earth” and “dirt” in her Indonesian sentences. Dria grew up in Indonesia with both parents speaking Indonesian to her. She took her bachelor’s degree in Jakarta and her master’s degree overseas. As answered in the questionnaire Dria sees both Indonesian and English as important for her daughter now and in the future. From her point of view, Indonesian is important because they live in Indonesia where families, friends and rest of the social environment speak Indonesian; while English is important because it is the school language. She wishes for her daughter to live in Indonesia as an adult.

6.3.7. Son speaks only English

This example of transcription shows a conversation that takes place at home in October 2014, between the mother, Mimi, and her second son, Budi, aged 10. Both Mimi’s children attend an international school that uses English as the main teaching medium. The example shows that Mimi code-switches between English and Indonesian, while the son speaks solely English.

Conversation 9. It is bed time now

Speaker	Example
Budi	Ipad fixed?
Mimi	Not yet

Budi	Charger?
Mimi	Not yet. <i>Aku belum sempat.</i> Sorry. I have to bring it to the shop 'Not yet. I didn't have time yet.'
Budi	You have to bring me to that room.
Mimi	What for?
Budi	To accompany me.
Mimi	It's already 10 pm ok. <i>Udah waktunya tidur, lah. Tidur siang nggak?</i> 'It's already 10 pm ok. It's bed time. Did you take a nap?'
Budi	Yes. No
Mimi	<i>Tuh kan. Ini siapa yang milihin bajunya?</i> 'See? Who chose your outfit?'
Budi	Me.
Mimi	<i>Matching</i> 'They match.'

In the conversation, even though Mimi code-switched, the son kept on replying in English. At the end of the conversation, Mimi used the English word "match" with the grammar common for Indonesians, "matching", when she gave the compliment about Budi's outfit matching. Mimi and the father, Lexa, were raised in Indonesia. Mimi was raised in Jakarta, where her parents spoke Indonesian to her, while Lexa was raised in Medan, the capital of the province of North Sumatra, with his parents speaking Karo, the regional language, to him. In the questionnaire, Mimi and Lexa stated that they deem Indonesian and English as equally important. Indonesian is seen as important because they live in Indonesia, and English is seen as the language that opens a lot of opportunities. They speak Indonesian and English with their younger son and English only with their eldest, following his request. Mimi and Lexa do not have any preference for their children's country of residence in their adulthood.

Closing remarks

The data show participants' eagerness to include English as a language in the home to support their children's performance at school. At the same time, most participants keep

on speaking Indonesian to their children, partly as they see Indonesian as the mother tongue, but also because it is needed for bilingual Indonesian-English acquisition for the global world and also, of course, because their children live in Indonesia. Some parents include other foreign languages, such as French, or a relevant regional language in family conversation.

In this chapter, I have shown that most participants communicate with their children in more than one language. This shows that raising children bilingually is a habitus, common for people who have more than one language in the home. Although the children might not develop age-appropriate Indonesian, the data in the video/audio showed that they are able to communicate with their parents. My data shows that although it is true that parents make an effort for their children to speak fluent English, it is not entirely accurate to say that upper-middle class parents neglect totally the development of their children's Indonesian language.

7. Conclusion

7.1. Understanding the use of English in urban Indonesian homes through habitus

This study has been driven by my personal interest in Indonesian parents' use of English in Jakarta to raise their children. What interests me the most when observing interactions between parents and children is witnessing their eagerness to include English as the home language even though their fluency in English is not necessarily high. Naturally, I wanted to understand the motivations for such eagerness, beyond the reason that parents want their children to thrive at school and to be successful participants in the globalized world.

I set out three research questions to investigate this phenomenon. First, I asked, "Why do the urban upper middle-class in Indonesia adopt English as the language of the home, despite the fact that it is not the parents' first language and the surrounding environment is Indonesian-speaking?" Second, I asked, "Why does raising children in a non-native language seem like a normal practice for parents?" Lastly, I ask, "Why do parents seem to have little attachment to the Indonesian language, even though it is the language they grew up speaking and were educated in?" In pursuing these questions, I have been focusing on upper-middle class parents in Jakarta who send their children to schools where English is extensively used.

The central notion of the thesis was introduced in Chapter Two, in which I describe Bourdieu's theory that humans conduct certain activities based on "habitus" (Bourdieu 1977). The theory, which states that habitus are mundane activities conducted without seemingly being formally regulated, posed a challenge for this study, as I wanted to show the process whereby English, a foreign language in Indonesia, becomes part of the home languages in urban Indonesia. To reach my goal, noting the observations of Bourdieu (1998b, 2), who states that collective history is equally as important as present empirical data, I traced the use of languages among Indonesian parents during the eras of the Ethical Policy of Dutch-Indies (1901-1943), the Japanese occupation (1943-1945) and the New Order regime (1966-1998). Habitus is ubiquitous, explaining many different aspects of social interactions, and I applied the concept to the areas of education, language and ideology, social class and globalization. Using this concept has

enabled me to see the thread of languages used at home during those eras, and to explain the habitus associated with the choice of home language of upper-middle class parents in the present day. Focusing on the language policy of each era has guided me to see the relationship between the language of schools stipulated by the state and the choice of home language by parents.

Habitus makes it clear that a social actor's behaviour towards a certain social activity, and the inculcation of certain body language, language and habit by parents, begins at home. I have shown that contemporary parents' decisions to include the school language as one of the languages they speak with their children is a practice inculcated by their own parents when they were growing up. Even though the school language differs between the eras of the Dutch-Indies (Dutch), the Japanese occupation (Indonesian), the New Order (Indonesian) and post-New Order (English), the habitus of including the school language in the home persists.

7.2. Language policy as an influencer of the choice of home language by parents

Analysis of the language attitudes of upper-middle class Indonesian parents in Jakarta has been performed through a questionnaire and observation of interaction between parents and their children through video/audio recordings. My aim in collecting the questionnaire and the video/audio data has been to show what parents think about Indonesian and English, as well as how the families code-switch between Indonesian and English at home. Analysing the questionnaires and the family conversations has enabled me to understand that raising children in the school language has indeed become second nature for upper-middle class Indonesians. My argument is supported by the results from Nababan's 1980 survey on the home language of people in urban areas (Nababan 1985), which showed that the Indonesian was the dominant language in the home in Jakarta. Following from this, I have sought to show that including English, the school language of English language schools, as the language in the home is a habitus inculcated by the parents of the participants of this study when they were growing up during the New Order era. To further support my argument, I traced the language of the school during the Ethical Policy of the Dutch-Indies (1901-1943) and during the Japanese occupation (1943-1945).

A few central points have been uncovered from this study. I examined Dutch language at school during the Dutch-Indies era and the Indonesian language during the Japanese occupation (Chapter 3), underlining the fact that in both cases, the school languages have always been the languages of prestige. Dutch became the language used by the educated native elites, which ironically was used as the medium to discuss the project of nationalism in Indonesia. The discussion in Dutch among the educated elites led to the idea of using Malay, later renamed Indonesian, as the common language that would unite the people of the archipelago. The Indonesian language was further cultivated during the Japanese occupation and used for war propaganda purposes. During this time Indonesian was disseminated through, among others, its function as the school language.

The ideology (Irvine and Gal 2000) of the educated elites is disseminated through language policy (Spolsky 2004). My analysis in Chapter Four has underlined the practical nature of language policies in independent Indonesia, which, in turn, led to the understanding that language is a tool for economic advancement. The propaganda of the New Order aimed at urging parents to speak Indonesian to their children was based on the national language ideology, which states, “The whole nation speak the same language” (Heller 2007, 4). However, my discussion has shown that the fast dissemination of Indonesian as the national language in order to create unity and the instruction to use Indonesian as the school language, has given rise to a view of the school language as the language for securing good employment.

Chapter 5 focused on language shift (Gal 1979), and a comparison was drawn of the Laws that stipulated the language of the school during and after the New Order. I showed that during the New Order, the main school language was Indonesian and, in some regions, regional languages functioned as the interim language. After the New Order, English became the school language for some private schools. A detailed discussion was presented showing that during the New Order, English language schools were exclusively for foreign nationals, while after the New Order, Indonesian citizens who could afford the high tuition fee were free to attend. I showed that the habitus of raising children in the school language, which began in pre-independent Indonesia and continued post New Order, has created language shifts. The subsequent analysis of

questionnaire data has shown that parents view the use of English in the home as having several functions, including helping their children succeed at school and later in the global world.

In the discussion on bilingualism and code-switching, the strong motivation of most parents in including English when speaking to their children was demonstrated in the samples of audio/video recordings. In Chapter 6, I have shown that parents code-switched between Indonesian and English as well as between Indonesian and other languages such as Javanese and French, which is evidence that parents are eager to support their children's English development and at the same time continue to value Indonesian as the language in the family. Through this research data, it became clear that parents' fluency of English is varied. The recorded interactions corroborated the results of the questionnaire, in which parents stressed that they wished for their children to be fluent in Indonesian as well.

7.3. Final remarks

Bourdieu's habitus has been discussed in this study as the theoretical framework to analyse and interpret the research data, and I have shown that habitus is a concept that can be applied in areas of education, language and ideology, social class and globalization. The concept of habitus has been employed to argue that there is a common thread of raising children in a school language among upper-middle class Indonesians, and this began with the Ethical Policy of the Dutch-Indies and continues to the present day. I have argued that, even though the school languages differed from one era to another, the habitus of raising children in the school language remains. I have shown that, even though parents are eager to support their children's English language development, most parents keep on using Indonesian in family conversation, which means that they still see the Indonesian language as important for their children.

The focus of my study was on the home language of upper-middle class Indonesians in Jakarta whose children attend English language schools. Indonesia's linguistic and

economic diversity means that the family language practices I examined in this study may or may not be applicable to the practices of families in different linguistic and economic groups. I do, however, hope that this study can be used as the basis for discussion on family language practices across different settings in Indonesia or beyond.

References

- Ager, D. 2001. *Motivation in Language Planning and Language Policy*. Edited by J Edward, *Multilingual Matters 119*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Alisjahbana, S. 1966. *Indonesia: Social and Cultural Revolution*. Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press.
- Alisjahbana, S. T. 1976. *Language Planning for Modernization: The Case of Indonesian and Malaysian*. The Hague: Mouton & Co.
- Alisjahbana, S. T. 1986. "The Relation of Language, Thought and Culture as Reflected in the Development of the Indonesian Language." *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* no. 1986 (62): 25-50.
- Anderson, B. 1966. "The Languages of Indonesian Politics." *Indonesia* (1): 89-116.
- Anderson, B. 1990. *Language and Power: Exploring Political Cultures in Indonesia*. New York: Cornell University Press.
- Anderson, B. 2006. *Imagined Communities: Reflection on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso.
- Anwar, K. 1980. *Indonesian: The Development and Use of a National Language*. Yogyakarta: Gajah Mada University Press.
- Appadurai, A. 1996. *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. Edited by D Gaonkar and B Lee. Vol. 1, *Public Worlds*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Austin, P.K. 2012. Language Use and Language Choice in Lombok, Eastern Indonesia.
- Baker, C. 2000. *The Care and Education of Young Bilinguals: An Introduction for Professionals*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Barker, J. 2008. "Beyond Bandung: Developmental Nationalism and (Multi)Cultural Nationalism in Indonesia." *Third World Quarterly* no. 29 (3): 521-540.
- Bloomfield, L. 1935. *Language*. London: Allen & Unwin.
- Boroditsky, L. 2001. "Does Language Shape Thought?: Mandarin and English Speakers' Conception of Time." *Cognitive Psychology* no. 43 (1): 1-22.
- Bourchier, D. 2014. *Illiberal Democracy in Indonesia: The Ideology of the Family State*. Ebook ed. New York: Routledge.
- Bourdieu, P. 1971. "Systems of education and systems of thought." In *Knowledge and Control: New Directions for the Sociology of Education*, edited by M. F. D Young. London: Collier-MacMillan.

- Bourdieu, P. 1974a. "Scholastic excellence and the values of the educational system." In *Contemporary Research in the Sociology of Education*, edited by J Eggleston. York: Methuen.
- Bourdieu, P. 1974b. "The school as a conservative force: Scholastic and cultural inequalities." In *Contemporary Research in the Sociology of Education*, edited by J Eggleston. York: Methuen.
- Bourdieu, P. 1977. *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. 1984. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. Translated by R Nice. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Bourdieu, P. 1985. "The Social Space and the Genesis of Groups." *Theory and Society* no. 14: 723-744.
- Bourdieu, P. 1986a. "The aristocracy of culture." In *Media, Culture and Society: A Critical Reader*, edited by R Collins, J Curran, N Garnham, P Scannell, P Schlesinger and C Sparks. London: Sage.
- Bourdieu, P. 1986b. "The production of belief: Contribution to an economy of symbolic goods " In *Media, Culture and Society: A Critical Reader*, edited by R Collins, J Curran, N Garnham, P Scannell, P Schlesinger and C Sparks. London: Sage.
- Bourdieu, P. 1986-1987. "The Force of Law: Toward a Sociology of the Juridical Field." *The Hastings Law Journal* no. 38 (5): 805-853.
- Bourdieu, P. 1989. "Social Space and Symbolic Power." *Sociological Theory* no. 7 (1): 14-25.
- Bourdieu, P. 1990. *The Logic of Practice*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bourdieu, P. 1991. *Language and Symbolic Power*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. 1994. "Rethinking the State: Genesis Structure of the Bureaucratic Field." *Sociological Theory* no. 12 (1): 1-18.
- Bourdieu, P. 1996. *The State Nobility: Elite Schools in the Field of Power*. Cambridge: Polity press.
- Bourdieu, P. 1998a. *On Television and Journalism*. London: Pluto press.
- Bourdieu, P. 1998b. *Practical Reason: On the Theory of Action*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bourdieu, P. 2000. *Pascalian Meditations*. Oxford: Polity Press.

- Bourdieu, P. 2001. "Uniting to Better Dominate." *Social Science Research Council (US)* no. 2 (3-4): 1-6.
- Bourdieu, P. 2004. "From the King's House to the Reason of State: A Model of the Genesis of the Bureaucratic Field." *Constellations* no. 11 (1): 16-36.
- Bourdieu, P. 2006. "The forms of capital." In *Education, Globalisation and Social Change*, edited by H Lauder, P Brown, J-A Dillabough and A Halsey. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bourdieu, P, and T Eagleton. 1994. "Doxa and common life: An interview." In *Mapping Ideology*, edited by S Žižek. London: Verso.
- Bourdieu, P, and J-C Passeron. 1977. *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture*. London: Sage publications.
- Bourdieu, P, and J-C Passeron. 1979. *The Inheritors: French Students and Their Relation to Culture*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Bourdieu, P, and L Wacquant. 1992. *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Brubacker, R. 1985. "Rethinking Classical Theory: The Sociological Vision of Pierre Bourdieu." *Theory and Society* no. 14 (6): 745-775.
- Brugmans, I. 1987. "Politik pengajaran/Teaching politics." In *Politik Etis dan Revolusi Kemerdekaan/The Ethical Policy and Independence Revolution*, edited by H Baudet and I Brugmans. Jakarta: Yayasan Obor Indonesia.
- Burns, P. 2004. *The Leiden Legacy: Concepts of Law in Indonesia*. Leiden: KITLV Press.
- Butt, S, and T Lindsey. 2012. *The Constitution of Indonesia: A Contextual Analysis* Oxford: Hart Publishing.
- Carder, M. 2007. *Bilingualism in International Schools: A Model for Enriching Language Education*. Vol. 8, *Parents' and Teachers' Guides*. Clevedon: Multilingual matters.
- Central Bureau Statistics, Indonesian. 2010. *Inhabitants Age Five and Above Based on Age Group and the Ability to Speak Indonesian*. edited by Central Bureau of Statistics of the Republic of Indonesia. Jakarta: Central Bureau of Statistics of the Republic of Indonesia.
- Central For Education and Culture Data and Statistics. 2017. *Education Statistics in Brief 2017/2018*. Edited by Sudarwati. Jakarta: Ministry of Education and Culture.

- Collier, V, and W Thomas. 2004. "The Astounding Effectiveness of Dual Language Education For All." *Journal of Research and Practice* no. 2 (1): 1-20.
- Cummins, J. 2000. *Language, Power and Pedagogy*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Dardjowidjojo, S. 1998. "Strategies for a Successful National Language Policy: The Indonesian Case." *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* no. 130: 35-48.
- Dardjowidjojo, S. 2000. "English Teaching in Indonesia." *EA Journal* no. 18 (1): 22-30.
- De Jong, L. 2002. *The Collapse of a Colonial Society: The Dutch in Indonesia During the Second World War*. Leiden: KITLV Press.
- Desan, M.H. 2013. "Bourdieu, Marx and Capital: A Critique of the Extension Model." *Sociological Theory* no. 31 (4): 318-342.
- Dikdasmen 2019. "Daftar Satuan Pendidikan Kerjasama per January 2019/List of Numbers of Cooperative Education Providers by January 2019". Accessed March 2019.<http://dikdasmen.kemdikbud.go.id/index.php/daftar-satuan-pendidikan-kerja-sama-per-januari-2019/>
- Dick, H.W. 1985. "The Rise of Middle Class and the Changing Concept of Equity in Indonesia: An Interpretation." *Indonesia* (39): 71-92.
- DiMaggio, P. 1979. "Review: On Pierre Bourdieu." *American Journal of Sociology* no. 84 (6): 1460-1474.
- Durkheim, E. 1984. *The Division of Labor in Society*. New York: MacMillan.
- Edwards, J. 1995. *Multilingualism*. London: Penguin books.
- Edwards, J. 2012. *Multilingualism: Understanding Linguistic Diversity*. London: Continuum.
- Elson, R. 2005. "Constructing the Nation: Ethnicity, Race, Modernity and Citizenship in Early Indonesian Thought." *Asian Ethnicity* no. 6 (3): 145-160.
- Elson, R. 2008. *The Idea of Indonesia: A History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Embree, E, M Simon, and W.B Mumford. 1934. *Island India Goes to School*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Errington, J. 2001. "State speech for peripheral publics in Java." In *Languages and publics: the making of authority*, edited by S Gal and K Woolard. St. Jerome Publishing.
- Errington, J. 2006. "Going 'Un-Native' in Indonesia(n)." *Social Analysis* no. 50 (1): 178-183.

- Fierman, W. 1991. *Language Planning and National Development: The Uzbek Experience*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Fishman, J. 1968. "Nationality-nationalism and nation-nationism." In *Language Problems of Developing Nations*, edited by J Fishman, C Ferguson and J Das Gupta. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Fishman, J. 1991. *Reversing Language Shift: Theoretical and Empirical Foundations of Assistance for Threatened Languages*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Fitzsimons, P. 2000. "Changing Conceptions of Globalization: Changing Conceptions of Education." *Educational Theory* no. 50 (4): 505-520.
- Furnivall, J. 1942. "Colonial Southeast Asia: Instruction for Education." *Pacific Affairs* no. 15 (1): 77-89.
- Gal, S. 1979. *Language Shift: Social Determinants of Linguistic Change in Bilingual Austria*. New York: Academic Press.
- Gal, S. 1992. "Multicliplity and Contention Among Ideologies." *Pragmatics* no. 2 (3): 445-449.
- García, O. 2009. *Bilingual Education in the 21st Century: A Global Perspective*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Garnham, N., and R Williams. 1986. "Pierre Bourdieu and the sociology of culture." In *Media, culture and society*, edited by R Collins, J Curran, N Garnham, P Scannell, P Schlesinger and C Sparks. London: Sage.
- Garrett, P. 2010. *Attitudes to Language*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Geertz, H. 1963. "Indonesian cultures and communities". In *Indonesia*. New Haven: HRAF Press
- Gellner, E. 1983. *Nations and Nationalism*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Goebel, Z. 2008. "Enregistering, Authorizing and Denaturalizing Identity in Indonesia." *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* no. 18 (1): 46-61.
- Greene, J.C. 2007. *Mixed Methods in Social Inquiry*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Grenfell, M. 2008. "Interest." In *Pierre Bourdieu: Key concepts*, edited by M Grenfell. Stocksfield: Acumen.
- Grenfell, M. 2012. "Bourdieu: A theory of practice." In *Bourdieu, Language and Linguistics*. London: Continuum.
- Grosjean, F. 1982. *Life with Two Languages: An Introduction to Bilingualism*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Hadisantosa, N. 2010. *Insights from Indonesia*. The British Council.

- Halim, A. 1971. "Multilingualism in Relation to the Development of Bahasa Indonesia." *RELC journal* no. 2 (4): 4-19.
- Harding-Esch, E, and P Riley. 2003. *The Bilingual Family: A Handbook for Parents*. Cambridge: Cambridge University press.
- Hardy, C. 2008a. "Doxa." In *Pierre Bourdieu: Key Concepts* edited by M Grenfell. Stocksfield: Acumen.
- Hardy, C. 2008b. "Hysteresis." In *Pierre Bourdieu: Key concepts*, edited by M Grenfell. Stockfield: Acumen.
- Harper, S. 2011. "Counting the Costs of a Global Anglophonic Hegemony: Examining the Impact of U.S Language Education Policy on Linguistic Minorities Worldwide." *Indiana Journal of Global Legal Studies* no. 18 (1): 515- 538.
- Haugen, E. 1959. "Planning for a Standard Language in Modern Norway." *Anthropoligcal Linguistics* no. 1 (3): 8-21.
- Heller, M. 2007. "Bilingualism as ideology and practice." In *Bilingualism: A Social Approach*. Baringstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Heryanto, A. 1995. *Language Development and Development of Language: The Case of Indonesia*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Heryanto, A. 1999. "The years of living luxuriously." In *Challenging Authoritarianism in Southeast Asia*, edited by A Heryanto and S Mandal. London: Routledge Curzon.
- Higgins, C. 2009. *English as a local language: post-colonial identities and multilingual practices* Multilingual Matters.
- Higgins, C. 2011. "The formation of L2 selves in a globalizing world." In *Identity Formation in Globalizing Context: Language Learning in the New Millenium*, edited by C Higgins. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Hobsbawm, E. 1987. *The Age of Empire 1875 - 1914*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.
- Hobsbawm, E. 1990. *Nations and Nationalism since 1780*. Cambridge: Universty press.
- Hobsbawm, E. 1994. *The Age of Extremes: A History of the World 1914-1991*. New York: Pantheon books.
- Hoffmann, C. 1991. *An Introduction to Bilingualism*. London: Longman.
- Hornberger, N. 1989. "Continua Biliteracy." *Review of Educational Research* no. 59 (3): 271-296.

- Hornberger, N. 1994. "Literacy and Language Planning." *Language and Education* no. 8 (1-2): 75-86.
- Irvine, J, and S Gal. 2000. "Language ideology and linguistic differentiation." In *Regimes of Language: Ideologies, Politics, and Identities*, edited by P Kroskrity, 35-84. New Mexico: School of American Research Press.
- Johnstone, B. 2000. *Qualitative Methods in Sociolinguistics*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Joseph, J. 2004. *Language and Identity: National, Ethnic, Religious*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Kaplan, R, and R Baldauf Jr. 1997. *Language Planning from Practice to Theory*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Kartodirdjo, S. 1984. *Modern Indonesia: Tradition and Transformation, a Socio-Historical Perspective*. Yogyakarta: Gadjah Mada University Press.
- Keane, W. 2003. "Public Speaking: On Indonesian as the Language of the Nation." *Public Culture* no. 15 (3): 503-529.
- Kedourie, E. 1996. *Nationalism*. Oxford: Blackwell publishers.
- Kitley, P. 1999. "Pancasila in the Minor Key: TVRI's "Si Unyil" Models the Child." *Indonesia* no. 68: 129-52.
- Kroskrity, P. 2005. "Language ideologies." In *A Companion to Linguistic Anthropology*, edited by A Duranti. Malden: Blackwell.
- Lauder, H, P Brown, J-A Dillabough, and A.H Halsey. 2006. "Introduction: the prospects for education: individualization, globalization and social change." In *Education, Globalization and Social Change*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Lev, D. 1990. "Notes on the middle class and change in Indonesia." In *The Politics of Middle Class Indonesia*, edited by R Tanter and K Young. Victoria: Center of Southeast Asian Studies, Monash University.
- Liddicoat, A. 2013. *Language-in-Education Policies: The Discursive Construction of Intercultural Relations*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Lowenberg, P. 1992. "Language Policy and Language Identity in Indonesia." *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication* no. 3 (1): 59- 77
- Macnamara, J. 1967. "The Bilingual's Linguistic Performance: A Psychological Overview." *Journal of Social Issues* no. 23 (2): 59-77.

- Mahmud, M. 2008. "Speaking Bugis and Speaking Indonesian in South Sulawesi." *Review of Indonesian and Malaysian Affairs* no. 42 (2): 67-92.
- Maier, H.M.J. 1993. "From Heteroglossia to Polyglossia: The Creation of Malay and Dutch in the Indies." *Indonesia* (56): 37-65.
- Maton, K. 2008. "Habitus." In *Pierre Bourdieu: Key Concepts*, edited by M Grenfell. Stockfield: Acumen.
- Maxwell, J. 2013. *Qualitative Research Design: An Interactive Approach*. Vol. 41, *Applied Social Research Method Series*. London: Sage Publications.
- May, S. 2007. "Language policy and minority rights." In *An Introduction to Language Policy: Theory and Method*, edited by T Ricento. Malden: Blackwell Publishing.
- Mayall, J. 2010. *National Plus Schools and the Indonesian National Education Policy: Background, Function and Major Issues*, The University of Western Australia, Perth.
- Mejía de, A. 2002. *Power, Prestige and Bilingualism: International Perspectives on Elite Bilingual Education*. Clevedon: Multilingual matters.
- Miles, M, and A.M Huberman. 1984. *Qualitative Data Analysis: A Sourcebook of New Method*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.
- Milroy, L, and M Gordon. 2003. *Sociolinguistics: Method and Interpretation*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Moeliono, A. 1993. "The first efforts to promote and develop Indonesian." In *The Earliest Stage of Language Planning: The "First Congress" Phenomenon*, edited by J Fishman. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Moore, R. 2004. "Cultural Capital: Objective Probability and the Cultural Arbitrary." *British Journal of Sociology of Education* no. 25 (4): 445-56.
- Moore, R. 2008. "Capital." In *Pierre Bourdieu: Key Concepts*, edited by M Grenfell. Stocksfield: Acumen.
- Moriyama, M. 2005. *Sundanese Print Culture and Modernity in 19th-Century West Java*. Singapore: Singapore University Press.
- Moriyama, M. 2012. "Regional languages and decentralisation in post-New Order Indonesia: The case of Sundanese." In *Words in Motion: Language and Discourse in Post-New Order Indonesia*, edited by K Foulcher, M Moriyama and M Budiman. Singapore: NUS Press.
- Nababan, P. 1974. "Language, Culture and Language Teaching." *RELC journal* no. 5 (18): 18-30.

- Nababan, P. 1985. "Bilingualism in Indonesia: Ethnic Language Maintenance and the Spread of the National Language." *Asian Journal of Social Science* no. 13 (1): 1-18.
- Nababan, P. 1991. "Language in Education: The Case of Indonesia." *International Review of Education* no. 37 (1): 115-131.
- Nash, R. 1990. "Bourdieu on Education and Social and Cultural Reproduction." *British Journal of Sociology of Education* no. 11 (4): 431-447.
- Nash, R. 2003. "Social explanation and socialization: On Bourdieu and the structure, disposition, practice scheme." *The sociological review* no. 51 (1): 43-62.
- Nichterlein, S. 1974. "Language and Values in Indonesia." *Melbourne Studies in Education* no. 16 (1): 222-240.
- Nunan, D. 2003. "The Impact of English as a Global Language Teaching." *TESOL Quarterly* no. 37 (4):589-613.
- Onishi, N. 2010. "As English spreads, Indonesians fear for their language." *The New York Times*, 25 July.
- Paauw, S. 2009. "One Land, One Nation, One Language: An Analysis of Indonesia's National Language Policy." *University of Rochester Working Papers in the Language Sciences* no. 5 (1): 2-16.
- Papastephanou, M. 2005. "Globalisation, Globalism and Cosmopolitanism as an Educational Ideal." *Educational Philosophy and Theory* no. 37 (4): 533-551.
- Pardede, R., and S Zahro.2017. "Saving not Spending: Indonesia's Domestic Demand Problem". *Bulletin of Indonesian Economic Studies* no.53 (3): 233-259.
- Parlina, I. 2013. "RSBI Schools to Run Normally until June: Minister." *The Jakarta Post*, 22 January.
- Paulston, C. 1997. "Language Policies and Language Rights." *Annual Review of Anthropology* no. 26: 73-85.
- Pennycook, A. 2004. "Performativity and language studies." *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies* no. 1 (1): 1-19.
- Rahardjo, S. 1994. "Between Two Worlds: Modern State and Traditional Society in Indonesia." *Law and Society Review* no. 28 (3): 493-502.
- Rasmussen, D. 1981. "Praxis and Social Theory (Review of "Outline of Praxis")." *Human studies* no. 4 (3): 273-278.

- Reay, D. 2004. "'It's All Becoming a Habitus': Beyond the Habitual Use of Habitus in Educational Research." *British Journal of Sociology of Education* no. 25 (4): 431-444.
- Ricento, T. 2007. "Language policy: Theory and practice - an introduction." In *An Introduction to Language Policy*, edited by T Ricento. Malden: Blackwell Publishing.
- Robison, R. 1996. "The middle class and the bourgeoisie in Indonesia." In *The New Rich in Asia: Mobile Phone, McDonalds and Middle-Class Revolution*. London: Routledge.
- Robison, R. 1998. "Authoritarian States, Capital-Owning Classes, and the Politics of Newly Industrializing Countries: The Case of Indonesia." *World Politics* no. 41 (1): 52-74.
- Robison, R and D Goodman. 1996. "The new rich in Asia. Economic development, social status and political consciousness." In *The New Rich in Asia: Mobile Phone, Mcdonalds and Middle-Class Revolution*. London: Routledge
- Romaine, S. 1989. *Bilingualism*. Cambridge: Blackwell.
- Romano, A. 2003. *Politics and the Press in Indonesia: Understanding an Evolving Political Culture*. London: Routledge Curzon.
- Schefold, R. 1998. "The Domestication of Culture. Nation-Building and Ethnic Diversity in Indonesia." *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* no. 154 (2): 259-280.
- Schubert, J.D. 2008. "Suffering/symbolic violence." In *Pierre Bourdieu: Key Concepts* edited by M Grenfell. Stocksfield: Acumen.
- Sen, K., and D Hill. 2000. *Media, Culture and Politics in Indonesia*. Melbourne: Oxford University Press.
- Siegel, J. 2002. "The Idea of Indonesia Continues. The Middle Class Ignores Acehnese." *Archipel* no. 64: 199-229.
- Silverstein, M. 1996. "Monoglot "standard" in America: Standardization and metaphors of linguistic hegemony." In *The Matrix of Language: Contemporary Linguistic Anthropology*, edited by D Brenneis and R Macaulay. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Silverstein, M. 1998. "Contemporary Transformations of Local Linguistic Communities." *Annual Review of Anthropology* (27): 401-26.
- Skutnab-Kangas, T. 1981. *Bilingualism or Not: The Education of Minorities*. Translated by L Malmberg and D Crane. Vol. 7. Clevedon: Multilingual matters.

- Sneddon, J. 2003. *The Indonesian Language : Its History and Role in Modern Society*. Sydney: UNSW press.
- Spencer, P, and H Wollman. 2002. *Nationalism: a critical introduction*. London: Sage publications.
- Spolsky, B. 2004. *Language Policy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Spolsky, B. 2009. *Language Management*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Subbiondo, J. 2005. "Benjamin Lee Whorf's theory of language, culture and consciousness: A critique of western science." *Language and Communication* no. 25:149-159.
- Swartz, D.L. 2013. *Symbolic Power, Politics and Intellectuals*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Tanu, D. 2013. *Unpacking "Third Culture Kids": The Transnational Lives of Young People at an International School in Indonesia*, The University of Western Australia, Perth.
- Thejakartapost.com. 2013. "International Standar School Unconstitutional." *Thejakartapost.com*.
- Thompson, J.B. 1991. "Editor's introduction." In *Language and Symbolic Power*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Thomson, P. 2008. "Field." In *Pierre Bourdieu: Key Concepts*, edited by M Grenfell. Stocksfield: Acumen.
- Tollefson, J. 2007. "Critical theory in language policy." In *An Introduction to Language Policy*, edited by T Ricento. Malden: Blackwell Publishing.
- Tribunnews.com. 2013. "Orangtua Murid Ada yang Kecewa RSBI Dibubarkan (Some Parents are Disappointed with the RSBI Cancellation)." *Tribunnews.com*.
- Thejakartapost.com. 2017. "International Standard School Unconstitutional: MK". *Thejakartapost.com*. 8 January 2013.
- Van der Veur, P. 1969. "Progress and procrastination in education in Indonesia prior to World War 2." In *Education and Social Change in Colonial Indonesia*. Athens: Ohio University.
- Van der Wal, S. 1963. *Het Onderwijsbeleid in Nederlands-Indie 1900-1940/Education Policy in the Netherlands-Indies 1900-1940*. Groningen: J.B.Wolters.
- Van Leeuwen, L. 1997. *Airconditioned Lifestyles: De Nieuwe Rijken in Jakarta (New Rich in Jakarta)*. Amsterdam: Het Spinhuis.

- Van Leeuwen, L. 2011. *Lost in Mall: An Ethnography of Middle Class Jakarta in the 1990s*. Leiden: KITLV.
- Van Niel, R. 1970. *The Emergence of the Modern Indonesian Elite*. The Hague: W van Hoeve
- Van Zanten, A. 2005. "Bourdieu as Education Policy Analyst and Expert: A Rich but Ambiguous Legacy." *Journal of Education Policy* no. 20 (6): 671-686.
- Vickers, A. 2005. *A History of Modern Indonesia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wacquant, L. 1992. "The structure and logic of Bourdieu's sociology." In *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*. Chicago: The University of Chicago press.
- Wacquant, L. 1993a. "From Ruling Class to Field of Power: An Interview with Pierre Bourdieu on La Noblesse d'Etat." *Theory, Culture & Society* no. 10 (3): 19-44.
- Wacquant, L. 1993b. "On the tracks of symbolic power: Prefatory notes to Bourdieu's 'State Nobility'." *Theory, culture, society* no. 10 (3): 1-17.
- Waters, M. 2001. *Globalization*. New York: Routledge.
- Whorf, B. 1956. *Language, Thought and Reality: Selected Writings*. Edited by J Carroll. Cambridge: Technology Press of Massachusetts.
- Woolard, K. 1998. "Introduction." In *Language Ideologies: Practice and Theory*, edited by B Schieffelin, K Woolard and P Kroskrity. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Wright, S. 2004. *Language Policy and Language Planning: From Nationalism to Globalisation*. Hampshire: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Yang, Y. 2014. "Bourdieu, Practice and Change: Beyond the Criticism of Determinism." *Educational Philosophy and Theory* no. 46 (14): 1522-1540.

Appendix

Questionnaire for data collection

Before answering the questions, please read carefully:

- Thank you for having read the information statement and having given consent to participate in this research. Please ask if you have not done so.
- As written in the information statement, you are fully aware that you and your family (spouse and children) might be selected to be part of the family observation in which you are asked to video record, with your own smart phone or video recording, 3 language interactions between family members (15 minutes each).
- You are eligible to take part in this study if:
 - You are aged between 30 and 54 years old; and
 - Reside in Jakarta or Bogor or Depok or Bekasi or Tangerang; and
 - Your children are between the ages of 5 to 13 years old and attend National Plus (NP) or International School (IS).
- This questionnaire consists of 3 parts.
- Read the instructions on each part carefully.
- You and your spouse are asked to fill in two separate questionnaires.

PART I

1. From which region(s) do your parents originally come from?

Father: _____

Mother: _____

2. In which city(ies) and/or country(ies) were you raised?

In the following questions, you may choose more than one answers. Put "x" next to your choice or highlight it with different colour.

3. What is/are the native language(s) of your mother?

a. Regional language: _____

b. Indonesian

c. English

d. Other foreign language: _____

4. What is/are the native language(s) of your father?
 - a. Regional language: _____
 - b. Indonesian
 - c. English
 - d. Other foreign language: _____
5. What language did your mother speak to you when you grew up?
 - a. Regional language: _____
 - b. Indonesian
 - c. English
 - d. Other foreign language: _____
6. What language did your father speak to you when you grew up?
 - a. Regional language: _____
 - b. Indonesian
 - c. English
 - d. Other foreign language: _____
7. What do you think is/are your native language(s)?
 - a. Regional language: _____
 - b. Indonesian
 - c. English
 - d. Other foreign language: _____
8. What language(s) do you speak to your children?
 - a. Regional language: _____
 - b. Indonesian
 - c. English
 - d. Other foreign language: _____
9. What language(s) do you speak to your spouse?
 - a. Regional language: _____
 - b. Indonesian
 - c. English
 - d. Other foreign language: _____

10. What language(s) do you speak at work?
- a. Regional language: _____
 - b. Indonesian
 - c. English
 - d. Other foreign language: _____
11. What is your vision for your children's tertiary education in terms of country choice?
- a. Indonesia
 - b. Overseas
 - c. Partly in Indonesia, partly overseas

In the following questions, choose one answer only

12. What is the highest education level that you completed?
- a. High school
 - b. Bachelor
 - c. Master
 - d. PhD
13. In which country(ies) did you spend your elementary and secondary school years?
- a. Indonesia
 - b. Overseas
 - c. Both
14. In which country(ies) did you spend your tertiary education years?
- a. Indonesia
 - b. Overseas
 - c. Both
15. When were you born?
- a. 1960 – 1965
 - b. 1966-1970
 - c. 1971- 1975
 - d. 1976-1980
 - e. 1981-1985

PART II

In your opinion, observation and/or experience, give one answer to the questions below and provide the reason for each answer

16. What is the level of effort required in acquiring fluent verbal Indonesian for Indonesian speakers?
- a. Big effort
 - b. Effort
 - c. Average
 - d. Little effort
 - e. No effort

Why do you think so?

17. What is the level of effort required in acquiring fluent verbal Indonesian for English speakers?

- a. Big effort b. Effort c. Average d. Little effort e. No effort

Why do you think so?

18. What is the level of effort required in acquiring fluent written Indonesian for Indonesian speakers?

- a. Big effort b. Effort c. Average d. Little effort e. No effort

Why do you think so?

19. What is the level of effort required in acquiring fluent written Indonesian for English speakers?

- a. Big effort b. Effort c. Average d. Little effort e. No effort

Why do you think so?

20. What is the level of effort required in acquiring fluent verbal English for Indonesian speakers?

- a. Big effort b. Effort c. Average d. Little effort e. No effort

Why do you think so?

21. What is the level of effort required in acquiring fluent verbal English for English speakers?

- a. Big effort b. Effort c. Average d. Little effort e. No effort

Why do you think so?

22. What is the level of effort required in acquiring fluent written English for Indonesian speakers?

- a. Big effort b. Effort c. Average d. Little effort e. No effort

Why do you think so?

23. What is the level of effort required in acquiring fluent written English for English speakers?

- a. Big effort b. Effort c. Average d. Little effort e. No effort

Why do you think so?

24. What is the level of Indonesian usage within your daily life and workplace?

- a. Very important b. Important c. Average d. Less important e. Not important

Why do you think so?

25. What is the level of English usage within your daily life and workplace?

- a. Very important b. Important c. Average d. Less important e. Not important

Why do you think so?

PART III

26. Do your children attend National Plus or International School? Why National Plus? Or why International School?

27. How did you choose the language(s) to speak to your children daily?

28. What language(s) do you think your children should speak and write fluently at this moment? Why?

29. What language(s) do you think your children should speak and write fluently later in life? Why?

30. What steps have your children been taking to reach the answer to question 28?

31. What steps have your children been taking to reach the answer to question 29?

32. In what country do you think your child(ren) will most likely live and work as adult(s)? Why?

Thank you