

Research article

Language Choice in *Brang Kidul* Community of Ponorogo, Indonesia

Rizki Amalia Sholihah^{1*}, Amir Ma'ruf², & Aris Munandar³

¹ Doctoral Program of Humanities (S3 IIH), Gadjah Mada University, Yogyakarta, Indonesia

²³ Faculty of Cultural Studies, Gadjah Mada University, Yogyakarta, Indonesia

* rizki.amalia.s@mail.ugm.ac.id

Abstract

This study aims to determine the language choice of Indonesian ethnic Javanese, especially of the *Brang Kidul* of Ponoragan; based on the distinguishing vocabulary and intonation in the narrative. "Ponorogo Brang Kidul" is the designation for the southern part of Ponorogo Regency of the East Java Province. Employing qualitative research method, sociolinguistic approach, and research communication model, this research was conducted in the higher education community toward three respondents who are native Ponoragan Javanese speakers. The research data were obtained from recorded dialogues of speakers in four speech contexts between students and lecturers and between fellow students. The language code selection patterns found were *Bahasa Jawa* (BJ), *Bahasa Jawa Ponoragan* (BJP), *Bahasa Arab* (BA), and *Bahasa Indonesia* (BI) which would have been considered mainly based on situations, age, and social status. The BJP vocabularies frequently found in the Brang Kidul dialect were "alah mendah", "ritek", "byungalaah", "angkan", "gor", "ale", "klawus", "dipadoni", and "kesit". Finally, found that factors influencing the choice of language in this study were the interlocutors and the topic of conversation as well as the intonation in the speech of the different speakers, namely the rising tone at the beginning of the speech and falling at the end.

Keywords

Dialect; Javanese language; language choice; Ponorogo language; sociolinguistic.

Article history

Submitted: 28/01/2023; revised: 05/05/2023; accepted: 15/05/2023.



© 2023 by the author(s). Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY SA) license, <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>.

1. INTRODUCTION

Language is not just a means of communicating information but also building and maintaining relationships with other people; where there are two fundamental aspects of language behavior from a social point of view, namely the function of language in building social relations and the role played by language in conveying

information about the speaker (Trudgill, 2000). This also makes language have an essential role for its users.

Discussions about language are always related to its most important function, namely as a speech tool. In speaking, humans as users who function language also have a relationship with external factors, namely social factors. Language has an essential function divided into ideational, interpersonal, and textual functions (Sudaryanto, 1990). In speaking, humans as users who function language also have a relationship with external factors, namely social factors. The relationship between language and external factors, namely social factors, has been extensively studied in in-depth research by experts in the field of sociolinguistics (Rokhman & Poedjosoedarmo, 2003).

In sociolinguistics, language is not only a formal structure, but its function is examined as a means of social interaction and communication. In communicating, people often need to pay more attention to the language used, whether it is excellent and correct, that is, by the situation, the interlocutor, the content of the speech, the impression that arises, and the correct grammar. This happens because most speakers pay more attention to the message to be conveyed, whether it has been well received by the interlocutor rather than the "form" of the language they use. This is in line with (Mesthrie, 2009) that many studies on language use in bilingual communities focus on the language that speakers usually choose; in principle, speakers can use their language to interact with others. In practice, the use of this language will be related to a particular context (setting, topic, interlocutor, etc.). Choosing a language code is undoubtedly present in a bilingual or multilingual society. Fishman (1971) revealed that several factors are considered when choosing language use: who is speaking, who is the interlocutor, the topic being discussed, and where the speech event occurs. This also happens to the Ponorogo speech community. They select a language code in their utterances and choose the Javanese Ponorogo dialect, Indonesian, and foreign languages such as Arabic and English.

Several previous studies discuss the choice of language codes in both bilingual and multilingual societies. Ramaniyar (2014) discusses the variations of code-switching and code-mixing, the causative factors that determine code-switching and code-mixing, and the impact of using code on teaching Indonesian to the Malay Sambas community in Pontianak City. Another research is which describes the form of language selection and the factors that determine the choice of language code in speech communities in Sukapura Village, Kiara Condong, Bandung with language codes, namely Indonesian, Sundanese, Javanese, English, and Arabic (Khotimah,

2014). The following study is by Yusuf (2017) who describes the form of a speech-language selection of Javanese Migrants in the Landasan Ulin District, Banjarbaru City.

Apart from Indonesia, there have been several studies on language selection, including trilingual code-switching in Hong Kong (Roy Chan, 2019), which shows that trilingual code-switching between Cantonese, English, and Putonghua does exist in Hong Kong. Another study in Luxembourg (Kingsley, 2013) was at multilingual meetings in transnational workplaces, showing that English was the most frequently used with other languages. Another choice of language is the Arab community in Quebec-Canada (Dweik & Qawar, 2015,) which shows that they have a positive attitude towards Arabic, English, and French. Another study on language selection is found on the Malaysia-Thailand Border (Jaafar et al., 2016), which shows that even though Malaysians and Thais speak two different languages, the use of the Kelantan dialect, which is a variation of standard Malay, is dominant in the border. Research on language selection is also found in the Netherlands, namely regarding the selection and language skills of immigrant children and parents (Driessen, 2017), conducted on 14,000 immigrant students. This research shows that if two-thirds of children speak their mother tongue in some areas and there is a tendency, the more often they use their mother tongue, the lower their Dutch language skills will be. There is also language selection between bus crew and passengers in Ghana (Oduro et al., 2020) which shows that the Asante Twi dialect is the most dominant language choice of the sample population (passengers and driver friends). Finally, the choice of language in private schools in Cyprus (Valentina & Elena, 2020) where the use of different codes serves as another form of power and legitimacy; Cypriot's use of Greek reflects social values of solidarity and membership in the dominant community while English reflects power in terms of academic achievement and access to and power in class discourse.

Research on language in Ponorogo itself has been carried out, among other things, on the geography of dialects in Ponorogo Regency (Ardiati, 2016). It is known that there are language variations in the form of phonemic, morphemic, and lexical, as well as the discovery of lexicons typical of Ponorogo in a number of 21 lexicons from 10 observation points in 21 sub-districts. Other research on the Ponorogo language, namely, Ponorogo dialect used in agriculture (Fauzi, 2019) namely the existence of dialectal elements and dialectal variations in Javanese Ponorogo in the agricultural realm. Another research is about using Javanese speech levels in the market (Azila & Febriani, 2021).

Ponorogo Regency is one of the regencies in East Java province of Indonesia, which is located at the coordinates between 111°17' – 111°52' East Longitude and 7°49' – 8°20' South Latitude and has an area of 1,371.78 km². This area borders the Regencies of Madiun, Magetan, and Nganjuk next door north, Tulungagung and Trenggalek Regencies on the east, Pacitan Regency on the other South, and Pacitan and Wonogiri Regencies (Central Java) in the West (BPS, 2018). Ponorogo consists of 21 sub-districts divided into four areas which, based on the local oral history as it might also be considered to become an adequate surce (Anderson & Jack, 2015; Thompson, 2017), I would follow by naming them *Brang Kidul* for southern part of Ponorogo, *Brang Wetan* for eastern Ponorogo, *Brang Kulon* for western Ponorogo, and *Brang Lor* for northern Ponorogo. This was also suggested by one of the Ponorogo cultural stakeholders, Agus Miswanto, who explained the beginning of this *Brang* division:

The term itself is an abbreviation of the word “sebrang,” which literally means direction. Previously, the “cultural” Ponorogo was divided into two parts: *Etan Kali* and *Kulon Kali*. Then this area was divided based on geographical location and the differences in several existing sub-dialects. Even though theoretically no one mentioned the term “Brang,” but in the Ponorogo community, this division of sub-dialects is used and understood. This arises when there are speakers from a different brang than the interlocutor. Labeling will often appear. “Wow, it has to be *wong brang etan*, or *wong brang lor*, and so on”. Therefore, it can be concluded that the term “brang” in the Ponorogo community has been used for a long time, again, even though no theory has standardized it.

Nevertheless, there is a research conducted by Ardiati regarding the geography of the Ponorogo dialect, which mentions the division of the Ponorogo dialect area, namely that there are 12 points that indicate speech differences and three points that show sub-dialect differences. The three different sub-dialect points are found in 4 villages and sub-districts: Balong Village, Mlarak Village, Cokromenggalan Village, and Sawoo Village (Ardiati, 2016).

Ponorogo Brang Kidul consists of 5 sub-districts (*kecamatan*), namely Ngrayun, Sawoo, Sambit, Slahung, and Bungkal, which is directly adjacent to Pacitan Regency (BPS, 2018). The term Brang to denote the boundaries of this geographical area also makes the boundaries of the regional division of dialects (or subdialects). Each Brang has a dialect that differs from the standardized Javanese dialect (referring to the Javanese dialects of Solo/Surakarta and Yogyakarta) in terms of vocabulary and intonation in pronunciation. The Ponorogo Javanese-speaking community has its

peculiarities in intonation, and several vocabularies are different from standardized Javanese. This then became the background for conducting this research, namely the existence of language differences (dialects) in the speech of the Ponorogo Brang Kidul community and the intonation in their pronunciation. To do so, I went to one of the sub-districts in the Brang Kidul Ponorogo area, namely Slahung, which its territory is in the form of hills to the south, west, and east, while the northern part is in the form of lowlands.

Respondents in this study were three students from Slahung District who, from birth to high school, lived in Slahung District and were only in their first year of studying at tertiary institutions located in Ponorogo District (City Center). Speech data from the three respondents were collected using tapping techniques to ensure that the respondents continued to have conversations naturally without being affected by the researcher participating (involved) in the conversation. This technique is part of the listening method (Mahsun, 2017). The respondents were selected due to differences in the dialect used by respondents from the Slahung District in Brang Kidul Ponorogo and speakers of Ponorogo Javanese from the Ponorogo District (City Center). Several vocabularies are different from standardized Javanese, with differences in intonation and pronunciation. The selected respondents also live in Slahung District, hence they must commute daily to the City Center to participate in lectures.

The problem in this research regards the choice of the language code of the Ponorogo people who come from the Brang Kidulan area, namely for students in the field of education, namely when interacting outside of learning in class. The aim is to find out the patterns of language code selection made by speakers from Brang Kidulan when interacting with other speakers from different areas. The choice of the educational domain as the research domain is because when in the educational realm, speakers of a language will be required to use a language code in their speech, for example, Indonesian, which is the language of instruction in learning in Indonesia. The existence of these rules then makes speakers, like it or not, can choose the language they will speak. However, often, speakers unknowingly do code-switching or code-mixing in their utterances so that language selection occurs by itself. When the learner (who is also a speaker of the language) is outside the classroom, he can make choices about his language. It is these interaction events carried out by the respondents outside the classroom that the researcher then captures as an effort to see which language code selection was made.

Sumarsono describes three categories of language selection in sociolinguistics.

First is code-switching, when a speaker masters more than one language and then switches when using that language and hearing various supporting factors, including the interlocutor, topic, and atmosphere. Second, code-mixing was previously referred to as interference, where speakers insert language elements when using specific languages in words, phrases, and groups of words. Finally, there is variation within the same language, so speakers must choose a particular variety in certain situations; for example, in Javanese, there are *krama* and *ngoko* (Sumarsono, 2002).

2. METHODS

The method used in this study is a qualitative method with a sociolinguistic approach and uses a communication ethnographic research model. Saville-Troike explained that the appropriate data collection method for ethnographic research is participatory observation, namely being at the research site and observing the language behavior of the speech community as the object of research, then recording examples of language use (Yuniawan, 2002). However, to obtain natural data, it is also possible to make observations without involving the respondent; this can be done in all research domains, such as "secret listening" and "selective listening" (Samarin, 1988). The data was obtained by recording the respondents' utterances using a recording device, namely SONY PX240. The data obtained will then be analyzed through several stages, namely (1) identified, (2) transcribed, and (3) data grouped according to the code.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1. Ponoragan Javanese Dialect

Most Ponorogo people are Javanese and use Javanese as their primary means of communication. The Javanese language found in Ponorogo is called the Javanese Panaragan dialect. The Panaragan dialect has several differences from the general Javanese dialect, which refers to the Yogyakarta or Solo Javanese dialects as dialects that are considered standard. The difference is in several lexicons, intonation, tone, and stress when pronouncing several lexicons in the Javanese Panaragan Dialect. An example of the Javanese Panaragan dialect can be seen in the following Table 1.

Table 1. Ponoragan Javanese Dialect

Lexicon	Meaning	Lexicon	Meaning
<i>mboyak/mbokben</i>	up to you	<i>Angkan</i>	desire, plan
<i>diloroi</i>	reprimanded	<i>Gor</i>	fail
<i>édhuk /éthém</i>	nice	<i>alah mendah</i>	yeah, really?
<i>enek</i>	there is	<i>Kesit</i>	lively, healthy
<i>gung, dung</i>	not yet	<i>Athik</i>	how come?
<i>terop</i>	tent	<i>ora ritek</i>	no need
<i>kat, juk, pacak</i>	since, until, from	<i>Disemantakne</i>	insinuated

Speakers of the Ponoragan dialect often use a distinctive intonation to say something to strengthen, delicious, delicious, huge, and so on. This can be seen in the words in Ponoragan Javanese, which are characterized by diphthong vowels (1) with an initial element [u] and an initial element [i] (Sugianto, 2017) and an example is the following adopted by Sugianto as seen on the Table 2.

Table 2. Diphthongs in Ponoragan Javanese

Initial element diphthong [u]				
No	Diphthongs	Word	Beheading of syllables	Meaning
1.	[ua]	u akeh [uakɛh]	ua -keh	'many/much'
2.	[uə]	u amba [uəmbə]	uam -ba	'very wide'
3.	[uɛ]	mue pet [muepet]	mue -pet	'very tight'
Initial element diphthong [i]				
1.	[ia]	weg ia h [wɛgiah]	we- gia h	'absolutely do not want'
2.	[iɛ]	dig i etne [digietne]	di- gi et-ne	'got really hard'

Diphthongs in the Javanese Ponoragan dialect are only found in informal (relaxed) variety in the form of a pattern of adding the main vowel /u/, which can be attached to [a], [ɔ], [o], [i], [e], [ɛ], [ə] and the main vowel /i/ are attached to [a], [ɛ] to strengthen (Sugianto, 2017). Unlike in Indonesian, there are four diphthongs, namely [ai], [au], [ei], and [oi], which are found at the beginning, middle, and end of words without any specific purpose in their use because they are elements of letters in a word (Badan Bahasa, 2022). Examples are 1) initial words, namely aileron, autodidak, eigendom; 2) the middle of the word, namely balairung, taufik, geiser, boikot; and 3) ending words, namely pandai, harimau, survei, and amboi. Speakers of the Ponoragan dialect will emphasize the beginning of the spoken word and for a longer

duration than pronouncing other words to strengthen it. These two things are the peculiarities of the Ponoragan dialect, which distinguishes it from other dialects in Javanese. Below are sentences containing words in Ponoragan Javanese, including the use of diphthongs to strengthen.

3.2. Selection of the Language Code of the Brang Kidul People

The Javanese Ponoragan dialect of Brang Kidul is special because the area of distribution of its speakers is the widest in Ponorogo Regency, namely in 82 villages out of a total of 281 villages, with a total area of 513.65 km² or 37% of the total area of Ponorogo Regency. Based on the results of the research, the codes for Indonesian (BI), Javanese Ponoragan (BJP), Javanese (BJ), and Arabic (BAr) were found. The BI and BA codes are more often used when discussing topics regarding courses and speaking with other people who also understand both languages in formal or non-formal situations. In non-formal situations, the BJP and BJ codes are used when interacting with fellow students guilty of running away from Slahung District and other sub-districts in Ponorogo. The codes R1, R2, and R3 were used to mention respondents.

Context 1: R1 is discussing assignments in the form of papers that must be worked on in groups with R2.

R1 : *Uangele puol tibake bar tak woco materine sing diwei Pak Dosen mau.*
'Sulit sekali ternyata setelah kubaca materi yang diberikan Pak Dosen tadi'
"It was very difficult after I read the material that the lecturer gave earlier"

R2 : *Alah mendah? Aku mau ora nggiatekne pas neng kelas marai.*
'Masa sih? Aku tadi tidak memperhatikan sama sekali ketika di kelas'
'Really? I wasn't paying attention at all in class'

R1 : *kuarepe dewe koe ki terahe!*
'memang kamu itu semaumu sendiri!'
'You are what you want!'

R2 : *Ngko aku melu kelompokmu ae yo, gek kowe sing ngarap tapine. Hehehe..*
'Nanti aku ikut kelompokmu saja ya, terus kamu yang mengerjakan, hehehehe'
"I'll just join your group later, okay, then you do the work, hehehehe"

R1 : *Ora ritek!*

'*Gak usah!*'

'No need!'

The conversation above shows the BJ-BJP language code selection pattern with the Brang Kidul dialect. This code can be identified by the vocabulary that characterizes the Javanese Ponoragan Brang Kidul: "*alah mendah*" and "*ritek*." These two vocabularies show the BJP code, which in the BJ code are "*mosok*" and "*usah/sah*." In this conversation, diphthong formations appear in the vocabulary in the BJ code, indicating a change in intonation in the pronunciation, which means it strengthens. The vocabulary is "*uangele*," "*puol*," "*nggiatekne*," and "*kuarepe*". Diphthong [ua] appears in two vocabularies, namely "*uangele*" and "*kuarepe*," then diphthong [uo] appears in the vocabulary "*puol*," and diphthong [ia] appears in the vocabulary "*nggiatekne*." The entire vocabulary that contains diphthongs has an exaggerated meaning from the actual meaning of the vocabulary.

Context 2: R3 meets one of the lecturers regarding assignments

R3 : *Assalamualaikum, Ustadz.*

Lecturer : *Waalaikumsalam warahmatullahi wabarakatuh.*

R3: *Afwan Ustadz, ana mengganggu. Kemarin yang tugas kelompok apakah harus dikumpulkan secara kolektif sebelum UAS? Amargi dereng rampung sedanten, taksih 3 kelompok.*

'*Maaf Ustaz, saya mengganggu. Kemarin yang tugas kelompok apakah harus dikumpulkan secara kolektif sebelum UAS? Karena belum selesai semua, baru 3 kelompok*'

'*Sorry Ustaz, I'm disturbing your time. Yesterday, did the group assignments have to be collected collectively before the final semester test? Because it's still ongoing, there are only three groups.*'

Lecturer : *Yang sudah selesai sebelum UAS, dikumpulkan saja, tidak perlu menunggu temannya. Taruh di meja saya, Mbak. Omongono kancamu, sing telat ngumpulne bijine beda.*

'*Yang sudah selesai sebelum UAS, dikumpulkan saja, tidak perlu menunggu temannya. Taruh di meja saya, Mbak. Diberitahu temannya, yang terlambat mengumpulkan nilainya akan berbeda*'

"Those who have finished before UAS, collect them. No need to wait for their friends. Put it on my desk, Ma'am. Being told by his friends, those who are late to collect their scores will be different."

R3: *Nggih Ustadz, suwun.*
'Iya Ustaz, terima kasih'
 "Yes Ustaz, thank you"

The conversation above shows that there was an event of code-switching carried out by the two speakers, namely R3 and the lecturer. R3 began his story by greeting and was answered by the lecturer. The following vocabulary that R3 chose to start his speech was the words "*afwan*" and "*ana*" rather than the words "*maaf*" and "*saya*." Then, R3 continued his sentence using Indonesian, namely "*mengganggu*." In the following sentence, in one utterance, R3 chooses Javanese with a variety of krama identified by the sentence "*Amargi dereng rampung sedanten, taksih three kelompok*." From R3's speech, it can be identified that there are code-switching events with the pattern of choosing BAr–BI–BJ language codes that occur in semi-formal situations. The interlocutor (lecturer) chooses Indonesian in the first sentence of his speech and then switches to Javanese Ngoko variety in the following sentence: '*Omongono kancamu, sing telat ngumpulne bijine bedo*'. This lecturer's speech also shows code-switching with the BI–BJ language code selection pattern.

Context 3: R1 leaves the classroom and talks with his classmates (who are mainly not from the Brang Kidul Ponorogo area)

R1: *byungalaah udian, angkan arep ngopi neng dalan anyar malih gor, piye ki engko ale arep golek anget-angetan.*
'aduh hujan, rencana mau ngopi di jalan baru jadi gagal, bagaimana nanti mau cari sesuatu yang hangat'
 'oh, it's raining. The plan to have coffee on the road just failed. How about later looking for something warm.'

TT (classmates): *omong opoo we ki? Ra jelas blas.*
'ngomong apa sih kamu? Tidak jelas sama sekali'
 'what are you talking about? It's not clear at all'

R1: *yuuh.. klawus ngene ki.*
'duh, tidak dapat apa-apa kalau begini'
 'duh, can't do anything like this'

Based on the conversation above, it can be seen that there is vocabulary that shows the existence of two different language codes, namely BJP and BJ. BJP is shown by R1, namely by the use of the tongue "*byungalaah*" which means 'ouch,' the

vocabulary "*udian*" which has a diphthong [ia] to emphasize the word "*udan*" in BJ, "*angkan*", "*gor*", and "*ale*". In BJ the word "*angkan*" has the same meaning as the word "*kekarep*" which means 'plan', then the word "*gor*" in BJ "*gak sido*" or "*ambyar*" which means 'failed' and "*ale*" in BJ "*nek*" which means 'if'. The pattern of language code selection used in this conversation is BJP-BJ. From the conversation, it is also known if TT needs help understanding some of the vocabulary spoken by R1 due to dialect differences, although it is still in the same language. This speech is an informal situation that occurs in the realm of education. There is also the vocabulary "*klawus*" which means getting nothing or what happens is not as expected.

Context 4: R2 asks for permission to return home from a student event with various backgrounds of other speakers (there are R1 and R3).

R2: *teman-teman, maaf saya mohon izin untuk pulang lebih dulu, di rumah nanti malam akan ada acara Yasinan, jadi diminta untuk bantu Ibu.*

Everyone, sorry I asked permission to go home earlier at home tonight. A Yasinan event will be held, so I asked you to help me.

TT (classmates) : *iya tidak apa-apa. Silakan pulang dan hati-hati di jalan.*

yes, that's okay. Please go home and be careful on the road

R1 (whispering to R3): *paling cah kui mau dipadoni mboke kon ndang bali.*

'*paling anak itu tadi dimarahi ibunya disuruh cepat pulang*'

'he was scolded by his mother and told to go home quickly'

R3 (also whispering): *iyo mesti, nggenah kuesit wes ilang*

'*tentu saja, secepat kilat dia sudah menghilang*'

"of course, as fast as lightning he was gone"

The context above shows a speech event between R2 and TT using the BI language code. Then in the same situation, R1 and R3 spoke using the BJP Ponorogo Brang Kidul dialect. This is identified by the existence of the vocabulary "*dipadoni*" which in BJ is "*seneni*" for ngoko variety and "*didukani*" for the krama variety, which means 'to be scolded' and the vocabulary "question," which in BJ is "fast" which means 'fast or can also be agile.' Vocabulary "question" also contains a diphthong [uɛ] with the aim of strengthening which means very fast or very agile.

Based on some of the contexts of these conversations, it is known that several patterns of language code selection appear in the speech of students from Ponorogo

Brang Kidul in various situations with other speakers, both from the exact origin and from different ones, as excerpted in the Table 3.

Table 3. Language Code Selection Pattern

No	Pattern	Use
1	BJ-BJP	Fellow BJ-BJP speakers in non-formal situations, same age, equal social status
2	BAr-BI-BJ	Fellow BJ-BI-BAR speakers in semi-formal situations, different ages (older), and higher social status
3	BI-BJ	Fellow BI-BJ speakers in semi-formal situations, different ages (older), and higher social status
4	BJP-BJ	Fellow BJ speakers in non-formal situations, same age, equal social status
5	BI-BJP	Fellow BI speakers in semi-formal situations, the same age, equal social status

However, when viewed from the form of speech that occurs, the formed patterns do not specifically show a particular pattern, with certain situations, strictly specific speakers. The pattern of selecting a new BAr code will appear if the topic of conversation is related to learning Arabic or the interlocutor is also a BAr user. For example, in context 2, the interlocutor is an Arabic lecturer. The pattern of using the BI language code can also be recognized if the speaker is in a semi-formal situation with a serious topic of conversation. And this pattern can appear both with interlocutors who are the same age or older. The BJ pattern can be reclassified into BJKr for the Javanese Krama code pattern and BJNg for the Javanese Ngoko code pattern. The BJKr and BJNg patterns will appear when the speaker deals with interlocutors with age and social status differences. In Context 1, the BJ-BJP language code pattern chosen by the two is BJNg because the two speakers are the same age and have the same social status, even though the topic of conversation is semi-formal.

Another pattern indicating the choice of the BJKr and BJNg language codes appeared in Context 2 when R3 conversed with an older lecturer with a higher social status. As a Javanese, R3 still holds that those considered more advanced (age and social status) must use the BJKr language pattern. At the same time, the lecturer continues to use BJNg in his speech because he considers R3 to be younger, so he has no obligation to use BJKr.

The pattern of selecting the language code contained in the four speech contexts of 3 native Javanese speakers of Ponorogo Brang Kidul, according to Sumarsono (2002), namely code-switching, code-mixing, and variations in the same language, are as following in Table 4.

Table 4. Language Code Selection Pattern Based on Speech Context

Code Switch	
Context 2	Lecture: <i>Yang sudah selesai sebelum UAS, dikumpulkan saja, tidak perlu menunggu temannya. Taruh di meja saya, Mbak</i> (BI) <i>Omongono kancamu, sing telat ngumpulne bijine bedo</i> (BI code switch to BJ)
Context 4	TT: <i>iya tidak apa-apa. Silakan pulang dan hati-hati di jalan</i> (BI) Student: <i>Paling cah kui mau dipadoni mboe kon ndang bali</i> (BI code switch to BJ)
Code Mix	
Context 2	Student: <i>Afwan Ustadz, ana mengganggu</i> (code mixing BA and BI) <i>Kemarin yang tugas kelompok apakah harus dikumpulkan secara kolektif sebelum UAS? Amargi dereng rampung sedanten, taksih 3 kelompok</i> (code mixing BI and BJ (krama)) Lecture: <i>Taruh di meja saya, Mbak. Omongono kancamu, sing telat ngumpulne bijine bedo</i> (code mixing BI and BJ (Ngoko)).
Variations in the same language	
Context 2	Lecture : <i>Omongono kancamu, sing telat ngumpulne bijine bedo.</i> Student (R3): <i>Nggih, Pak.</i> (Variations in the same language are BJNg and BJKr)
Context 3	R1 : <i>byungalaah udian, angka arep ngopi neng dalan anyar malih gor, piye ki engko ale arep golek anget-angetan.</i> TT : <i>omong opoo we ki? Ra jelas blas.</i> (Variations in the same language are BJP and BJ).

3.3. Javanese Ponoragan, Brang Kidul Dialect, and Factors Affecting Language Code Selection Patterns

Based on the four speech contexts the researcher collected, several vocabularies could be identified: the Javanese Ponorogo vocabulary in the Brang Kidul dialect. This vocabulary difference is quite fundamental compared to standard Javanese, so speakers who are not native speakers have a little difficulty understanding the meaning that speakers want to mean when choosing to use the BJP language code. The following is a vocabulary list for the Brang Kidul dialect. In the following Table 5,

I compare BJP Bang Kidul with BJP Brang Lor (simply selected as I live in the northern part of Ponorogo), and BJ Standard to see the differences in several vocabularies (lexicon) with the same meaning.

Table 5. Vocabularies Differences

No	BJP Brang Kidul	BJP Brang Lor	BJ Standard	Meaning
1	<i>alah mendah</i>	<i>mosok</i>	<i>mosok</i>	really
2	<i>ritek</i>	<i>rasah</i>	<i>usah, sah</i>	no need
3	<i>byungalaah</i>	<i>wadoh</i>	<i>waduh</i>	ouch
4	<i>angkan</i>	<i>pengenan</i>	<i>kekarep</i>	plan
5	<i>gor</i>	<i>rasido</i>	<i>gak sido, ambyar</i>	fail
6	<i>ale</i>	<i>nek</i>	<i>nek</i>	if
7	<i>klawus</i>	<i>buk</i>	<i>gak oleh opo-opo</i>	means that you don't get anything or that what happens doesn't match what you expected
8	<i>dipadoni</i>	<i>diseneni</i>	<i>diseneni/didukani</i>	expected
9	<i>kesit</i>	<i>kesit</i>	<i>cepet</i>	scolded

Also based on the four speech contexts involving three speakers of the Ponorogo Brang Kidul dialect, factors influencing the choice of language code are:

a. Interlocutors. The interlocutor factor influences a speaker in making language choices. If the interlocutor is the same age as the speaker, the speaker will use the same language regardless of the level of speech and the degree of politeness in his speech. Likewise, social status factors, such as being rich and poor, superiors and subordinates, etc., affect speakers' language when making speeches. Suppose the interlocutor is someone with a different age and social status from the speaker. In that case, the speaker needs to select a language code adjusted to his speech cloud, especially in the culture of the Javanese people who uphold manners in behavior and use of language towards older interlocutors and those with higher social status.

b. Conversation Topic. The topic of conversation based on the context of the speech above is one factor that influences the choice of a speaker's language. When the topic of conversation is in the formal or semi-formal realm, speakers will choose to use the appropriate language, namely Indonesian or Javanese variety of manners. It's different if the topic of conversation is in the non-formal realm. So speakers can choose to use the language code used in their speech.

The interlocutor factor and the topic of conversation are the two main factors that determine the choice of language code based on the context of the speech involving

three speakers of the Ponorogo language in the Brang Kidul dialect. The determining factor for choosing this language refers to the theory of SPEAKING (Hymes, 1974), which includes **s**etting and **s**cene (situation, place, and atmosphere of speech), **p**articipants (speakers, interlocutors, and listeners), **e**nds (purpose of speech), **a**cts (opportunity to speak), **k**ey (tone of voice and variety of language), **i**nstrumentality (delivery of the speech, spoken and written), **n**orms (rules of speech), and **g**enres (types of activity).

4. CONCLUSION

Ponoragan Javanese is a dialect used by Javanese-speaking communities in the Ponorogo Regency. The Javanese Ponoragan dialect is divided into the Brang Kidul, Brang Lor, Brang Wetan, and Brang Kulon dialects. The division of this dialect itself is based on the regions where dialects emerged in four parts of Ponorogo Regency, namely North Ponorogo, South Ponorogo, East Ponorogo, and West Ponorogo, which are different from the standard Javanese dialect (referring to the Javanese dialects of Solo and Yogyakarta). The language code selection patterns found were BJ-BJP (fellow BJ-BJP speakers in non-formal situations, same age, equal social status), BAr-BI-BJ (fellow BJ-BI-BAR speakers in semi-formal situations, different ages (older), and higher social status), BI-BJ (fellow BI-BJ speakers in semi-formal situations, different age (older), and higher social status), BJP-BJ (fellow BJ speakers in non-formal situations, the same age, equal social status), BI-BJP (fellow BI speakers in semi-formal situations, same age, equal social status). The BJP vocabulary in the Brang Kidul dialect is "alah mendah," "ritek," "byungalaah," "angkan", "gor", "ale", "klawus", "dipadoni", and "kesit." The factors that influence language selection based on the context of speech in this study are the interlocutor and the topic of conversation. In addition, there is an intonation in the speech of the Javanese speakers of Brang Kidulan, which is different from speakers in other parts of the world, namely the rising tone at the beginning of the utterance and falling at the end.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, K., & Jack, D. C. (2015). Learning to listen: Interview techniques and analyses. In *The oral history reader* (pp. 179-192). Routledge.
- Ardiati, L. C. (2016). *Kajian Geografi Dialek Bahasa Jawa di Kabupaten Ponorogo*. Publisher: UNS (Sebelas Maret University).

- Azila, M. N., & Febriani, I. (2021). Penggunaan Tingkat Tutur Bahasa Jawa Pada Komunitas Pasar Krempyeng Pon-Kliwon di Desa Ngilo-ilo Kabupaten Ponorogo (Kajian Sociolinguistik). *Metahumaniora*, 11(2), 172–185.
- Badan Bahasa. (2022). *EJAAN BAHASA INDONESIA YANG DISEMPURNAKAN EDISI KELIMA*. <https://ejaan.kemdikbud.go.id/>
- BPS, K. P. (2018). Kabupaten Ponorogo dalam Angka 2018. *BPS Kabupaten Ponorogo*.
- Driessen, G. (2017). Language choice and language proficiency of immigrant parents and children. *Journal of Education Research*, 10, 97–108.
- Dweik, B. S., & Qawar, H. A. (2015). Language Choice and Language Attitudes in a Multilingual Arab Canadian Community: Quebec—Canada: A Sociolinguistic Study. *British Journal of English Linguistics*, 3(1), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004>
- Fauzi, A. R. (2019). *Dialek Ponorogo Dalam Ranah Pertanian oleh Masyarakat di Kecamatan Balong Kabupaten Ponorogo (Kajian Antropodialek)*.
- Fishman, J. A. (1971). *Advances in the Sociology of Language* (Issue v. 1). Mouton. <https://books.google.co.id/books?id=a0BiAAAAMAAJ>
- Hymes, D. (1974). *Foundations in Sociolinguistics: An Ethnographic Approach*. University of Pennsylvania Press, Incorporated. <https://books.google.co.id/books?id=B3NIAeabrHwC>
- Jaafar, M. F., Awal, N. M., Mis, M. A., & Lateh, N. (2016). The patterns of language choice at the border of Malaysia-Thailand. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 5(2), 176–185.
- Khotimah, D. K. (2014). Pemilihan kode bahasa pada masyarakat tutur di Kelurahan Sukapura, Kecamatan Kiaracundong, Kota Bandung (kajian sociolinguistik). *Bahtera Sastra: Antologi Bahasa Dan Sastra Indonesia*, 1(2).
- Kingsley, L. (2013). Language choice in multilingual encounters in multinational workplaces. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 34(6), 533–548. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2013.807271>
- Mahsun, M. (2017). *Metode Penelitian Bahasa. Tahapan, Strategi, Metode, dan Tekniknya*. Rajawali Press.
- Mesthrie, R. (2009). *Introducing sociolinguistics*. Edinburgh University Press.
- Oduro, I., Asantewaa, M., Donkor, O., Kusi, F. K., Oduro, W., & Asamoah-Poku, F. (2020). Valentina. *Social Education Research*, 210–218. <https://doi.org/10.37256/ser.122020495>
- Ramaniyar, E. (2014). Pemilihan Kode dalam Masyarakat Bilingual pada Masyarakat Melayu Sambas di Kota Pontianak dalam Lingkungan Pendidikan (Studi Kasus dalam Pembelajaran Bahasa Indonesia di SMK Al-Madani Pontianak,

- Kalimantan Barat). *Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa*, 3(1), 89–102.
- Rokhman, F., & Poedjosoedarmo, P. (2003). *Pemilihan bahasa dalam masyarakat dwibahasa: Kajian sosiolinguistik di Banyumas*. <https://repository.ugm.ac.id/id/eprint/63752>
- Roy Chan, K. L. (2019). Trilingual Code-switching in Hong Kong. *Applied Linguistics Research Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.14744/alrj.2019.22932>
- Samarin, W. J. (1988). *Ilmu Bahasa Lapangan* (J. S. Badudu, Trans.). Kanisius.
- Sudaryanto. (1990). *Menguak fungsi hakiki bahasa*. Duta Wacana University Press. <https://books.google.co.id/books?id=XOpHAAAAMAAJ>
- Sugianto, A. (2017). *Bahasa dan Budaya Etnik Jawa Panaragan*. Kekata Publisher.
- Sumarsono, S. (2002). *Sosiolinguistik*. Sabda.
- Thompson, P. (2017). *The voice of the past: Oral history*. Oxford university press.
- Trudgill, P. (2000). *Sociolinguistics: An Introduction to Language and Society*. Penguin Books, 243. <https://doi.org/10.2307/326846>
- Valentina, C., & Elena, I. (2020). Classroom communities, language choices and accessibility to discourse: The case of a multi-ethnic/multilingual class of a private school in Cyprus. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 14(1), 58–75. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19313152.2019.1644092>
- Yuniawan, T. (2002). *Pemilihan Bahasa pada Masyarakat Etnik Jawa-Sunda dalam Ranah Pemerintahan: Kajian Sosiolinguistik di Kabupaten Brebes [Disertasi]*. Universitas Gadjah Mada.
- Yusuf, M. (2017). Pemilihan Bahasa Kelompok Tutar Pendatang Jawa Di Landasan Ulin, Banjarbaru (the Language Choice by Speech Community of Java Newcomers at Landasan Ulin, Banjarbaru). *Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra Dan Pembelajarannya*, 7(1), 22–34.

This page is intentionally left blank