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ABSTRACT

Language endangerment studies focus on languages rather than dialects. There are relatively few studies of dialect death. We are interested to know what endangerment looks like when studied at the level of dialect. Can one dialect be threatened while another is vigorous? Can dialects be threatened, but in different ways? To shed some light on such issues, this article looks at a number of geolinguistic research studies of the Betawi language and its dialects. The Betawi language is an indigenous, regional language of Indonesia, spoken by several million people in and around the greater Jakarta area. It is currently threatened. The language, is Malay-based. It has two dialects and there is also a subdialect, Betawi Ora. The present review of geolinguistic studies of Betawi helps identify where the language and its dialects are used, provides evidence for language and dialect shift operating at the level of dialect, and also shows what the main forces driving language shift or language loss are. Furthermore, the use of a consistent, empirical methodology across all the studies provides a diachronic perspective on geographical variation from between 1978 up to 2015. Three of the studies in particular paint a diachronic picture of language change in Bekasi over a period of thirty years that raises questions about the theory that the rate of language change is constant.
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INTRODUCTION

Despite the large number of studies on language endangerment and death (Austin and Sallabank, 2011, Moseley, 2007), there are relatively few on how these processes operate at the level of dialects (Tadmor, 2004). This is strange considering the close relationship between languages and dialects (Crystal, 2000: 38). Dialects are generally considered to be highly similar in identity to the language of which they are a part. Dialects are distinguishable from languages in geographical scale, distinctive linguistic features, and social and cultural aspects.

Given such a close relationship between dialect and language, we can ask why there has been a reluctance to study dialect endangerment and death. One view is that this reluctance occurs due to a mistaken assumption that the study of language can contribute more to linguistic theory than the study of dialects (Schilling-Estes and Wolfram, 1999: 486).

The present work focuses on dialect endangerment and is intended to demonstrate how dialect level studies of endangerment using the research methods of dialectology can make a contribution to our understanding of language endangerment, and also language variation and change.

METHOD

Dialect Endangerment and Linguistic Theory

The following are a selection of studies on dialect death that show the varied ways that this subject may be studied, the questions which are asked, and some theoretical issues that are raised.

In Schilling-Estes (1997), Schilling-Estes and Wolfram (1999) and a number of other studies, the authors report on the dialects of English used by two different island communities in the south-eastern United States, Ocracoke, North Carolina, and Smith Island, Maryland. The two dialects have existed in relative isolation from mainland dialect areas for around 300 years. However, due to social
changes, they are now emerging from this isolation. Schilling-Estes and Wolfram (1999) distinguish between a model of dialect death due to the loss or erosion of the distinctive features of the dialect, which they refer to as ‘dissipation’, and a model in which through mobility and population changes, the dialect’s features are becoming more distinctive, which they refer to as ‘concentration’. The Smith Island dialect can be characterized by the concentration model.

Millar (2016) discusses the attrition of traditional dialect lexis in a sample of communities associated with the fishing trade on the east coast of Scotland. Millar’s paper focuses on two processes, the loss in the precision of meaning of words or phrases which is replaced with a broadening of their meaning; and the break in the intergenerational transmission of the dialect from the older to the younger generation. Millar uses a model of language death proposed by Sasse (1992). He describes the process of language death as one caused largely by sociolinguistic forces involving the abandonment of the endangered variety in favor of another variety that is more prestigious. The linguistic features of the variety experience ‘degradation’ and this is passed on so the younger generation speak a ‘corrupted’ version.

Perea (2007) studies the process of extinction of the salat subdialect, in one of six dialects of Catalan, a statutory provincial language in the Catalonia Autonomous Community spoken in Spain. He states that Catalan includes six dialect areas, all subdivided into subdialects. The salat subdialect is one of five subdialects of Eastern Catalan. It is defined by only one dialectal feature which is presently dying out (Perea, 2007: 77). Perea does not see the relationship between language and dialect as hierarchical with language at the top, with dialect below it and subdialect below that. Rather, he argues that it consists of only two levels with language at the higher level and all other varieties at the same lower level mutually linked through a relationship of inclusion. Perea (2007: 86) concludes that salat is a moribund subdialect, characterized by an archaic feature, which has been assimilated by another dialect (Eastern Catalan) in relatively “good health”. However, the loss of the subdialect is not felt by salat speakers to involve a loss of cultural identity.

Tadmor (2004) investigates Nonthaburi Malay, a language found in about a dozen villages in Nonthaburi province in central Thailand where the dominant language is Thai. Nonthaburi Malay and Malay speakers in nearby provinces form a “speech archipelago” in an ocean of Thai speakers. The article raises the question of how Malay came to be spoken in places nearly 1,000 km from Malaysia and how this dialect has survived to the present and why it is presently moribund (Tadmor, 2004: 511-513). The survival of Nonthaburi Malay can be put down primarily to its long isolation. The dialect became endangered when language policies appeared that discouraged the use of Malay. Malay speakers are shifting to Thai (Tadmor, 2004: 528-529).

The studies above were done in Europe, the UK, the United States, and Thailand. The first three are about endangered dialects of official or national languages. The language situation in Indonesia is different in many respects from these. In order to better understand the issue of dialect endangerment and death in Indonesia, the following section reviews dialectology studies on the Betawi language.

Review of Dialectology Studies of the Betawi Language

Betawi is a Malay-based language spoken in and around Jakarta. It is considered to be threatened, category 6b on the Expanded Graded Intergenerational Disruption Scale (EGIDS) (Simons and Fennig, 2017). This is defined as ‘The language is used for face-to-face communication within all generations, but it is losing users’. The Betawi language is thought to have two dialects, Central Betawi (Betawi Tengahan) and Outskirts Betawi (Betawi Pinggiran) (Saidi, 1994).

The historical origins of Betawi go back to the Mataram period, when Sultan Agung from Java sent his troops to attack Batavia in 1628–1629. The attack on Batavia failed and many soldiers lost their life. Subsequently, in 1631, Sultan Agung sent an army to attack Kastil Jakarta. His Javanese troops, however, never reached the capital Batavia (Hanna, 1988: 60). The defeated soldiers, fearful of retribution from the powerful Sultan, stayed on the outskirts of Batavia and eventually settled there, marrying the local people. This history has had an impact on the distinctive features of one dialect of Betawi. The Betawi Pinggiran dialect is distinguished today by a noticeable number of words from Javanese.
Tawangsih (1978) was the first to do a dialectology study of the Betawi language. The study was done in Bekasi Regency which is located to the west of DKI Jakarta. The study collected data in 33 villages. Three linguistic areas were identified. In the west is a Betawi linguistic area in the districts Cabangbungan, Babelan, Tarumajaya, Bekasi, Setu, and Pondokgudang. In the east is a Sundanese linguistic area in the following districts: Pondokgude, Setu, Cibarusha, Lemahabang, and Pebayuran. There is also a Javanese linguistic area in the villages Karangharja, Sukamakam, and Sindangsari. This is a small ‘speech island’, surrounded by a Betawi speaking area. Members of this community who speak Javanese attest that they are the descendents of the Mataram troops.

Tawangsih (1983) was a second study of the Betawi language, this time done in Tangerang Regency. The research was conducted in the following locations: the villages of Dadap, Tanjung Pasir, and Babakan Asem in the Mauk and Teluk Naga districts; the villages of Slapajang Jaya and Jurumudi in Batu Ceper district; the villages of Desa Petir and Cipete in Tangerang district; the villages of Sudimara, Jurang Mangu, and Pondok Pucung in Ciledug district; the villages of Serua, Rempoa, and Pamulang in Ciputat district; and the villages of Pakulonan and Lengkong Gudang in Serpong district. The research produced a hundred language maps which showed the use of Betawi in Tangerang and also revealed the use of the Betawi Ora subdialect in Sudimara village in Ciledug.

A number of other dialectology studies of Betawi followed. Faizah (1987) performed language mapping research in the Kebun Jeruk district of Jakarta. This was the first study of Betawi there. Kebun Jeruk is located in the west of the city. It is next to Kembangan and Cengkareng which are at the edge of the city. The study found that the residents of Kebun Jeruk were shifting from the Betawi Pinggiran dialect to the use of the Betawi Tengahan dialect. Some speakers were shifting to the Jakarta dialect of Indonesian due to its image of modernity and its higher prestige.

Rahayu (1988), following Tawangsih’s (1983) study, wanted to look in more detail at the use of the Betawi Ora subdialect in Sudimara village in Ciledug. She found that a distinctive feature of the language used daily was the use of many Javanese words. Some examples are the words [lunag] ‘boys’; [gudel] ‘buffalo calf’; [apyb] ‘yawn’; dan [wetan] ‘east’. Another distinctive feature was the tendency for the sounds [b], [d], [g], [h], or [ʔ] to appear in word final position, something rarely seen in the Betawi Tengahan dialect (Rahayu, 1988: 26-31). There was also a shift, especially among young people, to use the Jakarta dialect of Indonesian. They explained that Betawi Ora had negative connotations, that it was a language variety associated with people from out of town in the small villages (bahasa kampung). This attitude is appearing at the same time as rural isolation has been decreasing, driven by improvements to mobility and the spread of urbanisation. In this area, Ciledug, better transport and the development of housing complexes have attracted many people from outside to settle in the area (Rahayu, 1988: 89-90).

Lauder (1990) did research in the Tangerang regency. It was the first research using a computerized language mapping process done in the country. The software was specially commissioned for the study, something that was ‘cutting edge’ for the time. Data was collected from 55 villages which were spread across the districts of Batuceper, Rajeg, Teluk Naga, Sepatan, Mauk, Kronjo, Kresek, Balaraja, Pasarkemis, Tangerang, Ciledug, Ciputat, Serpong, Curug, Legok, Cikupa, Tigaraksa, and Teluknaga. The research showed that the Betawi language area bordered the DKI Jakarta area; the Sundanese language area bordered the Bogor regency; and the Javanese language area bordered the northern edge of the Serang regency. The Betawi Ora subdialect was found in use in Sudimara village. Its use had been noted in this village by Soerjapranata (1927). The name Betawi Ora had originated to distinguish the subdialect from the language used by people living in Batavia. The word [ora] ‘no, not’ comes from Javanese. The community in Batavia speaking a variety of Malay used the word [tidaʔ] or [ŋgaʔ] for ‘no, not’ (Soerjapranata, 1927). Lauder’s (1990) research shows that Betawi Ora is spoken in Sudimara and also villages nearby in the center of Tangerang regency, including the villages of Pondokpucung, Lengkonggudang, Serua, and Pamulang. The distinctive word [ora] is still used by members of the older generation. However, younger people in the population are shifting from using [ora] to using [ŋgaʔ]. The other distinctive feature of Betawi Ora is the
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1 Tawangsih is the first author’s maiden name.
2 regency: kabupaten.
3 district: kecamatan.
prevalence of Javanese words. The use of many Javanese words continues more or less unchanged. Younger people report that their avoidance of the word [əŋ] is due to its negative connotations. Using the word [ŋgaʔ] makes them appear more modern and more open than the older generation. It makes them feel they have the same status or prestige as the Betawi people living in Jakarta, those who speak Betawi Tengahan (Lauder, 1990: 32).

While all the previous research had been done on the outskirts of Jakarta, Pratiwi (1996) situated her research in the Cipayung subdistrict in East Jakarta. Data was collected in 21 urban communities (RWs4) there. Two languages were found in use in Cipayung, namely Betawi and Sundanese. Previous studies had not mentioned use of Sundanese. The Betawi language there demonstrated the characteristics distinctive of the Betawi Pinggiran dialect. However, its speakers did not use the word [əŋ] for ‘no, not’. Local informants explained that ‘ora dipake lebih ke bletan’ meaning the word was being used in areas to the east of Cipayung towards Bekasi. Sundanese wasn’t widespread, and was being spoken only in Pondok Ranggon village. Local informants explained that the Sundanese speaking community there had migrated from the area of Jatinegara Kaum (Pratiwi, 1996: 98-110).

Suminarsih (1996) did research in Karawang regency, to the east of Bekasi. She found that three languages were being used there, namely Betawi, Sundanese and Javanese. Betawi was used in the villages Telagajaya, Karyabakti, Telukbango, and Sedari in the north. Javanese was being spoken south of this, in the villages Kertarahayu, Cemarajaya, and Dongkal. Sundanese was spoken in all the other villages (Suminarsih, 1996: 66-69).

Dewi (1997) did research in the city5 of Depok. Only one language variety was found in use there, the Betawi Pinggiran dialect. The word [əŋ] was found in use in Beji, a district of Depok, between Jagakarsa and Pancoran Mas, and also in an area in the southwest of Sukmajaya bordering on Sawangan and Cibinong (Dewi, 1997: 230-232). The people there reported that they considered the Betawi Pinggiran dialect to be ‘bahasa kampung’ or ‘norak’. It is likely that such negative language attitudes are contributing to the shift away from using the Betawi Pinggiran subdialect (Dewi, 1997: 72).

Andriani (1998) replicated the research done in Bekasi twenty years earlier by Tawangsih (1978). She used the same questionnaire, collected data from the same villages, and used the same technique of analysis. This was to see the extent to which language change had occurred over the space of two decades. The extent of lexical change that was found in Andriani’s study was categorized into six types. However, two of these were particularly interesting: (a) all existing lexis being replaced with new ones; and (b) a complex cluster of changes with some existing lexis unchanged, some found with a sound change, some lost, and also the emergence of new words. Despite such internal changes, the language use areas for Betawi, Sundanese and Javanese, as marked by the isoglosses, in the 1998 study showed little change from the 1978 one.

Ramawirawan (2010) did a study in Bekasi that extended the longitudinal research of Tawangsih (1978) and Andriani (1998) by another twelve years. This made it possible to see the extent of lexical change longitudinally over a total period of thirty two years. Whereas Andriani (1998) found no difference in the language area boundaries’ paths, Ramawirawan found through the dialectometry analysis that the degree of difference separating the three language areas had lessened. The overall result of such a reduction in the distinctiveness of the language varieties was that there were now only two language areas in 2010, Betawi and Sundanese, where there had been three in 1978 and 1998. Such a change was most likely influenced by increased mobility and inter-community contacts brought about by developing transport infrastructure, and by the use of Indonesian in the mass media. As a result, the communities in villages where Javanese had been spoken and which were surrounded by Betawi speaking communities, had borrowed words from Betawi and Sundanese. This kind of process is described by Dixon (1997: 15) who stated “If two languages are in contact...they are likely to borrow lexemes, grammatical categories and techniques, and some grammatical forms (in at least one direction, often both directions) and gradually become more similar.”

4 RW: rukan warga, urban community.
5 city: kota.
Wahyu (2011) performed research in Depok that followed up that done previously by Dewi (1997). In the thirteen years since Dewi’s research, Depok had experienced rapid urban growth. Its population had increased and also the urbanized area had spread out into areas that had been previously less developed. Reflecting this, the city’s administrative status was updated. When Dewi did her research, in 1997, the city had three kecamatan. However, by 2011, when Wahyu did his, the city had grown to have 11 kecamatan. The findings of Dewi’s study showed that only one language variety was used in Depok, the Betawi Pinggiran dialect. Wahyu’s research, meanwhile, found that the Betawi Pinggiran dialect remained the dominant language variety, but also found that Sundanese was now being spoken in two kelurahan, namely Leuwinanggun and Cimpaeun. Another type of change in the urban landscape had had an effect on the population in Depok. Depok is a university town. Universitas Indonesia established its 320 hectare campus in Depok in 1987. By 2010 it had an estimated 40,000 plus students. Many of these students found accommodation such as a private boarding house or rented small apartment. With this kind of demand, large numbers of houses were converted to boarding houses and tower blocks of small apartments mushroomed within a short space of time in Depok. The local people found themselves mixing with large numbers of students who had come from all over Indonesia. At the same time as this influx of newcomers, merchants, shop owners and entrepreneurs began to try their luck by opening all kinds of business that served the needs of the students. All of this prompted the local community to ditch their use of the local language and shift to Indonesian as their language for daily use (Wahyu, 2011: 77). Members of the local Betawi speaking community revealed that they felt embarrassed to use the local language as it was ‘norak’. They hoped that by shifting to Indonesian, they would avoid being perceived as ‘bodoh’. Almost all informants from Cilodong, Limo, Cisalak, and Sukmajaya, who continued to use Betawi, no longer used the word Betawi when referring to the language, preferring to call it Bahasa Depok (Wahyu, 2011: 74-75). This can be seen as kind of ‘rebranding’ of their language by renaming it.

Khairina (2015) did research in Cagar Budaya Betawi a protected area for the preservation of Betawi culture and history. It is located in Condet, in the district of Kramat Jati, East Jakarta. As this area is on the edges of Jakarta, it could be expected that you would find the Betawi Pinggiran dialect in use rather than Betawi Tengahan. However, Khairina found that the local people there used the word [ŋŋak] rather than the word [ɔra] to express ‘no, not’. In Pratiwi’s (1996) study, done on the western outskirts within Jakarta, she found the distinctive features of the Betawi Pinggiran dialect but without the use of the word [ɔra] and with many fewer Javanese loan words. Khairina saw the similarity between her own study, done in the east, and Pratiwi’s, done in the west and concluded that in her own study she was looking at a situation where the Betawi language didn’t have two dialects but three, namely Betawi Tengahan, Betawi Pinggiran, and Betawi Ora (Khairina, 2015: 89). This claim has not yet been independently corroborated. Another finding in the research was that users of the variety of Betawi used in the Condet area were not passing the language on to their children or grandchildren (Khairina, 2015: 94). This is the phenomenon of a break in intergenerational transmission. The fact that it is occurring in an area designated as protecting and preserving Betawi culture and language makes it all the more trenchant.

A review of all of this research from the late 1970s to the present using the methods of dialectology to study Betawi, shows, that overall, there is a language shift from Betawi to one or other varieties of Indonesian. The most pronounced shift has been from the Betawi Ora subdialect of Betawi Pinggiran. The shift has been going on for a number of decades, and there have even been reports by some informants that the subdialect was no longer used. In order to establish the actual status of Betawi Ora, whether it was disappearing or had been lost, further research was needed.

Answering this question, however, requires a comprehensive picture that can only be obtained from language mapping conducted across the entire area where we know that Betawi is spoken. Mesiyarti’s (2015: 111) language mapping research was designed to do this. Data was collected in 50 districts in the greater Jakarta area, encompassing Jakarta, Bogor, Depok, Tangerang, and Bekasi to trace the presence of the Betawi Ora subdialect.
The findings of the research are as follows:

1. Speakers using the definitive features of the Betawi Ora subdialect, those who still use the word [ɔran] and other vocabulary definitive of Betawi Ora were found in 26 districts. These were the districts of Teluk Naga, Cengkareng, Cipondoh, Pinang, Ciputat Timur, Sawangan, Bojong Gede, Cilodong, Sukmajaya, Bantar Gebang, Cikarang Barat, Mustika Jaya, Rawalumbu, Bekasi Selatan, Cakung, Bekasi Utara, Bekasi Timur, Sukatani, Tambah, Tambun Utara, Sukawangi, Babelan, and Taruma Jaya.

2. Speakers of a variety of Betawi Ora subdialect in which the word [ɔran] was no longer used but which retained the lexical items distinctive of Betawi Ora were found in the districts of Kosambi, Kalideres, Karang Tengah, Serpong Utara, Larangan, Ciputat, Pamulang, Bojongsari, Parung, Limo, Beji, Cibinong, and Cibitung.

3. Speakers of a variety of Betawi Ora subdialect where the word [ɔran] was no longer used and where the lexical items distinctive to Betawi Ora were rarely used were found in the districts Kebayoran Lama, Pancoran Mas, Jagakarsa, Tapos, Cimanggis, Ciracas, Cipayan, Jati Sampurna, Pondok Gede, and Jati Asih. Lexical items distinctive of Betawi Ora that were found everywhere and had a high resistance to loss were words in the semantic field of directions, such as [kidul] ‘south’ and [lor] ‘north’.
Mesiyarti’s (2015) study of Betawi Ora subdialect found that speakers had migrated eastward from Jakarta to Bekasi and Karawang. This finding was supported by Nariswari’s (2015) dialectology study of language variation in the district of Karawang. Her study focused on agricultural or farming terms in local languages used in the area. She identified the Betawi language in use in the Northwest area bordering Bekasi district and the Java Sea (Nariswari, 2015: 292). She also found that the Betawi Ora dialect was rarely used by the younger generation. They preferred to use the Betawi Tengahan dialect. They had also taken to using Indonesian, most likely because of its widespread use as the obligatory language of instruction in education (Nariswari, 2015: 293).

**ANALYSIS**

All of the research presented here used the methods of geolinguistic mapping or dialectology. The different studies were done over a period starting in 1978 and going up to 2015. Fourteen studies were done in and around greater Jakarta, one of which was done across the entire area. Together, these studies show a coherent, evolving picture of the Betawi language and its dialects and subdialects. The findings of these studies throw light on a number of key issues related to dialect areas, language endangerment, language attitudes, factors driving language shift, and theoretical assumptions of the rate of language change.

**Where is Betawi spoken now and what patterns of migration can be detected?**

The areas where the Betawi language is spoken are in Jakarta and around its edges, east, south and west. The Betawi Tengahan dialect is spoken primarily within the city. The Betawi Pinggiran dialect is spoken towards its outskirts or in provinces bordering it. There has been a trend for members of the Betawi speaking community to move outward, and for the Betawi Pinggiran speakers to move to the eastern areas of Jakarta and neighboring provinces.

**What is Betawi’s endangerment classification status?**

As mentioned above, Betawi endangerment status on the EGIDS scale is set at 6b Threatened in Ethnologue (Simons and Fennig, 2017). This level is characterized as ‘The language is used for face-to-face communication within all generations, but it is losing users.’ The research reviewed here shows that the language as a whole is losing speakers, supporting the 6b categorization. However, the shift is not occurring across all generations at the same pace. It is more pronounced among the younger generation. When we consider the alternative EGIDS classification of 7 Shifting, ‘The child-bearing generation can use the language among themselves, but it is not being transmitted to children’, it is possible that this description may apply to some Betawi communities. In particular, we have seen that Betawi speakers in the Condet area are not passing their language on to their children or grandchildren (Khairina, 2015: 94). This is already a sign that suggests a classification of 7 Shifting, but its seriousness comes into perspective more when we see that the break in transmission is occurring in an area designated to protect and preserve Betawi culture. A last point is that, based on all the evidence regarding dialects in this article, Ethnologue’s view that Betawi has no dialects should be revised to specify there being two dialects, Betawi Tengahan and Betawi Pinggiran.

**How are negative language attitudes being expressed?**

Language attitudes can be seen to be playing a significant role in language shift in Betawi. The overall image of the Betawi language has been somewhat negative. However, markedly negative attitudes such as explicit embarrassment or shame among Betawi Ora speakers is common. This is so among the younger generation. We can see from evidence in the field that the use of [ra] is going down. Younger people report that their avoidance of the word [ra] is due to its negative connotations. Using the word [nga] makes them appear more modern and more open than the older generation. It makes them feel they have the same status or prestige as the Betawi Tengahan speaking people living in Jakarta. The negative connotations of Betawi Ora are so strong among some people in Tangerang that the refer to the language drolly as Betawi Norak. Compensation strategies have emerged. Other than avoidance, strategies that hide or mitigate the connotations of Betawi Ora such as calling it
simply Betawi, or renaming the language according to the location, for example Bahasa Depok, Bahasa Tangerang, and Bahasa Bekasi are quite common. We have seen the impact of negative language attitudes in relation to dialect shift. The question is, are we witnessing dialect death? Certainly, in the case of Betawi Ora, the subdialect may be threatened, but it is not dead. The reports of its disappearance were due simply to the migration of the community to Bekasi and Karawang on the east part of Jakarta. The community seems to be using migration as a survival strategy and this may also help preserve the distinctive features of Betawi Ora.

**What do we know about non-linguistic factors causing language shift and language loss?**

In the case of the Betawi speakers in the Depok area, we can see the impact of development on the community. The establishment of Universitas Indonesia brought with it tens of thousands of students from all over Indonesia who found accommodation in the area in boarding houses and small apartments in tower blocks. Shops and restaurants were opened to cater for the students’ needs. All of this led to increased interaction between Betawi speaking locals and Indonesian speaking newcomers. The locals shifted to using Indonesian to make communication with the newcomers easier. This can be seen as a rational choice, driven by forces of development. Overall, in the wider area, the shift tends to be from Betawi Pinggiran dialect or Betawi Ora subdialect to either Betawi Tengahan dialect or to the Jakarta dialect of Indonesian. Other factors, important in the Betawi studies, included economic factors. The Betawi community have long relied on their land holdings as an important source of wealth. They may sell their land and move for a number of reasons. The first is to pay for performing the Hajj or pilgrimage to Mecca. The second is when development changes the land use and population around them with many new malls, housing estates and office buildings. The third is where the government is building a highway or other infrastructure through an area where their house is situated and pays compensation for their having to give up the house. All of these mean that communal moves or migrations to other areas around the edges of Jakarta have been going on for some time. The present studies show that most of the moves are to the east.

**What theoretical implications are there?**

The conventional view in historical linguistics is that language change is constant, that it is gradual, occurring over very long time periods, and that the basic vocabulary of languages is especially impervious to change. The position taken in traditional lexicostatistics is that the rate of change of meanings over time is relatively constant and can be represented with a simple formula where the variables are time, percentage of shared cognates and the retention rate per thousand years. A roughly constant retention rate of around 81% per thousand years for the Swadesh 200 basic word list has been assumed (Atkinson and Gray, 2005). However, work using computer simulation has suggested that language change may be faster in small communities (Nettle, 1999). The three studies done in Bekasi, West Java, Tawangsih (1978), Andriani (1998) and Ramawirawan (2010) show clearly that the rate of change can be much faster, even for basic words. We have seen that language change occurs much more rapidly than in periods measured in millennia, but rather that changes even with basic words, which should have an especially high retention rate, are occurring and that this is happening in decades. Is this primarily due to the size of the community, as suggested by Nettle, or are other factors in play? These issues are described in more detail in Lauder and Lauder (2016) which covers the changes between 1978 and 1998.

**CONCLUSION**

Dialectology remains a useful set of methodologies for the Indonesian setting. As regards future directions, there are still aspects of the issues of language change and language attitudes where we would benefit from further research. For language change, if the slow change model is no longer applicable, then what model can explain the changes we are seeing with language and dialect shift? Regarding language attitudes and their impact on the survivability of endangered languages, can negative attitudes be transformed to positive ones? This seems a tall order. However, without the
motivation to maintain a language’s vitality, we can wonder what the future holds for Betawi or its dialects.

**Glossary:**

*bahasa kampung:* a language variety associated with people from out of town in the small villages; this implies that these people are being looked down on

*Betawi Kampung:* a play on words, implying that it is a variety of Betawi that is characterized as being spoken by people from out of town, from the villages

*bodoh:* stupid; backward

*DKI Jakarta* (Daerah Khusus Ibukota Jakarta): special area of the capital city of Jakarta

*kabupaten:* a regency; a second level administrative area in Indonesia; a subdivision of a province

*kecamatan:* a district; a third level administrative area in Indonesia; a subdivision of a regency

*kelurahan:* an urban subdistrict; a subdivision of distrik

*kota:* city; a second level administrative area, at the same level as regency (*kabupaten*)

*norak:* in bad taste; having a bad image; objectionable

*RW:* *rukun warga,* an urban community; a fourth level administrative subdivision, under *kelurahan*, urban sub-district

**REFERENCES**


