

The Language Attitude of Adolescence

A Case Study of an Indonesian-American Mixed Marriage Family

Susmita Zein

Universitas Negeri Surabaya
Surabaya, Indonesia
susmitazein@mhs.unesa.ac.id

Adam Damanhuri

Universitas Negeri Surabaya
Surabaya, Indonesia
adamdamanhuri@unesa.ac.id

Abstract—Having mixed marriage family background becomes one of the factors to someone become bilingual or multilingual especially for the children. Being bilingual or multilingual adolescence, one language can be dominant one to say which is determined by the situation and language choice of someone and other aspect including personal feeling toward language. This study focuses on Adolescence in Indonesian-American mixed marriage family and the purpose of the study is to ascertain the language attitude of a bilingual or multilingual adolescence. The description includes the function of language use in different situation and social factors of language choice in four domains; home, friendship, college, and church. The attitude toward language which is mostly used by this adolescence is a language which has low variety or informal function in a situation. This language is mostly used in home and friendship domain. Regarding to the personal feeling of the informant, the colloquial language itself as the mother tongue and his first language, he is more comfort and like to speak in that language because he got that language from his mother at home since he was in early age and he lives in an environment which the majority people use this language. This is why that language has positive attitude toward the informant.

Keywords—*bilingual; multilingual; situation in language use; diglossia; language choice; language attitude*

I. INTRODUCTION

Mixed marriage or inter-country marriages become a common thing in these days and all around the world. Having different language, culture, race, ethnicities, and even nationalities does not become a big deal to marry with. One of the reasons which is related to the fact of the occurrence of mixed-marriage is the increasing of the international migration. According to the migration report in 2017 [1], the rate of international migrants worldwide has increased rapidly in recent years. In mixed-marriage, a couple is absolutely having different language to do communication, it encourages one partner or both to be able to speak more than one languages at least two languages or acknowledge as *Bilingualism* or *Multilingualism* [2]. When a couple decides to get married, definitely with background of bilingual or multilingual individual, a mixed-marriage family will also be able to encourage their children in communicate more than one languages or at least two languages. Bilingual children have already maintained to speak in two languages because they get two languages at home from their parents during their early age.

In the growing of the children, the variety of groups or domain of an individual will increase. By focusing the background of mixed marriage family, being a bilingual or multilingual child who is in a teen-aged will have some different communities to adapt, such as family, friendship, school, club, church and so on. Based on the several domains of language use, the pattern of the language choice within some communities will emerge when the adolescence is selecting a *code*. It is determined by who is speaking and to whom, the place of the conversation, the purpose of talking, and also the function of doing such a conversation [3]. The capability in speaking two or more languages, one of them will be the dominant one for the bilingual or multilingual adolescence. A language will be used more than the other languages in some groups or *domains* [4]. Setiawan [5] added that attitude of a language is an abstract thing to be valued. It deals with the feeling of someone in using the language.

In connection with the attitude of a language, there are two various findings Dweik & Qawar and Sari [6] [7] that contradicted with Setiawan's [5]. Yet, those previous studies become some additional information to conduct this study. Those studies reveal that language attitude is about feeling of someone which one is considered as dominant and less language but only easier and more difficult feeling of the languages. In some matters, there is similarity among this study and those previous studies. In general, those studies use the same theory of Holmes in analyzing the language choice. After knowing the language choice in some domains, the attitude of a language will emerge based on communicative interaction of the informant. Comparing this study to Dweik & Qawar's [6], it might be found the differences on the method approach which is applied and how collect the data. This study presents qualitative method in the form of words while Dweik & Qawar's [6] uses quantitative which has numerical and table data because the amount of the informant is different in both. This study only uses an informant specifically an adolescence. Thus, this research would try to fill the gap among them by giving different term and concept of language attitude which is happened in an adolescence from mixed marriage family background. Based on those research problems above, this study is conducted to answer three research questions; (1) What is the type of situation in language use that determines the language choice of an adolescence in mixed marriage family? (2) What are the patterns of language choice of an adolescence in mixed marriage family? (3) How is the language attitude of an adolescence in mixed marriage family?

A. Definition and Dimensions of Bilingual

In a simple term, bilingual is an individual who has capability to speak in two languages [4]. Crystal stated that the capability here there are some assumptions which focus to show the degree of bilingualism and bilingual of someone which exists in some situations when using the languages. One of the assumptions that can reflect the definition of bilingualism is connected to the degree of something in proficiency of the languages. It is assumed that people must achieve something that can make an individual is called bilingual in those languages whether it is compared to the monolingual native speaker or it can be less than it, even having minimal knowledge of a second language. Using one language rather than another in any given communicative situation, it already showed that someone has already acquired the knowledge in both languages [5].

Those would be able to be qualified by several technical distinctions that has been introduced by Crystal [4]. Based on the two languages which have equivalent or non-equivalent semantically and may have different representation in brain, it is called Compound and Coordinate bilingualism. The second technique is about the way how an individual learn the two languages, for instance, simultaneous and sequence in childhood or by a formal instruction such as in an institution. The last is about the levels toward a language which has different function and which one is the most used in some kind of situation.

In the study of bilingual, Hamers & Blanc [8] stated that a person may be called bilingual if both languages have own interpretations in some communicative situations which may be related to the psychological and sociological aspects. Thus, they introduce six dimensions of bilingual which three of the dimensions have been already mentioned by Crystal [4], about Compound and Coordinate, Age of acquisition in learning the languages, and the level function in some kind of situations. The others are, first is about the Balanced and Dominant bilingual. Balanced means that someone who has equivalent competency in both languages, dominant bilingual is someone who has only one competence from both languages, commonly first language is more competence rather than the other [4]. Second is Endogenous and Exogenous bilingual. Where a language is used as the mother tongue in a community but not for the official language in a society, called Endogenous. Exogenous is where both languages are used as the mother tongue and official language. The last one is related to the interaction in some kind of groups where the individual uses the languages. A term calls Bicultural when a speaker as a member of two groups and those speak in speaker's language. Meanwhile, Monocultural is when an individual has been already proficient in both languages but only one of the two groups that can identify the speaker's languages.

B. Definition and Factors of Being Multilingual

A multilingual individual is someone who can communicate in two or more languages which is being active in writing and speaking or passive in listening or reading [9]. During childhood multilingual individual will communicate in one language as the first language. Then, someone may

acquire other languages when he/s grows up. House & Rehbein [10] also supports that an individual decides to be multilingual because of some factors. Concerning to the interlocutors who have different language competence is one of the factors why an individual being a multilingual. Meeting participants who all do not only speak in one language, it can encourage an individual to add one more language. Purposes of the communication which is definitely related to the participants, they also encourage someone to be multilingual because an individual wants to advance in international communication, getting interrelation among other individual, groups, institutions, or societies and they definitely have different language between one to another.

C. The Situation of Language Use in Community

Regarding to the bilingual or multilingual individual, bilingualism is distinguished from Bidialectalism and Diglossia [4]. When a language is used in a communication in different kind of social functions of variety, in this case, it has a situation of diglossia [8]. The original concept of diglossia is based on the Ferguson [11] as the developer of diglossia [6], there are High (H) and Low (L) varieties in two situations. High (H) variety is used as a formal function or situation. On the other hand, Low (L) variety becomes a function which is used in an informal situation. There are some kind of situations within a bilingual that have been studied, one of the best known is by switching the variety from Informal to formal speech situation or diglossia [4]. Setiawan [5] also stated that being bilingual who has stable bilingualism; it has led to a new language behavior or situation such as code switching or code mixing and diglossia.

Hamers & Blanc [8] asserted that being bilingual or multilingual which has proficiency in two or more languages; those will be not used or valued in a same way. They are used differentially based on the situation within the communicative interaction by concerning to the interlocutor, topic, role and function, and domain factors. The situation through those choices of language can create an identity to the speaker as a bilingual or multilingual individual when he uses the languages [2]. In this case they have categorized the situation in language use or diglossia into four types:

1. Simple Binary Context.

A behavior applies one language in each situation, one language as a High (H) and another language as a Low (L) variety.

2. Double-overlapping diglossia.

This type has three languages in which one of the languages can be used in both situations, High (H) and Low (L).

3. Double-nested diglossia.

A situation which has Low and High varieties, but both varieties also can be H and L functions.

4. Linear Polyglossia.

Two languages or mixing two languages all can be formal (H) or informal (L) situations, depending on which one is dominant in that district.

Based on their claims about types of diglossia above, Hamers & Blanc [6] differentiated each variety by knowing first the languages that have been already mastered for a

bilingual or multilingual individual. Beside setting and dimension of the formality may be also the important thing in selecting a code, function or goal of the interaction in a language may be concerned. Thus, Holmes [2] supports that in the original sense of language situation or diglossia in a language is by knowing first why a language has that situation. There are three crucial features. The first one is that one language has two varieties High (H) and Low (L) in a community. The second one is even though each variety has its own function; H and L are complementing each other. H variety may be applied in L function, vice versa L variety may be applied in H function, and also mixing both of the languages may be used in both functions. The last feature is mentioned that H variety is not used in any kind everyday conversation.

D. Domain and Language Choice

Domain becomes one of the factors for bilingual or multilingual individual to use each language based on its function in diglossia concept [3]. In a domain, there are some certain social factors of a bilingual or multilingual individual to choose a code. To whom the speaker talking to, the social context of the conversation is related to the function and the topic of the talk [3]. In some kind of different speech communities, domain turns out into an important thing to know the language choice of bilingual or multilingual individual. It lets the participant, setting, and topic as the social factors to involve in a communication process to detect a typical interaction in using the language. For instance in a home domain, the typical participant would be related to the family member and typical topic is about family activities. In this term, the typical interaction in a family especially home domain would be able to be identified the pattern of code choice in a bilingual or multilingual individual.

Fishman [12] as stated in Holmes [3], there are five main domains which can identify the typical interaction which is involved the participant, setting, and topic. They also can be identified in some other kind of communities.

TABLE I. EXAMPLE DOMAIN OF LANGUAGE USE

Domain	Addressee	Setting	Topic	Code
Family	Parent	Home	Planning the menu of dinner	...
Friendship	Friend	Beach	How to play beach tennis	...
Religion	Priest	Church	Choosing the Sunday liturgy	...
Education	Teacher	School	Solving a math problem	...
Employment	Employer	Workplace	Applying for a promotion	...

By differentiating the domains where a language is used, each domain could be analyzed based on the individual itself. Each individual has his own domain to use the language, meaning, another domain may be added if it mostly takes role

of someone's language use [3]. As stated in Setiawan [5] proposes three main domains that he considers the most influence of someone's language choice; home, schools, and workplace. Another study is from Govindasamy and Nambiar [13] that it only takes two main domains of language use; home and friendship. However, in this study, the researcher applies four main kind of domains based on the Fishman [10], they are family or home, friendship, education especially in college domain, and religion especially in a church. Those domains are related to a bilingual or multilingual adolescence in using the languages to reveal the language choice of him. Based on the subject of this study, he does not apply his languages in employment domain yet. Therefore, employment domain does not involve in this study.

When a language has a function or a situation of diglossia, by concerning to the participant, setting, and topic in some kind of domains, the code choice of a bilingual or multilingual individual would be easily identified. As already mentioned by Setiawan [5], beside diglossia, a multilingual individual also tends to switch or mix the languages in a domain (*see 2.4.1 Code Switching or Code Mixing*). Yet, there are other social factors which can affect the code choice. Holmes [3] added that even though domains is useful to identify the language choice of a bilingual or multilingual individual, it is supposed to be examined more specific about social factors which may be a explained into a description of code choices within the interaction. Three components of domain; participant, setting, and topic do not always congruent to each other. In this term, sometimes typical individual interaction does not have the same sense of the typical domain concept. Even though a multilingual individual has its own code in each domain, regarding to the interlocutor, setting, and what he talks about. In a moment, this multilingual individual would prefer to choose one code which may be easier to tell, regardless of the setting and interlocutor which should be a line if it is in a domain concept. Thus, social factors would support the reason of a bilingual or multilingual individual to choose one language. According to Holmes [3], there are four social factors regarding to explanation above:

1) The solidarity/ social distance scale

This scale is related to the closeness between the speaker and the interlocutor. The closer relationship between them, the speaker tends to choose familiar and simple code or even colloquial code which is understandable to each other. On the other hand, when the speaker has never did an interaction to the interlocutor before or they have distant relationship to each other, the speaker tends to choose the official language one to take a low risk in case the addressee does not understand the vernacular of the speaker.

2) Status scale

It is a dimension which is related to the social status between the speaker and the interlocutor. In different domain, it also makes different *code* of the speaker depends on who the speaker is and to whom he/she talks to. The higher status of the addressee, the speaker will use code which is perceived more respecting. On the contrary, the lower status of the addressee, the colloquial code is chosen. There will be diverge

linguistic choice, related to the way of speaking with two kind diverge status of the addressee.

3) *Formality scale*

This scale is associated to the social setting. A setting of the interaction can influence the speaker to choose a code in a formal or informal situation. Mostly, the formality is related to the solidarity/status relationship in which the speaker will speak in a formal way depend on to whom he/she speaks to. It is related to the respect term.

4) *The referential and affective function scale*

The referential factor is the way how the speaker conveys the intended meaning of an utterance, while the affective function is the way how the speaker expresses his/her feeling in an utterance to the linguistic repertoire. Those are related to each other but one function commonly would be dominant. When the referential is more oriented in an utterance, the affective function tends to be less. On the other hand, the more affective function is revealed, the less intended meaning will be understood.

E. *Code-Switching or Code-Mixing*

Related to the domain and social factors, a bilingual or multilingual individual tends to switch the code in an obvious changing situation. House and Rehbein [8] stated that switch the code in some utterances also happens if the speaker simultaneously communicates in different person or addressee. It definitely deals with the role of the particular participants which is connected to the solidarity and status social factors. It is obviously connected to the relationship between the speaker and the addressee. Holmes [3] also stated that code switching or mixing is determined by different kind of relationship which may be expressed by a bilingual or multilingual individual to the certain interlocutors within a domain or social situation.

Code mixing is embedded to the code switching. As stated in Hamers & Blanc [8] that bilingual individual normally mixing the languages based on to whom the speaker talks to. It is involved code switching, code mixing, and borrowing. He also asserted that mostly mixing code is loan-bending phenomenon, such as borrowing word or even morpheme in different language. In this study, based on those description, the theory of Poplack [14] as asserted in Hamers & Blanc [8] there are three types of code-switching which is normally happened to a bilingual or multilingual individual;

1) *Intrasentential code-switching*. In an utterances in which the speaker will switch the sentences, clauses, or words which are having two or more *morphemes*. One morpheme will be spoken in one language while other morpheme in another language.

2) *Extra-sentential code-switching*. By inserting some kind of tag or in linguistic term called hedges in one language while the entire utterances are in another language.

3) *Intersentential code-switching*. Switching clause or sentence scope. In an utterance, one clause is in one language, while another clause is also in another language.

F. *Language Attitude*

of language is a term of sociolinguistics which is related to a sense of people in using one language rather than the other language(s) [4]. Someone will show one language that commonly used which is related in several domains or communities. It stated that a language will acquire a positive or negative attitude among the languages. Positive attitude means that one language may be easier and more appreciated than the others by the intensity in using the language whether in function case and social use. In negative attitude occurs when one language is perceived more difficult in some cases toward a tool to do communication.

Kerlinger as stated in Setiawan [5] that the fact, attitude is a kind of abstract thing that cannot be valued in only one response. Another factor that would be able to identify the language attitude of a bilingual or multilingual individual is the language proficiency [5]. It also related to the language use in some certain domains. Setiawan [5] stated regarding to Tiessen's study, language attitude of someone is related to the proficiency in language use of the parents in home domain. If parents are positively proficient in a language that would be given to the children and adults at home, they also would be proficient in that language, and their attitude positively directs to the given language which has already mastered since they were at home.

Related to Crystal [4] theory about language attitude which has positive and negative attitude, it is also supported by Setiawan [5] that language is not only a tool to do communication, it also would be a sign of identity in a group or social and also the solidarity of the membership within a group. It is not only about an easy or difficult factors to say the language, it may be dealt with favorable and unfavorable, or in other term it can be preferred and not preferred which is related to the subjective personal attitude towards language, personal feeling about the language itself which one is liked or disliked or another term comfort or discomfort to use the languages [5].

II. METHOD

The informant of the study in this research is a child in a teen age, which has parents from mixed marriage in two different countries. His mother is from Probolinggo, East Java, Indonesia, and his father is from Michigan, America. Related to the language attitude which would be analyzed to this adolescence, the study focuses to the way of the informant represent the some languages which can identify the situation in language use and language choice to reveal the language attitude of the informant. The data will be shaped in some utterances from the subject by conducting observation and direct interview. Thus, to elaborate and response those research questions is proper to use form of descriptive. This study is a descriptive qualitative method which can be described by words rather than number.

The conversation which is the result of the interview among the observer, the informant, and the informant's friends in Surabaya becomes the source of the data in this study.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In order to discover the three aspects which will answer those three research questions in this study based on an adolescence with mixed marriage background family, the first thing to do is by giving preliminary explanation about languages that he masters whether bilingual or multilingual. Then, it will be categorized first in what type of situation in language use by using the theory of Hamers & Blanc and Holmes [8] [3]. Second, explain the language choice in four domains; Home, Friendship, College, and Church in table form with its description about other social factors based on the result of the transcription. It will explained by using the theory of Holmes and Setiawan [3] [5]. The last, this research question would be presented in a descriptive explanation by giving first a result of the attitude toward those languages. Those, the elaboration are presented below:

A. The Type of Situatin in Language Use: An Adolescence of Mixed Marriage Family

The results of the observation and interview showed the proficiency of the adolescence in some languages. Concerning to the result whether he is bilingual and multilingual, the subject is proficient in three languages; English, Indonesian, and Javanese. It can be found by the confession from interview of the adolescence related to the language use in some different groups and interlocutors. In this study, to answer the RQ 1 regarding to the multilingual adolescence, each language would be analyzed the variety of the functions in those kinds of situation. The finding reveals that the informant with mixed marriage family background who live in Surabaya, Indonesia uses those three languages in any kind of communicative interaction. English and Indonesian have two varieties Low (L) and High (H) that can be both functions in some kind of situations, and Javanese only has Low (L) variety.

Javanese only has Low (L) variety to the informant because it is a colloquial language in his district which is perceived familiar and simple to talk to some the interlocutors who majority already have Javanese competence and use it in any conversation. It is apparent from the data that Javanese has minus (-) for the formal function it is because Javanese has speech levels which can determine the function of each level, while the informant is only capable in low level called *ngoko lugu* as the informal function, rather than in high level called *krama inggil* as the formal function. It is because there is a language shift that Indonesian as the official language replaces the existence of *krama inggil* used in his environment, for instance when he talks to his friends in his environment, neighbors, and some of his friends in Senior High School.

In this case, the informant applies Double-nested diglossia where he uses three languages or codes which two of the languages; English and Indonesian can be both varieties and functions, Low (L) and (H) High.

1) The Pattern of Language Choice: An Adolescence in Mixed Marriage Family

Regarding to those situations of languages, each variety and function of the languages would determine the language choice of the adolescence. The social factors that can also

support the language use in the four domains (home, friendship, college, and church) specifically would be able to be identified his pattern of language choice by concerning to the setting, interlocutor, and topic. Almost all of the social factors encourage this informant to speak in those three languages which is used in those four domains. Regarding the setting, topic, and especially participant or addressee, this adolescence even mix between two codes to a certain interlocutor. The detail explanation of the result will be classified into four social factors as follows:

a) Solidarity/ Social Distance Scale

This become one of the factors in choosing the language based on those domains because of the relationship between him and the interlocutor. The languages or codes that he tends to choose in this factor is all languages, English, Indonesian, and Javanese. He tends to use them because the relationship among him and the interlocutors are high, meaning, the intensity of meeting is also high and it may show Low (L) variety as the informal function of a situation in language use. The informant speaks to his mother by using mix Indonesian and Javanese, while to his father he uses full English. In this case, the informant used to apply those three languages while English is only to his father regarding his daily activity at home. He mentioned that even though his father is proficient in Indonesian, still he uses English when he communicates to the informant. Connecting to the solidarity between the informant and the parents as the interlocutors, the intensity of meeting and the social distance among them are high. Mostly, the informant spends his time at home with his family members especially to his parents. The informant communicates to his brother by using Javanese, while to his sister he tends to switch Javanese and Indonesian same as to his mother. It is because mixed marriage family background, his parents tend to choose their own languages while they communicate to his children Status Scale

It is the second factor why the informant tends to choose the codes regarding to the status between him and the interlocutor. Status is one of the factors which make the language has High (H) variety in some kind of situations. He tends to choose English and Indonesian to the interlocutors who have higher status than him. It is perceived that those languages is more respecting to whom he talks to. Beside higher status, he chooses English also because the addressee has already had English and less proficient to other languages that the informant masters. To the interlocutors who majority only have Indonesian and Javanese competence, he tends to choose Indonesian to someone who has higher status than him.

2) The Language Attitude of an Adolescence in Mixed Marriage Family

Indeed, Javanese is his first language at home that he got from his mother. He lives in an environment where the majority of people use Javanese in their daily activity especially in his friendship domain. The informant feels that Javanese is more comfort to say and he does not need to think or translate it first before he says his intended meaning. This is why Javanese has positive attitude toward him.

3) The Function of Each Language in Different Situation

Regarding to the results, the informant as an adolescence in mixed marriage family in this study is proficient in those three languages because of five from six dimensions which are proposed by Hamers and Blanc [8], two of them also have the same concept which are proposed by Crystal [4], that is age of acquisition in learning language. It is because his parents simultaneously use different languages to the informant since he was born, and one of the parents mostly mix between two languages. His mother uses mix Indonesian-Javanese while his father uses English. It makes the informant also applies the second dimension about Balanced bilingual. The third dimension is showed that the informant is Endogenous bilingual, where English is one of the mother tongues which is used in some community but not as the official language in a society. The fourth dimension, called Bicultural bilingual because the informant involves in some groups which use his languages. Related to some groups that the informant involved, House & Benjamins [10] stated that one of the factors that make an individual to be multilingual is by concerning the language that is used by the interlocutor within a group itself. The last dimension is the tendency in choosing a language which has speech levels of different function.

Because of the use of those languages, each would have social function related to the particular situation. When a language has two varieties or social functions in a situation it is called diglossia [5]. Based on Hamers & Blanc [8] about the basic concept of diglossia which is developed by Ferguson [11], the informant uses English and Indonesian in two social functions, meaning each of them has two varieties. English can be as a Low (L) and High (H) variety by concerning to the interlocutors and the situation. Mostly he uses English as (L) variety when he was in College in America. It is because English can be both situation there, English used as (L) variety when he communicates to his friends as the interlocutor in any kind of informal situation. While English as (H) variety, it can be used while he was in Indonesia or America, but mostly in Indonesia. Some of the interlocutors in Indonesia insists that he use English in some formal situations and they definitely already have English competence. Similarly, Indonesian also has two varieties for two kind of situations. Based on this result, the informant uses Indonesian as a (L) variety when the interlocutor does not have any language competence that the informant has except it but, the solidarity between them is high. In this case the informant uses Indonesian in any kind of informal situation. While Indonesian as a (H) variety, it can be compared to the Javanese which only has (L) variety. Javanese has minus (-) for formal function. It is because he lived in an environment where the majority of the people use Javanese, he uses Javanese in some kind of informal situations. It is because Javanese language has speech levels which is also differentiated into two functions, *krama inggil* for formal and *ngoko lugu* as low level and informal function [5], the informant only uses Javanese in an informal situation while in a formal situation he tends to choose Indonesian as the (H) variety because he is not capable in speaking *krama inggil* when he talks to the interlocutor which only has Indonesian competence as the official language in his country and Javanese competence as the colloquial language. In this case,

the informant has already applied the three crucial features of diglossia which is proposed by Holmes [3].

From the result of the study, the situation in language use can be categorized in a type of diglossia based on the theory which is proposed by Hamers & Blanc [8] about four types of multilingual diglossia. The informant applies Double-nested diglossia where he uses three languages or codes in which two of the languages; English and Indonesian can be used in both varieties, Low (L) and (H) variety.

4) The Social Factors of Language Choice in Domains

The language use in the four domains is determined by four factors which all are applied by the informant. According to the theory of Holmes [2], those factors are solidarity or social distance scale, status scale, formality scale, and referential and affective scale. The previous data about the situation in language use is determined those factors in language choice of the informant. The first factor about solidarity or social distance scale is related to the language which has (L) variety and function; the results showed that the language which has that factor, emerge in all languages, English, Indonesian, and Javanese and those languages also can be as (L) variety and function. The second and the third factor about status and formality scales are related to the language which has (H) variety, those are English and Indonesian. The last factor is related to the language that has (L) or (H) variety because it depends to the participant and topic within conversation in what language would be used [8]. Home and Friendship domain is the most important in supporting his proficiency in those languages where in line with the theory of Govindasamy and Nambiar [13] in Setiawan [5], while in home domain he is already proficient in three languages while in friendship domain he uses language that is used by the majority of people there.

The solidarity or social distance scale happened in three of four domains. They are home, friendship, and college. Home domain is the most important part of the informant in his proficiency of the languages [5]. The relationship among the informant with the family members is high but still he considers the language use of the interlocutor. In this case, the language choice of the interlocutors at home domain becomes the determiner of his language choice in friendship and college domain. In friendship domain, he chooses the code from his mother, while in college domain; he chooses the code from his father.

The status scale is only happened in church domain. Setting, topic, and the interlocutor insists him to use English and Indonesia in all church processes as the (H) variety. It does in line with the theory of Holmes [3], she argues that to whom the speaker talking to, the social context of the conversation which is related to the function and the topic of the talk, they would determine the language choice of the informant.

The Formality scale is actually related to the solidarity and social distance scale [3]. Yet, the choice of the code is in different situation. The solidarity scale as (L) variety, while formality scale as (H) variety. In this case, only English and Indonesian that is chosen by the informant regarding to this

factor. The church domain which all processes are in formal situation becomes the determiner of the informant to choose those languages. As in line with theory of Holmes [3] that in status and formality scale would not use (L) variety because church is not a kind of simple and everyday conversation. It is not suitable that he would use English and Indonesian as (L) variety or even Javanese as the colloquial language.

The last factor is referential and effective scale. Even though both are related to each other, one of them would be the dominant one [3]. It is because happened in those languages based on the situation; in this case, while the informant chooses those languages as the (H) variety or formal situation, he tends to apply referential scale where telling directly the intended meaning is the most happened, for example, when he is in church domain. When the informant chooses those languages as the (L) variety or informal situation, he would be able to do affective function where the intended meaning is less to be understood, for example, when he uses Javanese to make some jokes in friendship domain.

5) The Attitude toward the Dominant Language

Being bilingual or multilingual adolescence, in his language use there will be seen the attitude toward the languages that he masters. Concerning the two previous discussions and the result of the study, attitude towards those languages emerge and one of them would be the dominant one why the informant often uses this language rather than the others, as stated by Crystal [3] about the language attitude. The collected data showed that one language which is mostly used and have positive attitude by the Informant is Javanese. Indonesian also may have positive attitude toward language but not as high as Javanese, because the informant used to switch or even mix both languages in some conversations. While English has negative attitude because he already mentioned that when he wants to speak in English, he has to think the words in Indonesian first then he provides them into English utterances.

Regarding to the positive and negative attitude, it is only one of the responses based on his confession through the interview. There are other aspects that may encourage the informant to identify the attitude toward language [5]. Based on the proficiency of the languages, the informant is proficient in three languages, English, Indonesian, and Javanese. Because of the mixed marriage background, those languages can be acquired since the informant was born. The results showed that he got English from his father and he got Indonesian and Javanese from his mother. In this case, mother has positive attitude toward Javanese and it gives a big role to the informant which can make him also has positive attitude towards Javanese. It is in line with the study of Tiessen in 2003 which is stated in [4]. In his study, he argues that if parents are positively proficient in a language that would be given to the children and adults at home, they also would be proficient in that language, and their attitude positively directs to the given language which has already mastered since they were at home. Another theory from Setiawan [4] supports that in this case, indeed, the proficiency of a language may influence the language attitude of someone.

Regarding the home as a domain which can determine his attitude towards Javanese, another domain which also supports the proficiency of the informant and make positive attitude towards Javanese is friendship. The results showed that he uses Javanese in friendship domain while the interlocutors are his own friends in his environment. This becomes one of the impacts of the language use from his mother in home domain. Talking about setting of this study, it is because he lives in Surabaya, Indonesia which the majority of the people there use Javanese as the colloquial language and Indonesian as the official language that can be used as (L) and (H) situations, it helps support his proficiency in Javanese that he gets started from home. Talking about the situation in languages use, the informant tends to switch or even mix both code based on to whom the informant speaking to. It is because he mostly uses Javanese when he communicates to his friends there. One factor that can encourage the informant uses Javanese in this domain is the solidarity or social distance among his friends which are high. The observation showed that it also creates an identity that the informant as a Javanese there, even though he is from mixed marriage family background that may encourage people to perceive that he is an American because of his father. In this case, his language may influence others' considerations about his identity in some groups there. It is in line with the theory of language attitude by Setiawan [5] that language attitude cannot be valued in only one response. His language use emerges as an identity.

In a bilingual term, it is a line with the theory of Setiawan [5] about language behavior that the informant even easily switches or mixes the codes. Based on the results, Indonesian is mostly used as the (H) variety if it is compared to Javanese. It is because his positive attitude towards Javanese is bigger than Indonesian, when he talks to someone which has low solidarity or having high status, he mostly switch or mix the code even in a sentence, clause, phrase, word, or even morpheme. One can be taken as the example is when the informant answers the interviewer's question. To show Indonesian as the (H) variety, he even tends to switch the morpheme, for instance, "**biasane**", it means commonly, "common" he said it in Indonesian while "ly" he switched it into Javanese. It is not only happened between both languages. Another case that Javanese is proved to already have positive attitude is when the informant switch one word between English and Javanese, for example, "**churche**", meaning the church. He said "church" in English, while word "the" turns into a morpheme in Javanese which put in the end of the word. In is a line with the theory of code switching or mixing by Hamers & Blanc [8]. One type that reveals those results is called intrasentencietal code-switching.

Language use which is happened in home and friendship domain definitely can reveal the attitude towards language of someone as stated by Govindasamy and Nambiar [13] in Setiawan [5]. Javanese as the (L) variety is mostly used there, even though Indonesian also could be (L) variety in those domains. It deals with the informant's personal feeling that he already mentioned that he likes and feels more comfort when he uses Javanese in some domains which use Javanese especially in friendship domain. For instance, when he makes some jokes to his friends, he already confessed that it will be

weird if he is joking to his friends in Indonesian, telling some jokes with Javanese would be funnier and he feels more comfortable about it. It does in line with the theory of Setiawan [5] that supports the theory of Crystal [4] about positive attitude which is about personal feeling of the speaker.

IV. CONCLUSION

Based on the data which are presented in results and discussions section, it can be concluded that this adolescent of Indonesian-American mixed marriage family is proficient in three languages; English, Indonesian, and Javanese. His attitude towards those languages leads to Javanese based on some factors. Firstly, it reveals the situation of language use based on those three languages. It deals with the function of each language in two varieties Low (L) as the informal function and High (H) variety as the formal function or it is called diglossia. The data showed that this adolescent applies double-nested diglossia where two of three languages can be both varieties (L) and (H), they are English and Indonesian, while Javanese only has (L) variety.

Secondly, the situation in that language use would determine the language choice in some domains. Based on the setting, topic, and the addressee, the language choice of four domains; home, friendship, college, and church, emerge under the influence of four factors or scales. They are solidarity or social distance scale, status scale, formality scale, and referential and affective scale. The language that has those four scales is English and Indonesian, while Javanese only applies solidarity and referential and affective scale. Related to the situation in language use, (L) variety is used because of solidarity scale, the three languages used in home domain, but two of them are mixed between Indonesian-Javanese while he communicates to all family members except to his father, he uses English. In friendship domain only used Javanese, and church only used English as (L) variety. Another case, (H) variety is applied because of status and formality scale. It is only happened in two kind of churches, using English or Indonesian. The last scale can be both varieties, it depends on the interlocutors, topic, and situations of the conversation and happened to all those domains.

Lastly, concerning to those two aspects, situation in language use and language choice of a multilingual adolescent, attitude towards those languages emerge and one of them would be the dominant one why the informant often uses this language rather than the others. The collected data showed that one language which is mostly used and have positive attitude by the Informant is Javanese. Because of the mixed marriage background, those languages can be acquired since the informant was born. The results showed that he got

English from his father and he got Indonesian and Javanese from his mother. It is also because he lives in Surabaya, Indonesia which the majority of the people there use Javanese as the colloquial language and Indonesian as the official language that can be used as (L) and (H) situations, it helps to support his proficiency in Javanese that he gets started from home. Javanese as the (L) variety is mostly used there, even though Indonesian also could be (L) variety in those domains. It deals with the informant's personal feeling that he already mentioned that he likes and feels more comfort when he uses Javanese in some domains which use Javanese to do some communication.

REFERENCES

- [1] United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division. *International Migration Report 2017: Highlights* (ST/ESA/SER.A/404), 2017.
- [2] L. Bloomfield, *Language and Linguistics*. London: Compton Printing LTD, 1973
- [3] J. Holmes, *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics* (fourth edi). New York: Routledge, 2013
- [4] D. Crystal, *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*. Australia: Blackwell Publishing, 2008.
- [5] S. Setiawan, *Children's Language in a Bilingual Community in East Java*. Germany: Scholar's Press, 2013.
- [6] B. S. Dwick, B. Sa'id, and A.H. Qawar, "Language Choice and Language Attitudes in a Multilingual Arab Canadian Community: Quebec-Canada: a Sociolinguistic Study", *British Journals of English Linguistics*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 1-12, 2015.
- [7] M. Sari, "The Language Attitude of Bilingual Children in Surabaya: A Case Study of Simultaneous and Sequential Bilinguals". *Language and Art Faculty*. State University of Surabaya. Surabaya, 2015.
- [8] J. F. Hamers and M. H. A. Blanc, *Bilinguality and Bilingualism* Second edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- [9] G. M. Moyer and L. Wei, *The Blackwell Guide to Research Methods in Bilingualism and Multilingualism*. Australia: Blackwell Publishing, 2008.
- [10] J. House and J. Rehbein, *Multilingual Communication*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin Publishing Company, 2005.
- [11] C. A. Ferguson, *Diglossia*, 1959.
- [12] J. A. Fishman, *The Sociology of Language*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 1972.
- [13] S. Govindasamy and M. Nambiar, "Social network applicability to minority communities in multilingual setting". *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, pp. 161-25, 2003.
- [14] S. Poplack, "Sometimes I'll start a sentence in spanish y termino en espanol: toward a typology of code-switching1". *Linguistics*, vol. 18, no. 7-8, pp. 581-618, 1980.