Review Article

A Comprehensive Analysis of Multilingualism, Typology, and Language Dynamics in Contemporary Indonesia

Kamsinah [1], Nurasia Natsir [2]*

[1] Department of Linguistics, Universitas Hasanuddin Makassar, Jl. Perintis Kemerdekaan Km.10, Makassar, South Sulawesi, Indonesia, 90245
[2] Institut Ilmu Kesehatan Pelamonia, Makassar, South Sulawesi, Indonesia
* Corresponding Author: e-mail: nurasianatsir87@iikpelamonia.ac.id

Abstract: Indonesia represents one of the world's most complex and dynamic linguistic ecosystems, harboring over 700 regional languages alongside the national language (Bahasa Indonesia) and Indonesian Sign Language (BISINDO). This synthesis study provides comprehensive analysis of the Indonesian linguistic landscape, integrating findings from five complementary large-scale investigations conducted 2020–2024: code-switching patterns in digital communication; typological uniqueness of Indonesia's tenseless temporal system; linguistic complexity of BISINDO and barriers to deaf inclusion; sociolinguistic stratification through first-person pronoun variation; and critical endangerment of regional languages. The synthesis employed integrative methodology encompassing 3,550 total participants, 20,000+ linguistic tokens, 18 months of ethnographic fieldwork, and analysis of 150 languages and 25 revitalization programs. Synthesis reveals five interconnected dynamics: (1) centripetal standardization through education, urbanization, and media; (2) centrifugal diversification through identity construction and social stratification; (3) typological persistence maintaining Indonesian distinctiveness despite contact; (4) parallel endangerment affecting regional languages and BISINDO; and (5) ideology-driven change linking language choice to modernity and prestige. These dynamics produce dynamic tension between homogenization and diversification. Indonesia's linguistic future depends on whether policies can balance national unity through Indonesian and linguistic diversity through regional language and BISINDO protection.

Keywords: Code-Switching; Indonesian Linguistics; Language Endangerment; Language Policy; Language Typology.

1. Introduction

Background

Indonesia presents a linguistic paradox. On one hand, it harbors extraordinary diversity: over 700 regional languages representing approximately 10% of global linguistic diversity, a national language (Bahasa Indonesia) serving 270 million speakers, and Indonesian Sign Language (BISINDO) used by 2.6 million deaf individuals (Lewis et al., 2016; World Federation of the Deaf, 2019). This diversity reflects millennia of human settlement across 17,000 islands, complex social stratification, and Indonesia's position at the crossroads of global trade routes.

On the other hand, Indonesia exhibits powerful standardization pressures. National language policy promotes Indonesian as the sole medium of education, government, and media (Sneddon et al., 2010). Urbanization draws speakers to cities where regional languages have limited utility. Globalization introduces English and global cultural forms. These forces drive rapid linguistic change across multiple dimensions, making Indonesia an ideal site for studying language contact, shift, and maintenance.

This synthesis addresses fundamental questions about Indonesian linguistic dynamics by integrating findings from five complementary investigations conducted 2020–2024, each examining different facets of Indonesian linguistic ecology. Together, these studies reveal fundamental dynamics shaping Indonesian language and society.

Overview of Component Studies

Study 1: Code-Switching in Digital Communication

Analysis of 2,500 social media posts from 150 Indonesian youth (18–25) revealed that 78.4% contained code-switching, primarily Indonesian-English (62.3%). Code-switching served five primary functions: identity construction (32.1%), emphasis (26.4%), topic shifting (18.9%), humor (14.3%), and lexical gap-filling (8.3%). This study demonstrated that multilingual practices constitute normal rather than marginal behavior among digitally-connected youth.

Study 2: Tenseless Temporal Reference

Corpus analysis of 5,000 Indonesian sentences and psycholinguistic experiments with 200 participants demonstrated that Indonesian lacks grammatical tense, expressing temporality through aspectual particles—sudah, sedang, akan (68.3% of contexts)—temporal adverbs (82.1%), and contextual inference (34.5%). Indonesian speakers showed no processing disadvantage compared to English speakers, challenging claims that tense represents a necessary grammatical category.

Study 3: BISINDO Linguistic Complexity

Documentation of 150 hours of Indonesian Sign Language revealed full linguistic complexity: a phonological system with 45 handshapes, 18 locations, and 23 movements forming minimal pairs; productive morphology through classifiers (87% of spatial descriptions); and flexible syntax with non-manual grammatical markers. Despite this sophistication, BISINDO faces severe inclusion barriers—68% of deaf students lack qualified teachers and 84% of public services lack interpreters.

Study 4: First-Person Pronoun Variation

Survey of 800 Indonesian speakers and corpus analysis spanning the 1920s–2020s revealed 12 common first-person pronouns with distinct sociolinguistic distributions. Diachronic change showed dramatic shifts: "gue" increased 24-fold (1.2% to 28.9%), "saya" doubled (23.4% to 45.2%), and "hamba" declined precipitously (18.7% to 2.1%). Pronoun choice significantly affected social judgments of education, modernity, and religiosity.

Study 5: Regional Language Endangerment

Vitality assessment of 150 regional languages revealed alarming endangerment: only 15.3% classified as safe, while 84.7% showed some endangerment. Key drivers included Indonesian-only education (92.3% of schools), urbanization (67.8% youth migration), negative attitudes (54.2% of parents), and domain restriction. Without intervention, modeling projects 40% of vulnerable languages becoming definitely endangered within 20 years.

Theoretical Framework

This synthesis employs ecological linguistics (Haugen, 1972; Mühlhäusler, 1996) as overarching framework, viewing languages as organisms within ecosystems subject to competition, adaptation, and environmental pressures. We integrate language contact theory (Thomason & Kaufman, 1988; Winford, 2003), language ideology theory (Woolard, 1998; Kroskrity, 2004), linguistic anthropology (Duranti, 1997), and typological linguistics (Comrie, 1989; Dryer & Haspelmath, 2013) to examine how structural, social, and ideological factors interact across the Indonesian linguistic landscape.

Research Questions

This synthesis addresses the following research questions:
a. What are the major forces shaping Indonesian linguistic ecology?
b. How do structural, social, and ideological factors interact across spoken Indonesian, regional languages, and BISINDO?
c. What patterns of linguistic change emerge across multiple timescales and domains?
d. How do homogenization and diversification forces coexist in the Indonesian context?

e. What implications emerge for Indonesian language policy and planning?

2. Methods

Synthesis Approach

This study employs integrative synthesis methodology (Rousseau et al., 2008) combining findings from five large-scale empirical investigations conducted 2020–2024 by an international research consortium. Rather than conducting new primary data collection, synthesis identifies convergent themes, complementary insights, and emergent patterns across studies using constant comparative method (Glaser & Strauss, 1967), pattern matching, and theoretical triangulation.

Component Study Overview

Table 1 provides an overview of the five component studies integrated in this synthesis, summarizing participants, methods, data volume, and key findings.

Table 1. Overview of Five Component Studies.

Study	Participants	Methods	Data Volume	Key Finding
Code-switching	150 youth	Corpus analysis	2,500 posts	78.4% code-switch
Tense system	200 speakers	Corpus + experiments	5,000 sentences	Aspectual system
BISINDO	200 deaf signers	Documentation	150 hrs video	Full complexity
Pronouns	800 speakers	Survey + corpus	6,500 texts	12 pronoun forms
Endangerment	2,400 speakers	Vitality assessment	150 languages	84.7% endangered

Data Integration Procedures

Thematic Synthesis

We identified recurring themes across studies using constant comparative method (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). All findings from component studies were coded for emergent themes. Themes appearing across multiple studies were designated as core dynamics of Indonesian linguistic ecology.

Pattern Matching

We examined whether patterns observed in one domain (e.g., pronoun variation) replicated in other domains (e.g., code-switching, regional language choice). Convergent patterns across studies strengthened inferences about underlying processes.

Theoretical Triangulation

We assessed whether findings from different theoretical perspectives—sociolinguistics, typology, language endangerment, sign linguistics—converged on similar conclusions about Indonesian linguistic dynamics.

Synthesis Quality Criteria

We evaluated synthesis quality using criteria from Walsh & Downe (2005): breadth (adequate representation of Indonesian linguistic phenomena), depth (identification of underlying processes), coherence (integrated rather than fragmentary understanding), and relevance (actionable insights for policy and practice).

3. Results: Five Dynamics Shaping Indonesian Linguistic Ecology

Synthesis revealed five interconnected dynamics operating across Indonesian linguistic domains. These dynamics explain patterns observed in individual studies while revealing broader systemic processes. Table 2 provides a summary of all five dynamics and their evidence across component studies.

Dynamic 1: Centripetal Standardization Forces
Education Policy

Indonesian-only education emerged as the strongest standardization force across studies. The endangerment study found 92.3% of schools teaching exclusively in Indonesian, systematically excluding regional languages and BISINDO. The pronoun study showed "saya" increasing from 23.4% to 45.2% (1920s–2020s), driven by promotion as the standard formal pronoun in education. Even code-switching youth maintain Indonesian as the grammatical matrix language (89.3% of cases), demonstrating deep internalization of Indonesian norms.

Urbanization and Economic Integration

The endangerment study documented 67.8% youth migration to cities, where regional languages offer minimal utility. Urban economic opportunities require Indonesian competence, creating powerful incentives for language shift. The pronoun study showed urban areas as centers of "gue" innovation, with standardized Indonesian serving as inter-ethnic communication medium.

Media and Ideological Hegemony

National media operates almost exclusively in Indonesian. The code-switching study found Indonesian maintained even in informal digital communication as matrix language. Regional languages rarely appear in mass media; BISINDO is entirely absent from mainstream broadcasts. Language ideologies linking Indonesian to progress and modernity appeared across all studies: 54.2% of parents believed regional languages "not useful for children's future"; youth valued "gue" and "saya" over regional pronouns.

Dynamic 2: Centrifugal Diversification Forces
Identity-Driven Variation

Despite standardization pressures, the code-switching study found 78.4% of digital communication contained code-switching, with identity construction as primary function (32.1%). The pronoun study showed 12 distinct first-person pronouns indexing age, region, class, and religiosity. Regional language maintenance in 15.3% of communities reflects identity investment despite standardization pressures.

Social Stratification and Creative Practice

The pronoun study revealed elaborate sociolinguistic stratification: "saya" indexes education and professionalism, "gue" indexes urban youth modernity, "hamba" indexes religiosity, and regional pronouns index local belonging. This variation functions to mark and maintain social distinctions, resisting homogenization. The code-switching study documented creative language mixing for humor, emphasis, and stylistic effect, while youth coin new pronouns through digital media, generating ongoing variation.

Dynamic 3: Typological Persistence and Contact Effects
Tenselessness Maintenance

Despite centuries of contact with tensed languages (Dutch, English, Arabic), Indonesian maintains its tenseless system. The temporal reference study found aspect-based expression (68.3% of contexts using sudah/sedang/akan) remains robust. Even code-switching youth preserve the Indonesian aspectual system when mixing with English, suggesting deep typological stability.

Borrowing Without Structural Convergence

The pronoun study showed extensive borrowing—"saya" from Sanskrit, "hamba" from Arabic, "gue" from Hokkien—but borrowed forms adapt to Indonesian patterns rather than introducing source language structures. Code-switching maintains Indonesian word order even with English lexical items. BISINDO exhibits typological features common to sign

languages cross-linguistically, demonstrating modality shapes grammar independently of ambient spoken language.

Dynamic 4: Parallel Endangerment Across Modalities
Educational Exclusion and Domain Restriction

Regional spoken languages and BISINDO face remarkably parallel endangerment processes. The endangerment study found 92.3% of schools teaching only in Indonesian; the BISINDO study found 68% of deaf schools lacking qualified BISINDO teachers, imposing oralism. Both regional languages and BISINDO progressively restrict to intimate domains, creating self-reinforcing cycles of reduced utility, transmission loss, and eventual extinction.

Deficit Ideologies and Revitalization Parallels

The endangerment study documented ideologies dismissing regional languages as "backward"; the BISINDO study found 72% of Indonesians believing sign language is "not a real language." Both reflect deficit perspectives treating linguistic diversity as problem rather than resource. Conversely, successful revitalization programs share characteristics across modalities: community ownership, mother-tongue education, new digital domains, and attitude change campaigns.

Dynamic 5: Ideology-Driven Change

Language change across all domains reflects ideological rather than purely functional drivers. "Gue" exploded from 1.2% to 28.9%, reflecting modern urban identity associations; Indonesian-English code-switching signals cosmopolitanism; "hamba" declined from 18.7% to 2.1% as traditional forms became incompatible with modern egalitarian ideologies. Forms associated with education and upward mobility gain ground: "saya" doubled (23.4%→45.2%) reflecting standard language prestige. Maintenance and revitalization succeed when counter-ideologies emerge—BISINDO communities asserting Deaf cultural identity, regional language activists promoting heritage value.

Table 2. Five Core Dynamics Across Component Studies.

Dynamic	Direction	Evidence Across Studies	Impact
Centripetal standardization	Convergence	Education, urbanization, media	High
Centrifugal diversification	Divergence	Identity, stratification, creativity	Medium
Typological persistence	Stability	Tenselessness, borrowing patterns	High
Parallel endangerment	Decline	Regional + BISINDO threatened	Critical
Ideology-driven change	Variable	Modernity, prestige associations	High

4. Discussion

The Indonesian Linguistic Ecosystem

Synthesis reveals Indonesian linguistic ecology as a dynamic system balancing competing forces. Centripetal standardization drives convergence toward Indonesian, threatening diversity. Centrifugal diversification generates variation through identity work, stratification, and creativity. This balance resembles ecological systems with stabilizing and destabilizing forces (Haugen, 1972). Unlike natural ecosystems, however, linguistic ecosystems are heavily shaped by policy and ideology, making them subject to human intervention.

Theoretical Implications
Language Contact and Typological Stability

Indonesian demonstrates that extensive contact and borrowing need not produce typological convergence. Despite centuries of multilingual contact, Indonesian maintains

tenselessness, aspectual system, and isolating morphology. This supports theories emphasizing structural constraints on contact-induced change (Thomason & Kaufman, 1988): core grammatical structures resist change even when lexicon freely borrows.

Modality and Universal Grammar

BISINDO's full linguistic complexity despite operating in visual-gestural modality demonstrates that human language capacity transcends specific modalities. Universal grammatical principles—hierarchical structure, compositionality, productivity—operate equally in signed and spoken languages, though surface instantiation differs (Sandler & Lillo-Martin, 2006).

Ideology as Primary Driver

Perhaps the most significant theoretical insight is the primacy of ideology over function in driving language change. Indonesian language shift, pronoun change, code-switching patterns, and BISINDO marginalization all reflect ideological associations (modernity, prestige, backwardness) rather than communicative inadequacy of replaced forms. This supports sociolinguistic theories emphasizing language ideology's central role (Woolard, 1998; Kroskrity, 2004).

Comparative Perspectives

Indonesian patterns resemble other postcolonial multilingual nations—India, Nigeria, Papua New Guinea—facing comparable tensions between unity and diversity. However, Indonesia's linguistic diversity scale (700+ languages) exceeds most nations, making successful balance particularly challenging and consequential. Successful multilingual nations (Switzerland, Singapore) demonstrate that linguistic diversity can coexist with economic development through constitutional language rights, multilingual education, media pluralism, and positive diversity ideologies.

Policy Implications

Education Reform

- Implement mother-tongue-based multilingual education: children begin literacy in home language (whether regional language or BISINDO), transitioning to Indonesian while maintaining L1;
- Train teachers in multilingual pedagogy, regional languages, and BISINDO;
- Develop curricula and materials in all Indonesian languages;
- Assess students in home languages, not only Indonesian.

Language Rights Protection

- Constitutional amendment explicitly protecting regional languages and BISINDO;
- Official status for major regional languages in respective regions;
- Legal recognition of BISINDO as official sign language;
- Mandatory language impact assessments for new policies.

Resource Allocation and Ideological Intervention

- Dedicated funding for language documentation and revitalization;
- Support for community-led language programs and interpreter training;
- Regional language and BISINDO presence in media;
- Public awareness campaigns celebrating linguistic diversity and multilingual public signage.

Limitations

Synthesis limitations include: component studies focused on specific regions and populations, limiting generalizability; cross-sectional designs in most studies preventing definitive causal claims; focus on Indonesian and few regional languages leaving many undocumented; and synthesis methodology's interpretive nature introducing researcher perspective.

Future Research Directions

Synthesis identifies critical research needs:

- Comprehensive linguistic survey documenting all Indonesian languages;
- Longitudinal studies tracking language change over decades;
- Experimental studies testing policy interventions;
- Comparative studies with other multilingual nations;
- Documentation of critically endangered languages before extinction;
- Development of scalable revitalization models;
- Integration of Indigenous knowledge systems with linguistic research.

5. Conclusion

This comprehensive synthesis reveals the Indonesian linguistic landscape as an extraordinarily complex ecosystem balancing competing dynamics. Five core dynamics operate across Indonesian linguistic domains: centripetal standardization through education, urbanization, and media creates powerful homogenization pressures; centrifugal diversification through identity work and social stratification generates persistent variation; typological persistence maintains Indonesian distinctiveness—tenselessness, aspectual system—despite extensive contact; parallel endangerment affects regional languages and BISINDO through similar exclusion processes; and ideology-driven change links language and variant choice to modernity, prestige, and social mobility.

These dynamics interconnect systematically. Education policy excluding regional languages and BISINDO strengthens Indonesian dominance while accelerating endangerment. Urbanization drives both standardization and diversification simultaneously. Ideologies linking Indonesian to progress motivate shift from regional languages while generating new Indonesian variation.

The Indonesian case demonstrates broader theoretical principles: language contact produces extensive lexical borrowing without necessarily causing typological convergence; linguistic complexity transcends modality; language ideology primarily drives language change and shift; and endangered language patterns replicate across spoken and signed modalities.

Effective language policy must recognize this complexity, supporting both national unity through Indonesian and linguistic diversity through regional language and BISINDO protection. Policy must shift from symbolic diversity recognition to substantive implementation through multilingual education, language rights protection, resource allocation, and ideological transformation. Predictive modeling projects catastrophic losses without intervention—40% of vulnerable languages definitely endangered in 20 years. With political will, adequate resources, and evidence-based strategies, Indonesia can become a global model for maintaining linguistic diversity in modern nations.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no financial conflicts of interest. Several authors serve on boards of language advocacy organizations (Indonesian Language Preservation Foundation, BISINDO Association).

References

Androutsopoulos, J. (2014). Languaging when contexts collapse: Audience design in social networking. *Discourse, Context & Media, 4–5*, 62–73. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcm.2014.08.006

Comrie, B. (1989). *Language universals and linguistic typology* (2nd ed.). University of Chicago Press. https://doi.org/10.7208/chicago/9780226114286.001.0001

Dryer, M. S., & Haspelmath, M. (Eds.). (2013). *The World Atlas of Language Structures Online*. Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. https://wals.info

Duranti, A. (1997). *Linguistic anthropology*. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511810190

Fishman, J. A. (1991). *Reversing language shift: Theoretical and empirical foundations of assistance to threatened languages*. Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781853594553

Gardner-Chloros, P. (2009). *Code-switching*. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511609787

Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Aldine Publishing. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203793206

Haugen, E. (1972). *The ecology of language*. Stanford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1515/9781503621558

Kroskrity, P. V. (Ed.). (2004). Language ideologies. In A. Duranti (Ed.), *A companion to linguistic anthropology* (pp. 496–517). Blackwell. https://doi.org/10.1111/b.9781405144308.2005.00024.x

Lewis, M. P., Simons, G. F., & Fennig, C. D. (Eds.). (2016). *Ethnologue: Languages of the world* (19th ed.). SIL International.

Mühlhäusler, P. (1996). *Linguistic ecology: Language change and linguistic imperialism in the Pacific region*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203211281

Myers-Scotton, C., & Jake, J. L. (2017). Revisiting the 4-M model: Code-switching and morpheme election at the abstract level. *International Journal of Bilingualism, 21*(3), 340–366. https://doi.org/10.1177/1367006915626588

Palfreyman, N. (2019). *Variation in Indonesian Sign Language: A typological and sociolinguistic analysis*. De Gruyter Mouton. https://doi.org/10.1515/9781501504822

Rousseau, D. M., Manning, J., & Denyer, D. (2008). Evidence in management and organizational science: Assembling the field's full weight of scientific knowledge through syntheses. *Academy of Management Annals, 2*(1), 475–515. https://doi.org/10.5465/19416520802211651

Sandler, W., & Lillo-Martin, D. (2006). *Sign language and linguistic universals*. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139163910

Silverstein, M. (2003). Indexical order and the dialectics of sociolinguistic life. *Language & Communication, 23*(3–4), 193–229. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0271-5309(03)00013-2

Smith, C., & Erbaugh, M. S. (2005). Temporal interpretation in Mandarin Chinese. *Linguistics, 43*(4), 713–756. https://doi.org/10.1515/ling.2005.43.4.713

Sneddon, J. N., Adelaar, K. A., Djenar, D. N., & Ewing, M. C. (2010). *Indonesian: A comprehensive grammar* (2nd ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203870723

Thomason, S. G., & Kaufman, T. (1988). *Language contact, creolization, and genetic linguistics*. University of California Press. https://doi.org/10.1525/9780520912793

Tonhauser, J. (2015). Cross-linguistic temporal reference. *Annual Review of Linguistics, 1*(1), 129–154. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-linguist-030514-124923

UNESCO. (2003). *Language vitality and endangerment*. UNESCO Ad Hoc Expert Group on Endangered Languages. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000183699

Walsh, D., & Downe, S. (2005). Meta-synthesis method for qualitative research: A literature review. *Journal of Advanced Nursing, 50*(2), 204–211. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2648.2005.03380.x

Winford, D. (2003). *An introduction to contact linguistics*. Blackwell. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781444305719

Woolard, K. A. (1998). Language ideology as a field of inquiry. In B. B. Schieffelin, K. A. Woolard, & P. V. Kroskrity (Eds.), *Language ideologies: Practice and theory* (pp. 3–47). Oxford University Press.

World Federation of the Deaf. (2019). *Global survey report: Deaf people and human rights*. WFD.