

## THE SPEECH ACCOMMODATION STRATEGIES OPTED BY MIGRANT STUDENTS IN SURABAYA

Farah Anjanillah

Universitas Islam Negeri (UIN) Sunan Ampel  
Surabaya [farahanjanillah.pusbas.uinsa@gmail.com](mailto:farahanjanillah.pusbas.uinsa@gmail.com)

Received: 09-06-2024

Revised: 15-06-2024

Approved: 22-06-2024

### ABSTRACT

*The social conditions of Indonesia as multilingual and multicultural might lead to the emergence of language variations such as dialects. Nevertheless, those dialects could affect the mutual intelligibility between the speaker and the interlocutor (Wardhaugh & Fuller, 2015). From this case, the researcher is attracted to undertake a study exploring the strategies applied by migrant students from many regions in East Java to accommodate Surabayan dialect along their undergraduate degree journey in Surabaya. This study aims to sketch out the forms, strategies and motives underlying speech accommodation by employing the theoretical framework of Giles & Powesland (1975), Giles et al's (1979) and Coupland et al (1988). The data were obtained through a questionnaire. The results of the study showcase that the migrant students employed convergence and divergence strategy to accommodate Surabayan dialect indicated in numerous word classes. The forms of speech accommodation include upward and long-term adjustment (Dragojevic et al, 2016). Meanwhile, in terms of motive, it involves affective and cognitive motive (Dragojevic et al, 2016). Besides, the respondents also applied interpretability and approximation strategy (Coupland et al, 1988). To wrap those all up, it could be grasped that the application of speech accommodation strategies are affected by external factors of language such as social distance, prestige, with whom and where the interaction occurs (Wijana & Rohmadi, 2013; Gnisci et al, 2016; Palomares et al, 2016).*

**Keywords :** *Speech accommodation, Motives of speech accommodation, Dialect*

### INTRODUCTION

The motto of Indonesia as *Bhinneka Tunggal Ika* 'Unity in Diversity' strongly depicts that Indonesia is rich in numerous tribes and languages. According to Dardjowidjojo (2003) and (Lewis et al, 2014), there are 706 local languages within Indonesia. Nonetheless, the local language which has the highest number of speakers is Javanese language with 84,000,000 (Lewis et al, 2014). Therefore, by the diversity of the social and cultural background of the speakers, Javanese language is colored with various language variations. Crystal (2008) illuminated the terminology of "variety" as the language's situational differences including dialect. According to Meyerhoff (2006), dialect refers to the distinctive features at the level of pronunciation, vocabulary, and grammar which are used by a particular group of people of the same language. In other words, it could be conceived that dialect is a part of language (Crystal, 2008). Linguistically, when two people understand each other what they are talking about, it means they speak two different dialects from the same language. This concept is called as mutual intelligibility (Wardhaugh & Fuller, 2015). Nevertheless, it is noteworthy to consider that there are also unintelligible dialects leading to a case where two speakers of the same language could not understand each other (Wardhaugh & Fuller, 2015). By this point, it is fascinating to probe how the migrant students originating from various

regions of East Java tackle down the different dialects when staying in Surabaya for undertaking their undergraduate study. As the result, the researcher is intrigued to carry out an inquiry to answer the research problems as the following; 1) “what are the strategies applied by migrant students from many regions in East Java to accommodate Surabayan dialect along their undergraduate study in Surabaya?” and 2) “what are the motives which underlie the use of speech accommodation?”.

In hindsight, there have been the proliferating interests on this grand theme of speech accommodation for migrant people in other regions of Indonesia, such as the studies carried out by I. Suputra (2012), Putri & Setiawan (2020), D. Suputra et al (2020), Wicaksana (2020), Prasetyo (2023) regarding the strategies of speech accommodation and the underlying reasons. Meanwhile, Novitasari & Handayani (2023) discussed the variations of Javanese dialects. This literature is also relevant with this study taking into account that the strategies of speech accommodation could be dismantled through the existence of distinct dialects between the migrant students and the host society. Nevertheless, those previous inquiries did not classify more specific on the forms of convergence and divergence as well as the motives. Thus, this study has filled the gap and enriched the existing inquiries by specifying the forms of convergence and divergence as proposed by Giles & Powesland (1975) as well as the classification of motives by employing the theoretical framework of Giles et al (1979).

## **THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK**

### **Speech accommodation Theory (SAT)**

This theory was proposed by Howard Giles and his associates in 1973 (Coupland, 1984; Meyerhoff, 2011). This tenet deals with the process of linguistic behavior adjustment or accommodation done by the speakers as a strategy to re-negotiate, maintain or establish relationships with the interlocutors within a communication (Meyerhoff, 2011). Therefore, it is also known as audience design (Bell, 1984; Yule, 2010; Meyerhoff, 2011). In addition, referring to Giles, Wardhaugh & Fuller also elucidated that this notion is also termed as Communication accommodation Theory (CAT). This tenet offers two strategies; convergence and divergence (Meyerhoff, 2011).

Convergence refers to the strategy in which the speakers attempt to attune their linguistic behavior to be in the same frequency as the interlocutors (Meyerhoff, 2011; Dragojevic et al, 2016). It could be seen through the similarities in using vocabulary or pronunciation (Meyerhoff, 2011; Holmes, 2013). Furthermore, this strategy also belongs to polite strategy within a communication since the speakers implicitly consider that the interlocutors' speech is acceptable and worthy to be imitated (Holmes, 2013). In other words, it could be said that the speakers who undertake convergence strategy share the same interest as the interlocutors. Furthermore, adopting this strategy also enables the speakers to be inclusive with the interlocutors' group and to create intimacy (Gnisci et al, 2016; Palomares et al, 2016). On the contrary, divergence deals with a strategy in which the speakers intentionally use different word choices from what have been being used by the interlocutors (Meyerhoff, 2011). Thus, it is noteworthy that when the speakers employ divergence, it does not mean that they do not respond to the interaction with the interlocutors, instead it is a form of speech attunement or accommodation to maintain their own accents, interests or cultures. By those points, it might be grasped that SAT implies that there is a relationship between language and society structure since language could accommodate social bonds.

In terms of the motives underlying speech accommodation, Giles et al (1979) divided them into two major classifications; affective and cognitive motives. Affective motive deals with the motivation of convergence to gain social approval from the interlocutor (Dragojevic et al, 2016). Meanwhile, in terms of divergence, affective motive deals with maintaining their identities (Dragojevic et al, 2016). Whereas, cognitive motive denotes the speaker's desire to create an effective and comprehensive communication with the interlocutor (Dragojevic et al, 2016). For the convergence strategy, the speaker wants to reach an effective communication by attuning their linguistic features with the interlocutor. Meanwhile, comprehension of the communication could also be facilitated by divergence since divergence could indicate that certain spheres of knowledge and behaviors might not be shared among interactants, with the goal of preventing misunderstandings (Dragojevic et al, 2016).

Based on the goal, adjustment is manifested in five ways (Coupland et al, 1988). The first way of adjustment is called an approximation strategy. It deals with the strategy to accommodate the speakers' speech styles including the verbal or non-verbal behaviors to be similar (convergence) or dissimilar (divergence) as the interlocutors (see Giles & Wadleigh, 2008). Thus, this way concerns more on the interlocutors' productive language. The second way is interpretability strategy. These refer to the strategies to attain understandable communication (Dragojevic et al, 2016). In order to reach the comprehension within an interaction, the speaker could adopt convergence by using the same vocabularies as the interlocutors. The third way of adjustment is discourse management strategy. It accentuates the macro-conversational needs. Hence, the speakers attune the conversational topics based on the interlocutors' interest (Dragojevic et al, 2016). The fourth way of adjustment is called an interpersonal control strategy. It concentrates on the role relationships in communication (Dragojevic et al, 2016). For instance, to remind the interlocutors with regard to their relative status, the speakers might use honorifics or an interruption (Dragojevic et al, 2016). Ultimately, the last way of adjustment is called as emotional expression. It focuses on the way to make the interlocutors comfortable within the interaction (Dragojevic et al, 2016). All in all, the speakers could interchangeably alter the speech accommodation from convergence to divergence simultaneously, besides they could also employ multiple strategies at the same time (Dragojevic et al, 2016).

### **The Forms of Convergence and Divergence**

Giles & Powesland (1975) categorized convergence and divergence into several five forms based on the social value, degree, symmetry, modality, and duration of the behavior. 1) upward/downward refers to the form of adjustment with regard to social value (Giles & Powesland, 1975). Upward adjustment deals with the shifting toward a more prestigious speech variety, in contrast downward adjustment related to the shifting toward a stigmatized or less prestigious variety (Dragojevic et al, 2016). 2) full/partial adjustment deals with the degree people escalate or their speed to match exactly another speaker's rate (Dragojevic et al, 2016). 3) symmetrical/asymmetrical deals with whether or not people's communicative moves or topics of the conversation are reciprocated by the other (Dragojevic et al, 2016). 4) unimodal/multimodal refers to whether people adjust only one or some communicative features, for instance only adjusting the vocabulary or adjusting multiple dimensions such as the accent, eye contact, and so forth (Dragojevic et al, 2016). Finally, 5) short-term/long-term deals

with the duration of adjustment. Sometimes, it only occurs in a short time such as only in one or a few social interactions. Besides, it could occur in the long term since it is more maintained through multiple interactions (Dragojevic et al, 2016). Based on those theoretical frameworks, it could be grasped that in having a conversation, the speaker might use the language based on the situational or implicational context (Wijana & Rohmadi, 2013). Hence, the researcher hypothesized that the migrant students from various regions in East Java would use a number of convergence or divergence forms and under various motives in accommodating their speech styles with the Surabaya community.

## **RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

Considering that this study strove to analyze the complexity of human phenomena of a certain community, thus it implemented case study design (Harrison, Birks, Franklin & Mills, 2017). In terms of the subjects of the study, they were chosen based on purposeful sampling since the researcher intentionally chose them based on several qualifications in order to understand the phenomenon being investigated (Creswell, 2012). The 15 respondents were opted as the following criteria; the migrant students are the new students whose origins are from East Java, specifically the regions which have distinct dialects from Surabayan dialect and have studied for 8 months at X university of Surabaya.

The participants of this study come from Kediri, Nganjuk, Blitar, Tulungagung, Madiun, Ngawi, Ponorogo, Bojonegoro, Lamongan. This small scale of Java Island was intended to reach the feasibility of the study. It is in accordance with Given's notion (2008) on the requirement of conducting qualitative research. Given (2008) explicated that the qualitative inquiry must be feasible. It means that the researcher has to take into account and assure whether the study could be accomplished or not by the population or the scale (Given, 2008). Therefore, the researcher decided to explore this phenomenon only in the scope of East Java. Although it demonstrates a small scale and has not represented the whole Indonesia, the researcher expects that the findings could sketch out the use of speech accommodation strategies in Surabaya as the host land.

To answer research problems with regard to the strategies and the motives of speech accommodation, the researcher collected the data of this study through questionnaire in the google form. However, the data of the dialects are restricted only in terms of vocabulary. In terms of the data analysis, there were several steps undertaken as the following: First of all, the researcher identified and classified the data of convergence and divergence strategy based on the word class. After that, the researcher analyzed the form of each convergence and divergence strategy by employing the analytical framework of Giles & Powesland (1975). The next step is that analyzing the data gained through questionnaire and relating it to the motives underlying speech accommodation under Giles et al's theory (1979). In this part, the participants were allowed to give multiple motives propelling their speech accommodations based on the different situations. Finally, the researcher drew the conclusion.

Regarding the data transcription, the researcher employed orthographical transcription (Sudaryanto, 2015; Wijana, 2016) according to *Kamus Bahasa Jawa-Bahasa Indonesia I* 'The Dictionary of Javanese-Indonesian Language' (1993), the second edition of *Kamus Basa Jawa (Bausastra Jawa)* 'Javanese Language Dictionary' (2011), and *Kamus Bahasa Jawa Tegal-Indonesia* 'The Dictionary of Tegal Javanese-Indonesian

Language’ (2017). Besides, the researcher also applied gloss (Sudaryanto, 2015) by translating the Javanese data into English. The italic typing was used to indicate Javanese language, whilst the glosses were indicated within ‘...’ or two apostrophes.

**RESULT AND DISCUSSION**

Based on the analysis results, the researcher uncovered that there are distinct speech accommodation strategies applied by the migrant students in Surabaya and various motives underlying the speech accommodation as presented subsequently.

**The Strategies of Speech Accommodation**

**Convergence Strategy**

When being asked “*Selama menjadi mahasiswa baru di Surabaya untuk kuliah, pernahkah Anda mengubah kosakata asal daerah Anda dengan kosakata Jawa Surabaya?*” ‘Along being a new undergraduate student in Surabaya, have you ever altered your regional Javanese vocabularies into Surabayan vocabularies?’, 84.2% of the participants answered “yes”, while 15.8% of them are vice-versa. The list of Surabayan vocabularies that have been adopted by the participants is presented in the subsequent tables:

**Table 1.**  
**Convergence Strategy in Noun**

<b>Surrounding Dialects</b>	<b>Surabayan Dialect</b>	<b>The Vocabularies that Have Been Opted by The Participants in Surabaya</b>	<b>Gloss</b>
<i>Bocah-bocah</i>	<i>Arèk-arèk</i>	<i>Arèk-arèk</i>	Guys
<i>Dalan, ratan</i>	<i>Èmbong</i>	<i>Èmbong</i>	Street
<i>Porak</i>	<i>Karepmu</i>	<i>Karepmu</i>	(It is) up to you

**Table 2.**  
**Convergence Strategy in Adjective**

<b>Surrounding Dialects</b>	<b>Surabayan Dialect</b>	<b>The Vocabularies that Have Been Opted by The Participants in Surabaya</b>	<b>Gloss</b>
<i>Parek</i>	<i>Cedhek</i>	<i>Cedhek</i>	Near
<i>Élok</i>	<i>Apik</i>	<i>Apik</i>	Good
<i>Mumet</i>	<i>Ngelu</i>	<i>Ngelu</i>	Dizzy
<i>Kesel</i>	<i>Pegel</i>	<i>Pegel</i>	Tired

**Table 3.**  
**Convergence Strategy in Question Word**

<b>Surrounding Dialects</b>	<b>Surabayan Dialect</b>	<b>The Vocabularies that Have Been Opted by The Participants in Surabaya</b>	<b>Gloss</b>
-----------------------------	--------------------------	--	--------------

<i>Piyé?</i>	<i>Yok-apa?</i>	<i>Yok-apa?</i>	How?
<i>Nyapo? Généa?</i>	<i>Lapo?</i>	<i>Lapo?</i>	Why?

**Table 4.**  
**Convergence Strategy in Particle of Interrogative Sentence**

Surrounding Dialects	Surabayan Dialect	The Vocabularies that Have Been Opted by The Participants in Surabaya	Gloss
<p><i>To?</i></p> <p>Example:  <i>Awakmu durung nggarap tugas to?</i>                      ‘Haven’t you done your task?’</p>	<p><i>Ta/a?</i></p> <p>Example:  <i>Kon durung nggarap tugas ta/a?</i>                      ‘Haven’t you done your task?’</p>	<p><i>Ta/a?</i></p> <p>Example:  <i>Kon durung nggarap tugas ta/a?</i>                      ‘Haven’t you done your task?’</p>	To ask for information
<p><i>To?</i></p> <p>Example:  <i>Awakmu wis tuku kuwi to?</i>                      ‘You have already bought that thing, haven’t you?’</p>	<p><i>Se?</i></p> <p>Example:  <i>Kon wis tuku iku se?</i>                      ‘You have already bought that thing, haven’t you?’</p>	<p><i>Se?</i></p> <p>Example:  <i>Kon wis tuku iku se?</i>                      ‘You have already bought that thing, haven’t you?’</p>	To confirm an utterance or event
<p><i>Yé?</i></p> <p>Example:  <i>Awakmu sing nggarap iki yé?</i>                      ‘Are you really the one who does this work?’</p>	<p><i>Ta/a?</i></p> <p>Example:  <i>Kon sing nggarap iki ta/a?</i>                      ‘Are you really the one who does this work?’</p>	<p><i>Ta/a?</i></p> <p>Example:  <i>Kon sing nggarap iki ta/a?</i>                      ‘Are you really the one who does this work?’</p>	To emphasize the attitude of disbelief

Table 4.2a Convergence Strategy in Particle of Declarative Sentence

Surrounding Dialects	Surabayan Dialect	The Vocabularies that Have Been Opted by The	Gloss
----------------------	-------------------	--	-------

		Participants in Surabaya	
<i>To</i>	<i>Se</i>	<i>Se</i>	To emphasize the utterance
Example: <i>Ya dudu ngono to carané, ngéné lho carané.</i> 'That is not how it works, indeed, this is how it works.'	Example: <i>Ya gak ngono se carané, ngéné lho carané.</i> 'That is not how it works, indeed, this is how it works.'	Example: <i>Ya gak ngono se carané, ngéné lho carané.</i> 'That is not how it works, indeed, this is how it works.'	

Table 5a. Convergence Strategy in Adverb of Time and Frequency

Surrounding Dialects	Surabayan Dialect	The Vocabularies that Have Been Opted by The Participants in Surabaya	Gloss
<i>Sésuk</i>	<i>Mené</i>	<i>Mené</i>	Tomorrow
<i>Bolak-balik, kerep</i>	<i>Gelek</i>	<i>Gelek</i>	Often
<i>Endang</i>	<i>Agé</i>	<i>Agé</i>	Soon
<i>Lagèk</i>	<i>Kaèt</i>	<i>Kaèt</i>	Just now

Table 6. Convergence Strategy in Demonstrative Pronoun

Surrounding Dialects	Surabayan Dialect	The Vocabulary that Have Been Opted by The Participants in Surabaya	Gloss
<i>Kuwi</i>	<i>Iku</i>	<i>Iku</i>	That

Table 7a. Convergence Strategy in Pronoun

Surrounding Dialects	Surabayan Dialect	The Vocabulary that Have Been Opted by The Participants in Surabaya	Gloss
<i>Awakmu, pena</i>	<i>Kon</i>	<i>Kon</i>	You

Table 8a. Convergence Strategy in Verb

Surrounding Dialects	Surabayan Dialect	The Vocabularies that Have Been Opted by The Participants in Surabaya	Gloss
<i>Ngapusi</i>	<i>Mbujuki, nggorohi</i>	<i>Mbujuki, nggorohi</i>	Lying/Deceiving
<i>Sir</i>	<i>Pèngin</i>	<i>Pèngin</i>	Wanting
<i>Bar (Bubar)</i>	<i>Mari</i>	<i>Mari</i>	Finishing
<i>Ceblok</i>	<i>Logor</i>	<i>Logor</i>	(Something) falls
<i>Teka</i>	<i>Tutug</i>	<i>Tutug</i>	Arriving
<i>Rumangsaku</i>	<i>Prasaku</i>	<i>Prasaku</i>	I think/ in my opinion

Table 9a. Convergence Strategy in Modal

Surrounding Dialects	Surabayan Dialect	The Vocabularies that Have Been Opted by The Participants in Surabaya	Gloss
<i>Arep</i>	<i>Katé/até</i>	<i>Katé/até</i>	Will

The aforementioned findings seem to exhibit that the participants tend to alter their regional dialects into Surabayan dialect. Hence, it belongs to convergence strategy since they modify their speech styles to be more similar to the interlocutors who are Surabayan people (Yule, 2010; Meyerhoff, 2011; Dragojevic et al, 2016). In this context, the linguistic behavior adjustment is in terms of vocabularies (Meyerhoff, 2011; Holmes, 2013). From the data above, it could be grasped that the alteration of the vocabularies only focuses on the daily conversational vocabularies. This finding supports the previous study carried out by Putri & Setiawan (2020) uncovering that the students from different regions in East Java changed their linguistic features while they stayed in Surabaya. Moreover, the alteration of linguistic features only concentrates on the daily vocabularies (Putri & Setiawan, 2020).

Furthermore, the results of this study also resonate with Prasetyo's (2023) finding showcasing that the migrant students from Ponorogo studying in Malang tended to switch their vocabularies into Javanese language with Malangese dialect such as from the word *arep* into *apé* 'will', *kowe* into *kon* 'you', and from particle *ta* into *se* and a 'particle'. Based on Wedhawati et al's (2001) observation, particle *ta* has functions such as asking a confirmation or truth towards the addressee, as well as giving emphasis. This is also in parallel with Soedjiatno et al's (1984) study dismantling that the particle *ta*, *a*, *se* serve an emphasis function. Soedjiatno et al (1984) elaborated that the emphasis might deal with certainty, interjection, urgency, participation. Similarly, Wicaksana (2020) also argued that the particle *ta* functions to emphasize an utterance. Therefore, the finding in this study underscores the former inquiries. Besides, the result regarding pronoun seems to also be in synergy with Novitasari's & Handayani's (2023) research reporting that the pronoun *awakmu* and *kon* 'you' are Javanese language variations used in Madiun and Surabaya. Overall, despite those

resemblances, this finding appears to enrich the existing studies by displaying another pronoun variation which is *pena* ‘you’.

**Divergence strategy**

When being asked “*Selama menjadi mahasiswa baru di Surabaya, pernahkah Anda mempertahankan untuk menggunakan kosakata asal daerah Anda saat berkomunikasi dengan orang Surabaya?* ‘Along being a new undergraduate student in Surabaya, have you ever maintained to use your own regional Javanese dialect while having a conversation with Surabayan people?’”, all of the participants answered “yes”. Below are the regional Javanese vocabularies which have been frequently maintained to be spoken by the participants in Surabaya:

Table 1b. Divergence Strategy in Interjection

Surrounding Dialects	Surabayan Dialect	The Vocabularies that Have Been Maintained by The Participants in Surabaya	Gloss
<i>Pèh!</i>	<i>Cok! (Jancok!) Wadhuh!</i>	<i>Pèh!</i>	To express the feeling of confusion, amazement, annoyance, disappointment as well as anger  (see Hanggraito, 2021; Ningsih & Rohmah, 2023)
<i>Biyuh!</i>	<i>Cok! (Jancok!) Wih!</i>	<i>Biyuh!</i>	To express an amazement
<i>Lèh!</i>	<i>Lho!</i>	<i>Lèh!</i>	To express a surprise feeling
<i>Puyak!</i>	<i>Karepmu!</i>	<i>Puyak!</i>	To express an exclamation when someone is not interested in something and does not care at all (similar to English informal interjection “Meh!”)

Table 2b. Divergence Strategy in Pronoun

Surrounding Dialects	Surabayan Dialect	The Vocabulary that Have Been Maintained by The Participants in Surabaya	Gloss
<i>Awakmu</i>	<i>Kon</i>	<i>Awakmu</i>	You

Table 3b. Divergence Strategy in Adverb of Time

Surrounding Dialects	Surabayan Dialect	The Vocabularies that Have Been Maintained by The Participants in Surabaya	Gloss
<i>Lagèk, sik tas</i>	<i>Kaèt</i>	<i>Lagèk, sik tas</i>	Just now
<i>Dhipik</i>	<i>Dhisik</i>	<i>Dhipik</i>	Firstly
<i>Dhilit menèh</i>	<i>Dhiluk engkas</i>	<i>Dilit menèh</i>	In a moment
<i>Bar iki (bubar iki)</i>	<i>Mariki (mari iki), mari ngene</i>	<i>Bar iki (bubar iki)</i>	After this

Table 4b. Divergence Strategy in Adjective

Surrounding Dialects	Surabayan Dialect	The Vocabularies that Have Been Maintained by The Participants in Surabaya	Gloss
<i>Keju</i>	<i>Pegel</i>	<i>Keju</i>	Tired
<i>Pegel</i>	<i>Mangkel</i>	<i>Pegel</i>	Annoyed at/about something

Table 5b. Divergence Strategy in Verb

Surrounding Dialects	Surabayan Dialect	The Vocabularies that Have Been Maintained by The Participants in Surabaya	Gloss
<i>Nyilih</i>	<i>Nyelang</i>	<i>Nyilih</i>	Borrowing
<i>Empané</i>	<i>Koyoké</i>	<i>Empané</i>	It seems that...

Table 6b. Divergence Strategy in Imperative

Surrounding Dialects	Surabayan Dialect	The Vocabulary that Have Been Maintained by The Participants in Surabaya	Gloss
<i>Wasno!</i>	<i>Deloken! / Dontoken!</i>	<i>Wasno!</i>	Look at this!

Table 7b. Divergence Strategy in Question Word

Surrounding Dialects	Surabayan Dialect	The Vocabularies that Have Been Maintained by The Participants in Surabaya	Gloss
<i>Piyé?</i>	<i>Yok-apa?</i>	<i>Piyé?</i>	How?
<i>Nyapo? Généa?</i>	<i>Lapo?</i>	<i>Nyapo? Généa?</i>	Why?

Table 8b. Divergence Strategy in Noun

Surrounding Dialects	Surabayan Dialect	The Vocabularies that Have Been Maintained by The Participants in Surabaya	Gloss
<i>Cah-cah</i> <i>(bocah-bocah)</i>	<i>Arèk-arèk</i>	<i>Cah-cah</i> <i>(bocah-bocah)</i>	Guys
<i>Jublang</i>	<i>Kali</i>	<i>Jublang</i>	River

Table 9b. Divergence Strategy in Particle

Surrounding Dialects	Surabayan Dialect	The Vocabulary that Have Been Maintained by The Participants in Surabaya	Gloss
<i>Yé?</i>  Example: <i>Tenan yé?</i>  'Is that true, really?'	<i>Ta/a?</i>  Example: <i>Temenan ta/a?</i>  'Is that true, really?'	<i>Yé?</i>  Example: <i>Tenan yé?</i>  'Is that true, really?'	To exhibit the attitude of disbelief

After analyzing the data, the researcher finds out that besides employing convergence strategy, all of the participants also simultaneously employ divergence strategy while having a conversation with the host community in Surabaya. They tend to maintain some of their

regional Javanese vocabularies in nine types of word class although they have a conversation with Surabayan people. Hence, it mirrors the implementation of divergence strategy since they intentionally draw a boundary distinguishing their speech from the interlocutor (Yule, 2010; Meyerhoff; 2011; Wardhaugh & Fuller, 2015). Notwithstanding, it is worth mentioning that there are some overlapping data which are used both in convergence and divergence strategy. Some of the participants tend to apply a convergence strategy by opting for the pronoun *kon* ‘you’ instead of *awakmu* ‘you’. Interestingly, other participants incline to adopt divergence strategy by maintaining to use the pronoun *awakmu* ‘you’ rather than *kon* ‘you’. Therefore, this finding depicts the existence of overlapping data. Besides pronoun, the overlapping data are indicated in the adjective. Some participants tend to adopt a convergence strategy by using the word *pegel* ‘tired’. However, it turns out that there are also participants who favor the use of the word *keju* ‘tired’ instead of *pegel* ‘tired’ as a divergence strategy.

To a further analysis, the other overlapping data could be seen in the category of verb and adverb of time. In terms of verb, *mari* is preferable instead of *bubar*. Hence, the participants tend to implement convergence strategy. Nevertheless, intriguingly, the participants incline to adopt a contradictory strategy in terms of adverb of time which is *bar iki* (*bubar iki*) ‘after this’ is preferable instead of *mariki* (*mari iki*) or *mari ngene* ‘after this’. Thus, in this case, divergence seems to be applied when dealing with the adverb of time. In a more profound analysis, the researcher also dismantles that the overlapping data also embed several question words such as *nyapo? généa?* and *lapo?* ‘why’, *piyé?* and *yok-apa?* ‘how’. Besides, the noun *bocah-bocah* and *arèk-arèk* ‘guys’ also emerge both in convergence and divergence strategy. Finally, the particle *ye* and *ta/a* functioning to showcase the attitude of disbelief appear to also be overlapping data.

Juxtaposing this study result among the existing literature, the researcher reveals that this finding resembles with Prasetyo’s (2023) inquiry sketching out that the students originating from Ponorogo who studied in Malang applied divergence strategy indicated by the maintenance of using adverb of time *dhipik* ‘firstly’. Besides, this result appears to also be in tune with the research of Wicaksana (2020) presenting that one of the students originating from Blitar who undertook undergraduate study at one of the universities in Malang adopted divergence strategy by using pronoun *cah* instead of *rek* ‘guys’.

## The Underlying Motives of Speech Accommodation Convergence Strategy

### Adjusting linguistic features based on the host community as a form of adaptation

Pertaining to the motives underlying their linguistic adjustments, from the 15 participants, 13 participants explicate that they consciously and intentionally adjust their speech styles based on who they are talking to and based on a particular place. It seems to be evident in the subsequent extracts:

#### Excerpt 1

“Ketika berbicara dengan teman/orang yang berasal dari Surabaya.” ‘When speaking with friends/people who originate from Surabaya.’ (LHY, Questionnaire, 14/03/2024)

#### Excerpt 2

“Ketika berbicara dengan teman kelas.” ‘When speaking with classmates’ (DR, Questionnaire, 15/03/2024)

#### Excerpt 3

“Di kampus.” ‘At the campus.’ (YD, Questionnaire, 16/03/2024)

Those excerpts are in accordance with Dragojevic et al's theory (2016) on the macro-level factors affecting the speaker's initial adjustment. In this finding, it matches with the **sociocultural** norms and values factor. Sociocultural norms and values embed with whom, when, and how it is appropriate to interact (Dragojevic et al, 2016). Referring to Fishman, Rohmadi (2017) also asserted that in having a conversation, the speaker is influenced by situational factors such as to whom and when it is used to the interlocutor. In more profound investigation, this result of the study also reflects Dell Hymes' framework on the ethnography of speaking or communication (Wijana & Rohmadi, 2013; Holmes, 2013). Referring to Hymes, Wijana & Rohmadi (2013) as well as Holmes (2013) elucidated that ethnography of speaking concentrates on the extra-lingual components influencing the way the speaker speaks. In this context, the respondents of the study took in account the setting, participant factor (Wijana & Rohmadi, 2013; Holmes, 2013). Thus, considering that they interact with the host community in Surabaya, that is why the participants tend to attune their linguistic behaviors similar to the interlocutors.

Furthermore, one of the participants also argued that adopting Surabayan vocabularies is a form of adaptation:

**Excerpt 4**

*"Menggunakan kosakata Jawa Surabaya menurut saya adalah bagian dari adaptasi budaya terhadap lingkungan saya."* 'I think using the Javanese vocabularies of Surabaya dialect **is a part of culture adaptation** towards my (new) environment.'  
(DR, Questionnaire, 15/03/2024)

The extract above might imply that the participant attempted to adapt to a new environment by decreasing the lexicon distinction. Hence, the participant selected a convergence strategy. This result appears to also be relevant with I. Suputra et al's (2020), Putri & Setiawan's (2020) studies displaying that a place becomes a crucial factor propelling the respondents to an adaptation effort by employing convergence way. In a nutshell, it underpin Giles et al's (1991) explicating that convergence deals with a way to adapt to the interlocutor. In the deeper analysis, when being asked how frequent the participants adopt Surabayan dialect in their homeland, the result of the study reports that 9 participants answered "sometimes", 3 participants gave a rejoinder "ever", and 3 other participants answered "never". From these findings, it could be conceived that the convergence form might occur in the long term (Dragojevic et al 2016). Within 8 months, Surabayan dialect attunement might occur repeatedly and become more retained considering that the participants will have been studying in Surabaya for 4 years as undergraduate students. In further detail, Dragojevic et al (2016) also elaborated that **long-term accommodation** could lead to a permanent alteration in someone's speech. Hence, the migrant students who have continuously engaged to Surabayan dialect for a long duration might be indistinguishable from other Surabayan students (Dragojevic et al 2016). This is also relevant with the result of this study figuring out that when the participants come home and speak Surabayan dialect, they are considered to sound like the true Surabayan person by their families. It could be proven in the following extracts:

**Excerpt 1**

*"Wah, saiki wis dadi arek Suroboyoan".* 'Wow, you have already become a Surabayan person.' (KSR, Questionnaire, 14/03/2024)

**Excerpt 2**

*Mereka hanya bilang "Wah sudah bisa menggunakan bahasa Jawa Surabaya. Kelihatannya sudah lama di Surabaya sampai dibawa bahasanya". 'They only say "Wow, you have already been able to speak Javanese language with Surabayan dialect. It seems that you have stayed in Surabaya for a long time until you still speak it at home.'* (FN, Questionnaire, 14/03/2024)

The foregoing excerpts seem to exhibit that there are positive reactions from the participants' parents when the participants use Surabayan dialect at their homes. Furthermore, those extracts might also signal that the participants' parents regard that their children have successfully adapted with the new environment by using Surabayan dialect. It resonates with Prasetyo's (2023) study stating that the longer the migration duration of migrant students in Malang, the more frequent Malangese dialect is used by them. Besides getting positive reactions, this study also uncovers that another participant tends to obtain a negative reaction when he speaks Surabayan dialect at home. It could be seen in the subsequent excerpt:

### **Excerpt 3**

*Banyak yang bilang bahasa saya sudah mulai berubah karena bahasa Surabaya-an terkenal dengan keras dan sedikit tidak sopan. Dan saya dibawa itu ketika dirumah. Jadi banyak yang bilang kalau bahasa saya agak keras tidak seperti yang dulu. 'There are many people who say that I have changed because the Surabayan dialect is known as and is a little bit impolite. And . So, there are many people who say that my language is a bit, unlike previously.'* (AA, Questionnaire, 14/03/2024)

In a nutshell, the result of this inquiry emphasizes the existing study undertaken by Putri & Setiawan (2020) figuring out that the migrant students speaking Surabayan dialect in their hometowns were treated differently like a stranger by their hometown friends. Meanwhile, in this case, the participant is considered to be a little bit discourteous, for using Surabayan dialect in his hometown. This appears to be in tune with Krauß's (2018) observation dismantling that the Javanese society dominantly argued that Surabayan Javanese is a rude dialect. Krauß (2018) found out that the pronoun *kon* 'you' in Surabayan dialect sounds non-polite to Central Javanese speakers. Thus, the alteration of vocabulary used by the participant in his hometown might trigger a negative response due to the negative construction of Surabayan dialect among the society.

### **Raising intimacy with the host community**

Another reason stated by 5 participants why they attune their speaking to Surabayan dialect is because they want to be more intimate with the host community. Therefore, it also matches with *the end component* as proposed by Dell Hymes. *The end factor* deals with the purpose of the interaction (Wijana & Rohmadi, 2013; Holmes, 2013). Hence, considering that they desire to be more intimate with Surabayan people, they converge their speech styles. Moreover, it is also in accordance with Yule's tenet (2010) explaining that the use of convergence strategy could decrease the social distance between the speaker and the interlocutor. Furthermore, it also resonates with Palomares et al's statement (2016) elucidating that the application of convergence strategy enables to strengthen the social closeness either in the intra-group or inter-group communication. In a broader sense, Gnisci et al (2016) elucidated that the use of speech accommodation offers a pragmatic implication.

By attuning the speech style similar to the interlocutor, pragmatically it would bond a more intimate sphere (Gnisci et al, 2016). To simplify, the participants attempt to be easily accepted and included in the host community. Hence, it resonates with Wijana's statement (2016) explaining that convergence strategy is the reflection on how the speaker adapts with the host community.

In a profound exploration, the researcher discovers that the aim to escalate intimacy with the host society seems to also be affected by the mocking factor. It is evident in the excerpt below:

**Excerpt 1**

*“Beberapa kali sering diejek karena bahasa dari Ngawi merupakan bahasa yang juga digunakan di Jawa Tengah, jadi cenderung terlihat lebih sopan.”* **‘People mock me several times because the dialect from Ngawi is a dialect which is spoken in Central Java, so it tends to sound more polite.’** (LHY, Questionnaire, 14/03/2024)

Based on the quote above, it could be comprehended that the participant attempted to avoid the mocking towards her regional dialect. Ngawi dialect is considered to be more polite than the Surabayan dialect. In this case, it turns out that the polite dialect seems to be viewed negatively, for instance it might sound ‘stiff’ in a friendship domain, especially in Surabayan dialect milieu. Therefore, due to this mocking, the participant tends to decrease the social distance with the host society by not using the polite dialect.

Comparing to the previous studies, the result of this inquiry seems to underpin D. Suputra et al's (2020) research uncovering that one of the respondents' reasons for using convergence strategy is to evoke social approval. In this vein, Putri & Setiawan (2020) also presented a similar finding stating that the migrant students in Surabaya tended to be more accepted by the host society and built better relationships with them through adopting the same vocabularies. Overall, it could be conceived that the 5 participants' reason is categorized as **affective motive** since it concerns with the motivation of the speaker to gain social approval from the interlocutor (Coupland, 1984; Dragojevic et al, 2016). By extent, Giles & Wadleigh (2008) stated that the convergence strategy could be undergone in various ways. In this finding, one of the ways employed is **approximation strategy** since the participants' strive to speak similarly like the interlocutor by altering their regional Javanese vocabularies into Surabayan vocabularies (Giles & Wadleigh, 2008).

**Gaining social prestige**

Based on the questionnaire result, 4 participants also simultaneously argue that another motivation leading them to foreground Surabayan dialect is that because they do not want to be bullied due to their regional dialects, thus they strive to background their own dialects. The detail quotes could be seen below:

**Excerpt 1**

*“Banyak orang yang berpendapat bahwa bahasa daerah saya aneh, karena memang saya terkadang memakai bahasa daerah yang asing didengar oleh orang lain.”* **‘There are many people who think that my regional dialect is weird, this is because sometimes I speak my regional dialect which sounds foreign for other people.’** (KSR, Questionnaire, 14/03/2024)

**Excerpt 2**

*“Mungkin teman-teman merasa aneh dengan logat yang asing, jadi beberapa kali dijadikan bercandaan, tapi saya tidak tersinggung.”* ‘Maybe my friends feel weird with foreign dialect, so they make fun of it several times, but I am not offended.’ (CA, Questionnaire, 14/03/2024)

**Excerpt 3**

*“Ketika ngobrol atau cerita, saya cenderung menggunakan dialek surabaya agar lawan bicara saya tidak salah fokus dengan dialek saya yang kadang terdengar lucu.”* ‘When chatting or telling a story, I tend to use Surabayan dialect so that my interlocutor will not focus on my dialect which is sometimes sounds funny.’ (PLU, Questionnaire, 15/03/2024)

Based on this finding, it could be grasped that the word *aneh* ‘weird’ on the excerpt 1 and 2 implicitly imply that the participants’ friends might view Surabayan dialect as more prestigious than other regional dialects. Thus, the participants’ regional dialects seem to be seen paradoxically leading to bullying or mocking. Moreover, the participant on the excerpt 3 also stated that her dialect sounds *lucu* ‘fun’. By this point, the participant might agree with the stigmatization towards her dialect. In other words, those participants seem to accommodate the Surabayan dialect due to its social value (Giles & Powesland, 1975). Giles & Powesland (1975) conceptualized the form of convergence strategy which is oriented by social value as upward adjustment. It deals with the shift towards a more prestigious variety of speech (Dragojevic et al, 2016). Additionally, it also appears to exhibit covert prestige since the participants endeavor to attune their regional dialects into the dialect which is perceived as a ‘higher’ or ‘better’ dialect in the larger society (Yule, 2010).

Above all, it is noteworthy that although the participant in the excerpt 2 said that she was not offended by the mocking related to her dialect, however the fact that she tended to change her word choice by using Surabayan vocabularies might imply that she actually strove to avoid the mocking or joke made by her friends. Thus, she might implicitly apply upward adjustment (Dragojevic et al, 2016) related to covert prestige (Yule, 2010).

**Creating an effective communication**

Finally, 13 participants also argue that the motive underlying them to converge their dialects is to obtain an efficient interaction. It appears to be evident in the excerpt below:

**Excerpt 1**

*“Ketika berbicara dengan orang yang tidak paham dengan bahasa saya.”*

‘When speaking with people who do not understand my dialect.’

(VN, Questionnaire, 15/03/2024)

The excerpt above likely underpins Giles et al’s (1979) notion on cognitive motive. This notion is related to the speaker’s desire to create an effective and comprehensive communication with the interlocutor. Additionally, it is also in accordance with Coupland’s idea (1984) explicating that one of the major reasons for the speaker to accommodate their speech style is to attain an efficient communication. This concept also shares similarity with

Palomares et al's theoretical framework (2016) on the strand between CAT and intergroup dynamics. Those scholars illuminated that implementing accommodation enables the speaker to solve the barrier of comprehensive interaction. Meanwhile, in terms of the type of convergence strategy applied by the participant based on cognitive motive, the researcher concludes that it belongs to interpretability strategy (Giles & Powesland, 1975; Dragojevic et al, 2016). This is because the participants concentrate on how to make their communication understandable by the interlocutors in Surabaya. That is why they opt for the Surabayan dialect as the speech accommodation.

Discussing the result of this study with the relevant literature, this result appears to strengthen D. Suputra et al's (2020) inquiry revealing that one of the reasons encouraging the participants to use convergence deals with the communication efficiency. Moreover, Prasetyo (2023) also unveiled that the migrant students originating from Ponorogo who studied in Malang tended to use Javanese language with Malangese dialect in order to communicate intensively with the interlocutors and to be easily understood.

### **Divergence Strategy**

#### **Maintaining identity**

Meanwhile, in terms of the motive underlying it, all of the participants state that sometimes they choose to maintain their regional vocabularies in order to project their identities. It could be proven in the following extracts:

##### **Excerpt 1**

*"Banyak perbedaan dengan bahasa Jawa Surabaya sehingga banyak teman-teman yang dari daerah sekitar Surabaya pun yang mempertanyakan "basa apa lho kui?" Tapi saya tetap keukeuh dengan bahasa Jawa asal daerah saya."* "There are differences between my regional dialect and Surabaya dialect of Javanese language so that there are many friends who originate from around Surabaya ask to me "what language is that?" **But I firmly use my regional dialect of Javanese language.'**

(SAD, Questionnaire, 14/03/2024)

##### **Excerpt 2**

*"Agar tidak menghilangkan ciri khas daerah sendiri."*

**'In order not to lose the characteristics of my own region.'**

(DR, Questionnaire, 14/03/2024)

##### **Excerpt 3**

*"Karena saya ingin tetap menjadi pribadi yang tidak menghilangkan bahasa atau kosa kata dari kota saya, bahkan masyarakat semua harus tau tentang kosa kata dari daerah Jawa yang lainnya agar mereka bisa faham bahwa variasi bahasa di Jawa ini banyak."* 'Because I want to keep being an individual who does not lose the language or vocabulary from my town, even all of the society should know the vocabularies from other regions of Java so that they will understand that there are plentiful variations of Javanese language.'

(IAD, Questionnaire, 15/03/2024)

Those extracts appear to be aligned with Wijana's and Rohmadi's argument (2013) on linguistic pride. Wijana and Rohmadi (2013) pointed out that one of the ways to maintain the existence of a language or dialect is by rising the speakers' linguistic pride. In this context, linguistic pride might be done by encouraging the speakers to be proud of the unique characteristics of the dialect (Wijana & Rohmadi, 2013). Hence, the participants' statements above might sketch out their linguistic pride towards their own dialects. This linguistic pride is even stronger in the excerpt 3 showcasing that the participant wants the broader society to know the richness of Javanese language variations. To wrap those all up, attaching linguistic pride to oneself might contribute to making the surrounding Javanese dialects long-lasting (Wijana & Rohmadi, 2013). As the result, their existence might underpin and enrich the standard Javanese language (Wijana & Rohmadi, 2013).

In addition, 8 of 15 participants also assert that they tend to retain some of their regional vocabularies when interacting with Surabayan people in order to still project politeness. For instance, the participants coming from Ponorogo, Tulungagung and Kediri favor to say their regional interjection *pèh!* and *biyuh!* instead of saying *cok!* (*jancok!*) (see Table b.1). Based on Krauß's (2018) observation, *jancok* is a swear word carrying a negative connotation resembles to English 'hell', 'fuck', or 'damn'. Nevertheless, Krauß (2018) elaborated that it could also function as a discourse marker to establish an intimacy in a friendship. Thus, not only does the word *cok!* or *jancok!* express an anger, but it does also express admiration, happiness, surprise, annoyance, sadness, disappointment and regret (Hanggraito, 2021). Regardless those various functions, most of the Javanese society from outside Surabaya still consider it as a rude and impolite word (Krauß, 2018). As the result, the 8 participants tend to use *pèh!* or *biyuh!* which does not carry a negative connotation.

According to Ningsih & Rohmah (2023), the word *pèh!* could represent amazement, confusion, anger, annoyance, as well as disappointment. Meanwhile, the word *biyuh!* tends to be used for illustrating amazement. Aside from the interjections, the divergence seems to also be evident in the aspect of pronoun. Some of the participants argue that the pronoun *kon* inclines to carry a rude connotation. Therefore, they prefer to use the pronoun *awakmu* in order to still demonstrate politeness regardless of those two pronouns belong to *ngoko* 'low' speech level. Fascinatingly, Krauß (2018) also found out that some Surabayans showcased an anxiety regarding the rudeness of Surabayan dialect, thus they instead inclined to speak Indonesian language which does not have speech level system in order not to offend the speakers of other Javanese dialects. Nevertheless, it needs to be highlighted that it does not mean that the speakers of Surabayan dialect are impolite (Krauß, 2018).

In a nutshell, it is worth mentioning that not only does the preference of using their own regional vocabularies exhibit politeness, but it also portrays an identity maintenance. Those points seem to amplify Dragojevic et al's (2016) and Palomares et al's notion (2016) stating that divergence strategy also belongs to non-cooperative accommodation because the speaker accentuates their differences to increase social distance and exhibit their social identity. In the same spirit, Wijana (2016) also asserted that divergence strategy is salient when the speakers intend to foreground their identities. All in all, the speaker attempts to be dissimilar with the interlocutor by using their regional Javanese dialects (Yule, 2010; Dragojevic et al, 2016; Palomares et al, 2016). Therefore, this type of divergence is also classified as an approximation **strategy** (Coupland et al, 1988).

In further exploration, this motive is classified to the **affective motive** since it deals with people's intention to manage their identities by employing non-accommodative strategy, divergence (Dragojevic et al, 2016). Finally, this finding also shares similarity with the existing study conducted by I. Suputra (2012) sketching out that Balinese in Sasak

community strove to maintain their identities by applying divergence strategy. In this vein, D. Suputra et al (2020) also portrayed that one of the reasons behind the implementation of divergence strategy among the respondents is to protect their cultural legacies and identities. Despite those similarities, this study provides more nuanced analysis by linking to the types of motive, the strategies and the forms of convergence as well as divergence as proposed by Giles & Powesland (1975), Giles et al (1979) and Coupland et al (1988).

## **CONCLUSION**

As the concluding remarks, this study discloses that the migrant students employ convergence and divergence strategy to accommodate Surabayan dialect. The convergence strategy includes the alteration of vocabularies in 9 word classes such as noun, adjective, question word, particle, adverb of time and frequency, demonstrative pronoun, pronoun, verb, and modal. The most dominant vocabularies alteration could be seen in the word class of verb appeared in 6 data. The second dominant convergences are on the adjective, adverb, noun and particle exhibited in 4 data. Next, the convergence in noun and question word is showcased in 2 data. Lastly, the convergence in demonstrative pronoun, pronoun, and modal is proven in 1 datum. Regarding the distinct forms of speech accommodation, the findings encompass upward and long-term adjustment (Dragojevic et al, 2016). Meanwhile, in terms of the motive of using convergence, their reasons are; they want to be approved by the host community, and they attempt to establish more intimate rapport with the host community and gain a higher social prestige. These reasons are categorized as affective motive (Dragojevic et al, 2016). Besides, they also endeavor to create more effective interaction, thus it belongs to cognitive motive (Dragojevic et al, 2016). Hence, this motive demonstrates the use of interpretability strategy (Coupland et al, 1988). In terms of divergence, the maintenance of vocabularies include 9 word classes which are interjection, pronoun, adverb of time, adjective, verb, imperative, question word, noun, and particle. The most prominent divergences are reflected on the interjection and adverb with 4 data. Meanwhile, noun, adjective, verb, and question word is exhibited in 2 data. Finally, the imperative, noun, pronoun, and particle appears in 1 datum. Above all, it needs to be highlighted that there are overlapping data which are used both in convergence and divergence strategy encompassing pronoun, verb, particle, adjective, question word, and noun. With respect to the motive, they state that they strive to maintain their identities, hence it belongs to affective motive (Dragojevic et al, 2016). This type of motive illustrates the implementation of approximation strategy (Coupland et al, 1988). Another reason for opting divergence is that to maintain politeness taking into account that Surabayan dialect is mostly constructed as a rude dialect (Krauß, 2018). Therefore, this reason also falls into the affective motive (Dragojevic et al, 2016) considering that it deals with how the participants retain their identities by using their own regional vocabularies which are perceived to be more polite than Surabayan dialect. Ultimately, it could be grasped that the implementation of speech accommodation strategies are affected by external factors of language such as social distance, prestige, with whom and where the interaction occurs (Wijana & Rohmadi, 2013; Gnisci et al, 2016; Palomares et al, 2016).

Regardless of those findings, this inquiry still has a limitation. It only concentrated on examining the use of speech accommodation in one party, the migrant students as the speakers. Hence, this lacuna could be further filled and enriched by the next scholars by exploring deeply the speech accommodation used by both stakeholders; the speaker and the interlocutor. The future researchers could carry out the study by using observation methods or analyzing it through a movie. In addition, in order to reveal myriad forms and strategies of

convergence and divergence, the subsequent studies could expand the focus of the study by investigating the accent, gestures or conversational topics applied by both stakeholders.

## **REFERENCES**

- Coupland, N. (1984). Accommodation at work. *IJSL* 4(6), 49-70.
- Coupland, N., Coupland, J., Giles, H., & Henwood, K. (1988). Accommodating the elderly: Invoking and extending a theory. *Language in Society*, 17, 1–41.
- Creswell, J., W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (4th Ed). USA: Pearson Education.
- Crystal, D. (2008). *A dictionary of linguistics and phonetics* (6th Ed). UK: Blackwell Publishing.
- Dardjowidjojo, S. (2003). English teaching in Indonesia. In K.E. Sukanto (Ed), *Rampai bahasa, pendidikan, dan budaya: Kumpulan esai Soenjono Dardjowidjojo*, 83-91. Jakarta: Yayasan Obor Indonesia.
- Dragojevic, M., Gasiorek, J., & Giles, H. (2016). Accommodative strategies as a core of the theory. In H. Giles (Ed.), *Communication, accommodation Theory: Negotiating Personal Relationships and Social Identities Across Contexts* (pp. 36-59). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Forshee, J. (2006). *Culture and customs of Indonesia*. London: Greenwood Press.
- Giles, H., Bourhis, R. Y, & Taylor, D.M. (1977). Towards a theory of language in ethnic group relations. In H. Giles (Ed.), *Language, Ethnicity and Intergroup Relations* (pp. 307-348). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Giles, H., & Powesland, P. F. (1975). *Speech style and social evaluation*. London, UK: Academic Press.
- Giles, H., Scherer, K. R., & Taylor, D. M. (1979). Speech markers in social interaction. In K. R. Scherer & H. Giles (Eds.), *Social markers in speech* (pp. 343–381). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Giles, H., Coupland, J., Coupland, N. (1991). *Contexts of Accommodation*. Cambridge University Press.
- Giles, H., & Wadleigh, P. M. (2008). Accommodating nonverbally. In L. K. Guerrero & M. L. Hecht (Eds.), *The nonverbal communication reader: Classic and contemporary readings* (pp. 425–436). Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.
- Given, L. M. (2008). *The SAGE encyclopedia of qualitative research methods*. USA: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Gnisci, A., Giles, H., & Soliz, J. (2016). CAT on trial. In H. Giles (Ed.), *Communication, accommodation Theory: Negotiating Personal Relationships and Social Identities Across Contexts* (pp. 169-191). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gumperz, J. J. (1982). *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Hanggraito, A. A. (2021). Jancuk: Public perception on the use of swear words in communication among Arek cultural community in East Java. *Medkom: Jurnal Media dan Komunikasi* 2(1), 1-14.
- Harrison, H., Birks, M., Franklin, R., & Mills, J. (2017). Case study research: Foundation and methodological orientations. *Forum qualitative sozialforschung/ forum: Qualitative social research*, 18(1), p.19.
- Holmes, J. (2013). *An introduction to sociolinguistics* (4th Ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Krauß, D. (2018). Polite vocabulary in the Javanese language of Surabaya. *Wacana, Journal of The Humanities of Indonesia* 19(1), 58-99.

- Lewis, M.P, Simons, G.F and Fennig.C.D (eds). (2014). *Ethnologue: Languages of the world* (17th edn). Dallas. TX: SIL International.
- Meyerhoff, M. (2006). *Introducing sociolinguistics*. New York: Routledge.
- Meyerhoff, M. (2011). *Introducing sociolinguistics* (2nd Ed). New York: Routledge.
- Ningsih, A. S., & Rohmah, G. N. (2023). The representation of the term "peh" in Javanese language in the Tulungagung. In E. Thoyib (Ed.) *Proceedings of the 5 rd Annual International Conferences on Language, Literature and Media (AICOLLIM)*, 6-7 September 2023 (pp. 257-264).
- Novitasari, A. A., & Handayani, W. R. (2023). Variasi bahasa jawa Arekan-Mataraman di kabupaten Jombang dalam budaya Besutan di channel youtube Bulik Guru [The Javanese language variation of Arekan-Mataraman in Besutan culture of Jombang regency on Bulik Guru youtube channel]. *Lingua XIX*(1), 66-76.
- Palomares, A.N, Giles, H., Soliz, J., & Gallois, C. (2016). Intergroup accommodation, social categories and identities. In H. Giles (Ed.), *Communication, accommodation Theory: Negotiating Personal Relationships and Social Identities Across Contexts* (pp. 123-151). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Prasetyo, M. A. (2023). Pemertahanan bahasa Jawa dialek Ponoragan pada mahasiswa kabupaten Ponorogo di kota Malang [The maintenance of Javanese language with Ponoragan dialect among the students originating from Ponorogo regency in Malang town]. *Prosiding Seminar Nasional Linguistik dan Sastra III (SEMNALISA)*, 23 June 2023 (pp. 83-99).
- Putri, N. V. W., & Setiawan, S. (2020). "Why am I changed?" The convergent process in multilingual community: Speech accommodation. *New Language Dimension* 1(2), 90-101.
- Soedjiatno, Saksomo, D., Latief, M. A., Moehnilabib, M. (1984). *Kata Tugas Bahasa Jawa Dialek Jawa Timur* [Function Words of Javanese Language of East Java Dialect]. Jakarta: Pusat Pembinaan dan Pengembangan Bahasa Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.
- Suputra, I. G. W. (2012). Balinese convergence and divergence in Sasak community. *Lingua Scientica* 19(1), 21-30.
- Suputra, D. P. R., Ramendra, D. P., & Swandana, I. W. (2012). The analysis of communication accommodation strategies used by students of English language education of Ganesha university of education. *Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris Undiksha* 8(1), 5-12.
- Rohmadi, M. (2017). *Pragmatik: Teori dan analisis* [Pragmatics: Theory and Analysis]. Surakarta: Yuma Pustaka.
- Tim Balai Bahasa Yogyakarta. (2011). *Kamus bahasa Jawa (Bausastra Jawa)* (2nd Ed) [Javanese language Dictionary]. PT. Kanisius.
- Yule, G. (2010). *The study of language*. USA: Cambridge University Press.
- Wardhaugh, R & Fuller, M. J. (2015). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics* (7th Ed). Oxford: Wiley Blackwell.
- Wedhawati, Wiwin, E. S. N., Leginem, Nardiati, S., Herawati, Sukesti, R., Marsono, Setiyanto, E., Sabariyanto, D., Arifin, S., & Sumadi. (2001). *Tata Bahasa Jawa Mutakhir* [The Newest Javanese Language Grammar]. Jakarta: Pusat Bahasa Departemen Pendidikan Nasional.
- Wicaksana, P. S., & Pratama, P. M. (2020). Bentuk pemertahanan bahasa oleh mahasiswa penutur bahasa Jawa dialek Mataraman di Malang: Kajian pemertahanan bahasa [The form of language maintenance by the speakers of Javanese language with Mataraman

- dialect in Malang: The study of language maintenance]. *Paradigma: Jurnal Filsafat, Sains, Teknologi, dan Sosial Budaya* 26(1), 8-20.
- Wijana, I. D. P., & Rohmadi, M. (2013). *Sosiolinguistik: Kajian teori dan analisis* [Sociolinguistics: Theory and Analysis]. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Wijana, I. D. P (2016). Bahasa dan etnisitas: Studi tentang nama-nama rumah makan Padang [Language and ethnicity: A study about the names of Padang's restaurants]. *Linguistik Indonesia* 34(2), 195-206.