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The Indonesian language situation and linguistics
Prospects and possibilities

Nobody knows how many languages are spoken in the world today, but it is estimated that one-tenth of them are spoken in Indonesia. Wurm and Hattori (1981, 1983) distinguish just under 500 languages within the borders of Indonesia, but the information on which their findings are based is heterogeneous, and for some areas nearly nonexistent. The criteria they use to distinguish dialects from languages are not always explicit and in some respects problematic. Particularly for varieties of Malay that are spoken in pockets throughout eastern Indonesia and in discontinuous chains of dialects throughout Sumatra, mainland Malaysia and Kalimantan, it is difficult to ascertain whether they represent different languages, and if so, to establish their boundaries. If different criteria than those of Wurm and Hattori are used for defining a language, the number of languages may increase dramatically. 

Whereas Wurm and Hattori (1983:map 40) classify Lamaholot as one language, spoken in eastern Flores and on the islands east of Flores, Keraf (1978:299) concludes on lexicostatistical grounds that the 33 varieties of Lamaholot he investigated (he did not include the Lamaholot pockets on the islands of Pantar and Alor; see also Stokhof 1975:8-10, 43-4) should be classified as 17 different languages. According to the atlas (Wurm and Hattori 1983:maps 43 and 44) there are 21 languages spoken in the province of South Sulawesi, belonging to four different Austronesian 'supergroups' or groups of the same status. Grimes and Grimes (1987:15-8), however, also on the basis of lexicostatistical calculations, distinguish 35 separate languages, divided into three 'stocks' with complicated subdivisions and one isolate.

Given this unsatisfactory state of the art, Indonesia has started a large-scale language survey project, which ten years from now should result in an up-to-date geographical picture of the Indonesian language situation, based on clearly defined and consistently applied criteria. However, such a picture is by definition out-of-date as soon as it is completed – certainly for a developing, multilingual, polyglot society such as Indonesia. The linguistic situation in Indonesia is highly dynamic and subject to pressures,

---

1 This is illustrated by the 11th edition of Ethnologue (Grimes 1988), which lists 669 living languages for Indonesia.
shifts and changes, which cannot be captured by traditional dialectological methods alone.

In the following sections I shall first present a rough picture of the Indonesian linguistic scene, based on Wurm and Hattori (1983)\(^2\) for a static view, and on the published results of the censuses of 1971, 1980 and 1990 for a more dynamic view. Then I shall discuss some of the social factors behind the dynamic character of Indonesian languages, and conclude with a survey of future tasks and perspectives of linguistics as I see them.

**Indonesia's linguistic scene**

As indicated above, the number of indigenous languages in Indonesia today can be conservatively estimated to be nearly 500. These languages are divided into eight different unrelated language families. Some languages in Irian Jaya are still unclassified and may very well each constitute a family of its own. Table 1 indicates the eight identified language families, each with the number of languages belonging to it, grouped by number of speakers. The figures are based on Wurm and Hattori (1983) and include some 35 languages that are spoken only in eastern Malaysia and Brunei Darussalam, but probably not beyond the borders of Indonesia.

The language families in the table that are not Austronesian are commonly known as non-Austronesian or Papuan. It should be stressed, though, that our present knowledge cannot justify viewing the non-Austronesian languages as a single group of linguistically related languages.

| Table 1. Languages in Indonesia, eastern Malaysia and Brunei Darussalam, grouped by language family and number of speakers |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| language family | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| Austronesian | 3 | 2 | 20 | 62 | 126 | 82 | 28 | 14 | 337 |
| Trans New Guinea | 3 | 32 | 48 | 61 | 13 | | | | 157 |
| West Papua | 3 | 10 | 8 | | | | | 21 |
| Geelvink | 1 | 4 | 1 | | | | | 6 |
| East Bird's Head | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | | 3 |
| Sko | 1 | 1 | | | | | | 2 |
| Kwomtari | 1 | | | | | | | 1 |
| Sepik-Ramu | 1 | | | | | | | 1 |
| unclassified | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | | | | 5 |
| total | 8 | 3 | 56 | 121 | 199 | 104 | 28 | 14 | 533 |

\(^1=\text{?}\) \(^3=\text{<200}\) \(^5=\text{1000-10,000}\) \(^7=\text{100,000 - 1 million}\) \\ \(^2=0\) \(^4=\text{200-1000}\) \(^6=\text{10,000-100,000}\) \(^8=\text{> one million}\)

Table 1 includes three languages with no speakers. Wurm and Hattori (1981:map 2) mention only Mapia (once spoken on the island of that name,\

\(^2\) For a discussion on the method and merits of this atlas see Steinhauer 1986.
and known from Stokhof 1988) and Batumerah (once spoken in the village of that name, a village that has now been absorbed by Ambon Town; see Collins 1983:62) as being extinct. Another extinct language (not mentioned in the atlas) is the Tambora language, which was destroyed by the eruption of Mount Tambora in 1815. The language is known from a short wordlist in Raffles (1817:appendix F, cxviii-ix) and a subsequent account by Zollinger (1850).

To a certain extent it is possible to derive patterns of language shift from the results of the successive censuses of 1971, 1980 and 1990.

The census figures of 1971 distinguish respondents that know Indonesian from those that do not, these ‘others’ being divided into speakers of a local vernacular and those speaking a foreign language (such as Chinese or Arabic, presumably). In the published data on the 1971 census (Biro Pusat Statistik 1974) the categories of those knowing Indonesian and ‘others’ are furthermore broken down by residence, age group, and sex. The figures in Biro Pusat Statistik 1974:60 show that knowledge of Indonesian is more widespread among men than among women, that it is more widespread in urban than in rural areas, and that there is some correlation with education. This is suggested by a sharp rise in the figures indicating knowledge of Indonesian in age groups older than the youngest group and a gradual fall in these figures for the higher age groups. In Table 2 these observations are examined further, by comparing the percentages of people knowing Indonesian with those able to read and write Latin script. The categories are further broken down by sex, residence, and age group.

It is apparent from Table 2 that a significant number of people learned to read and write in a language other than Indonesian (a regional language for instance, or Dutch, in the case of some of the older generation). For all age groups illiteracy is greater among women than among men. The idea must have been widespread that education for women was a waste of time and money, if not contrary to Nature or God’s Plan.

---

3 The words given by Raffles are obviously not Austronesian. So far, however, no non-Austronesian language has been identified either to which the Tambora language could be related.

4 Residence is either urban or rural. The age groups used here are 0–9, 10–19, 20–29, 30–39, 40–49, 50–59, 60–69 and 70+, with the understanding that a respondent born on 23 August 1943 is still included in the age group 40–49 on 22 August 1993, but in the next group on the next day.

5 The percentages of respondents who know Indonesian have been calculated on the basis of the figures given in Biro Pusat Statistik 1974:60. The percentages of respondents literate in Latin script are taken from Biro Pusat Statistik 1974:61-5. Where the percentages for knowledge of Indonesian exceed those for literacy, they have been printed in bold.
Table 2. Knowledge of Indonesian and literacy in 1971, broken down by age group, residence and sex

| Age group and residence | Number of respondents | % knowing Indonesian | % literate in Latin script |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|
|                         | men                   | women                | men | women | men | women |
| 0-9 U                   | 3,089,400             | 2,991,767            | 51.3 | 51.4 |    |   |
| R                       | 16,041,982            | 15,737,625           | 16.6 | 16.4 |    |   |
| 10-19 U                 | 2,459,685             | 2,460,327            | 87.3 | 85.3 | 92.6 | 88.6 |
| R                       | 10,481,291            | 10,103,727           | 59.2 | 53.7 | 80.9 | 73.5 |
| 20-29 U                 | 1,634,995             | 1,725,224            | 91.4 | 83.5 | 94.2 | 80.9 |
| R                       | 5,944,574             | 7,651,364            | 61.7 | 42.1 | 79.3 | 55.1 |
| 30-39 U                 | 1,287,429             | 1,340,232            | 86.3 | 70.5 | 86.2 | 57.6 |
| R                       | 6,350,334             | 6,904,677            | 49.1 | 26.1 | 64.4 | 30.2 |
| 40-49 U                 | 899,886               | 844,200              | 82.1 | 63.0 | 78.8 | 43.8 |
| R                       | 4,590,972             | 4,416,357            | 40.3 | 19.5 | 51.6 | 18.0 |
| 50-59 U                 | 470,141               | 474,401              | 77.4 | 55.0 | 71.1 | 30.1 |
| R                       | 2,548,731             | 2,586,596            | 34.9 | 15.2 | 41.1 | 9.8 |
| 60-69 U                 | 226,698               | 268,951              | 70.2 | 49.0 | 58.5 | 20.4 |
| R                       | 1,404,890             | 1,580,914            | 28.5 | 13.1 | 28.6 | 5.5 |
| 70+ U                   | 116,125               | 150,859              | 61.3 | 45.0 | 43.6 | 13.8 |
| R                       | 774,454               | 783,983              | 24.8 | 13.0 | 18.6 | 3.9 |

U = urban  R = rural

Table 2 also shows that knowledge of Indonesian can be acquired not only through education, but through exposure and inter-ethnic contacts as well. Again, this is less apparent among women, whose social mobility used to be much more restricted than it is now. Obviously the exposure factor is much stronger in urban than in rural environments: inter-ethnic contacts, and domains and topics for which the use of Indonesian is more appropriate than a regional language, are a common feature of urban life, while they are rare phenomena in traditional rural communities. The relative importance of exposure is greater with the higher age groups, because they have had a longer period of exposure and have generally had less education. The effects of exposure get the upper hand earlier for women (especially rural women), because the education factor was still of little significance for them in 1971. But even for urban men, exposure becomes a relatively strong factor at an early age.

The most important question pertaining to language in the 1971 census was 'Do you know Indonesian?', and 'If not, do you know a regional or a foreign language?' In the 1980 and 1990 censuses, the same information was collected, with more detailed questions about daily language use: 'What is your daily language at home?'; 'If not Indonesian, do you know Indonesian?'

In the published results of the 1980 and 1990 censuses (Biro Pusat Statistik 1983 and 1992) only eight major languages are distinguished besides...
Indonesian, all other languages being grouped as 'other'. Both censuses report a considerable rise in the avowed knowledge of Indonesian.

It should be stressed that answers to the above questions are necessarily subjective. Even for a trained linguist, criteria for establishing knowledge of Indonesian are difficult to establish. Is Riau Malay Indonesian? Or Ambonese Malay? Besides, the answer 'a bit' is not allowed. There may have been a tendency to answer 'yes' as a sign of one's good citizenship, where 'a bit' or perhaps 'no' would have been more in accordance with the facts. If the benevolent response towards the foreign tourist who manages to stammer a one-word phrase in heavily accented Indonesian, O, bahasa Indonesiannya lancar sekali! ('Oh, you speak fluent Indonesian!'), is to be taken as indicative of the average Indonesian's evaluation of linguistic competence, then the results of the censuses regarding knowledge of Indonesian should be viewed with some scepticism. However, I assume that such factors did not change dramatically in the nineteen years between 1971 and 1990, so that a comparison of the results of the censuses does make sense.

Table 3 shows the census count of knowledge of Indonesian in absolute numbers and as percentages of the rural and urban populations broken down by age group and sex.

The picture which arises from this table is consistent with the tendencies already observed. For all age groups there is a gradual increase in knowledge of Indonesian between 1971 and 1990, ranging up to practically 100% for urban adolescents and young adults. Women are catching up with men, except for the higher age groups. Also, the gap between rural and urban areas is narrowing. Not shown here, but apparent from the published data, is an increasing correlation between knowledge of Indonesian and literacy in Latin script.

Let us now look at the census figures on language use at home, collected for the 1980 and 1990 censuses. In Table 4 (see the appendix) the absolute numbers of first-language speakers of Indonesian, Javanese, Sundanese, Madurese, Minangkabau, Buginese, Batak, Balinese, Banjarese

\[\text{6} \] The raw census data reported some 200 possible answers to the question about one's daily language, other answers being qualified as 'other'.

\[\text{7} \] The data are not immediately comparable, as the breakdown into age groups in the latter two censuses differs from the 1971 census: 0-4, 5-9, 10-14, 15-24, 25-49, 50+. The 1990 census, moreover, does not try to qualify the youngest age group linguistically.

\[\text{8} \] The question 'what is your daily language at home?' is also problematic: daily bilingualism is excluded as a possible choice.

\[\text{9} \] The data are from Biro Pusat Statistik 1974:60, 1983:76-7 and 1992:190-1. To enable comparison with 1971 the age groups distinguished in the three censuses have been rearranged to achieve a common denominator, i.e. a breakdown into age groups of 0-9, 10-49 and 50+; 5+ (everyone age 5 or above) has been added as the sum total for the comparable figures of 1980 and 1990. The percentages are those of the total age group specified for sex and residence.
### Table 3: Absolute numbers and percentages of respondents knowing Indonesian in 1971, 1980 and 1990, broken down by age group, residence and sex

| Age Group | 1971 | 1980 Urban | 1990 Urban | 1970 Rural | 1980 Rural | 1990 Rural |
|-----------|------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
|          |      |            |            |            |            |            |
| 0-4       | m    | 979,069    |            |            | 725,356    |            |
|           | f    | 922,606    |            |            | 687,071    |            |
|           | m    | 42.1%      |            |            | 8.5%       |            |
|           | f    | 42.0%      |            |            | 8.4%       |            |
| 5-9       | m    | 1,495,554  | 2,728,841  |            | 3,205,518  | 4,913,219  |
|           | f    | 1,447,591  | 2,614,674  |            | 3,174,575  | 4,743,485  |
|           | m    | 69.1%      | 81.3%      |            | 37.0%      | 57.3%      |
|           | f    | 69.9%      | 85.2%      |            | 38.1%      | 58.5%      |
| 10-14     | m    | 1,925,979  | 3,191,984  |            | 6,240,945  | 7,571,279  |
|           | f    | 1,864,874  | 3,089,446  |            | 5,636,076  | 7,092,541  |
|           | m    | 97.2%      | 99.9%      |            | 87.3%      | 96.7%      |
|           | f    | 96.7%      | 99.9%      |            | 85.9%      | 96.8%      |
| 15-24     | m    | 3,665,964  | 6,179,797  |            | 8,517,470  | 10,558,737 |
|           | f    | 3,753,961  | 6,558,836  |            | 8,555,687  | 10,664,903 |
|           | m    | 98.1%      | 100%       |            | 87.3%      | 96.9%      |
|           | f    | 95.7%      | 99.9%      |            | 78.7%      | 94.2%      |
| 25-49     | m    | 4,474,409  | 8,813,810  |            | 12,109,925 | 16,484,801 |
|           | f    | 3,950,585  | 8,266,011  |            | 8,824,598  | 14,605,662 |
|           | m    | 95.8%      | 98.2%      |            | 76.6%      | 88.7%      |
|           | f    | 85.7%      | 94.1%      |            | 53.3%      | 75.5%      |
| 5+        | m    | 12,861,631 | 23,488,322 |            | 33,438,483 | 44,781,783 |
|           | f    | 12,009,977 | 22,728,429 |            | 27,630,334 | 40,107,559 |
|           | m    | 91.1%      | 95.2%      |            | 69.6%      | 83.0%      |
|           | f    | 84.5%      | 91.2%      |            | 56.1%      | 73.3%      |
| 0-9       | m    | 1,586,064  | 2,474,623  | 2,662,016  | 3,930,874  |            |
|           | f    | 1,537,162  | 2,370,197  | 2,573,553  | 3,860,093  |            |
|           | m    | 51.3%      | 55.1%      | 16.6%      | 22.9%      |            |
|           | f    | 51.4%      | 55.6%      | 16.4%      | 23.4%      |            |
| 10-49     | m    | 5,490,224  | 10,066,352 | 18,185,591 | 14,835,663 | 26,868,340 | 34,614,817 |
|           | f    | 5,014,797  | 9,569,420  | 17,914,293 | 11,314,664 | 23,016,361 | 32,363,106 |
|           | m    | 87.4%      | 96.9%      | 98.8%      | 54.2%      | 82.1%      | 92.8%      |
|           | f    | 78.7%      | 91.5%      | 96.7%      | 38.9%      | 67.8%      | 85.1%      |
| 50+       | m    | 601,813    | 1,299,725  | 2,573,890  | 1,482,628  | 3,364,625  | 5,253,747  |
|           | f    | 460,855    | 992,966    | 2,199,462  | 701,505    | 1,439,421  | 3,000,960  |
|           | m    | 72.6%      | 83.5%      | 88.4%      | 31.4%      | 50.8%      | 65.2%      |
|           | f    | 51.5%      | 59.1%      | 68.5%      | 14.2%      | 20.8%      | 34.8%      |

m = male  f = female

and 'other' regional languages are compared for 1980 and 1990, broken down by age group, sex, and residence.\(^{10}\)

---

\(^{10}\) The data are from Biro Pusat Statistik 1983:70-2 and 1992:174, 177, 180. The percentages are based on the total numbers of respondents specified for language and age group; the category (language) 'not stated' has been left out. For the 'Total' numbers and percentages, the small numbers of respondents whose age group was unknown were also left out.
Table 4 corroborates the finding that Indonesian is closely connected with urban culture. For all age groups, not only the percentages but also the absolute numbers of its daily speakers in urban environments exceed those of the rural population. For all regional languages the proportions are the other way around.

Table 4 shows that there are striking differences among the regional languages. They show an overall increase of speakers in absolute numbers, with the exception of certain age groups, and with considerable difference in degree. The youngest age groups of rural speakers of Javanese, Madurese, Minangkabau, Balinese and Buginese show a decrease in speakers (in italics in Table 4). As the figures show, urbanization cannot be the only explanation. Language shift appears to be only a marginal factor. Perhaps birth control makes the difference. The marked regional differences certainly deserve investigation. Especially striking is the difference between neighbouring communities, such as Sundanese and Javanese. Javanese shows an overall decline in percentage. It is the only language represented in Table 4 for which the absolute number of rural speakers of another group besides the youngest age group declines, in this case the age group of adolescents and young adults. Sundanese, on the other hand, shows a steady percentual increase for practically all age groups (urban, rural and total). In Table 4 percentual increase is printed in bold.

A somewhat less spectacular difference shows up for two other neighbouring languages, Minangkabau and Batak. Whereas the relative importance of Batak is increasing among the rural population, it is the urban percentages which are increasing for Minangkabau. The reason is apparently the phenomenon of merantau, migration to towns and cities (often outside the home area) by adolescents and adult Minangkabau men. Compare the numbers of urban Batak and Minangkabau speakers in 1990, broken down by age group and sex, in Table 5.11

| age group | Batak women | Batak men | Minangkabau women | Minangkabau men |
|-----------|-------------|-----------|-------------------|-----------------|
| 5-9       | 24,727      | 27,715    | 74,713            | 62,380          |
| 10-14     | 24,530      | 26,879    | 69,110            | 59,673          |
| 15-24     | 60,464      | 57,756    | 97,708            | 123,179         |
| 25-49     | 77,850      | 79,874    | 120,007           | 163,807         |
| 50+       | 30,777      | 24,679    | 8,869             | 51,695          |

Table 4 also shows that Balinese is reasonably persistent among the adolescent and higher age groups, but less so for the two youngest age groups; the figures also show a high rate of urbanization not accompanied by language loss.

11 The data are based on Biro Pusat Statistik 1992:172. No comparison has been made with 1980, because the published data for 1980 are not broken down by sex.
Compared with Madurese and Buginese, Batak shows great vitality, with its growing role in the rural mosaic of languages. Madurese and Buginese seem to be the least vital of the languages represented in Table 4. The reasons for this deserve investigation. For Madurese a plausible explanation is that the mixed language situation in East Java (Javanese and Madurese; see Sodaqoh Zainudin et al. 1978:8 and Wurm and Hattori 1983:map 39) causes a disproportionate shift to a common language. However, the increase of Indonesian in East Java is below the average (see Table 6). When Madurese shift to another language, they shift to Javanese. The slight numerical increase of Javanese in East Java, as against a decline in Yogyakarta, Central Java, and West Java (according to the data in Table 6), may be an indication of this, although differing transmigration rates should also be taken into account.

Table 4 clearly shows that it is Indonesian that is increasing everywhere, in absolute figures as well as percentages (with the only exception being the oldest age group in rural areas). This is only to be expected. What is amazing, however, is the position of Banjarese, with a total increase of more than 55%: 32.9% for the urban population, which is well below the national urban population increase of 74.7%, presumably because of a lower urbanization rate; but 66.6% for the rural population, for which the national increase is only 9.8%. This strong position of Banjarese is caused by the rapid disappearance of the smaller regional languages in South and Central Kalimantan, whose speakers switch to Banjarese as their first language (see below).

This shift is seemingly at variance with the favourable figures for the ‘other’ languages in Table 4. These figures, however, can hardly be taken at face value. In the first place, differences similar to those between Madurese and Banjarese may be encountered among the ‘other’ languages too. Second, it should be kept in mind that these ‘other’ languages represent nearly 500 different languages, many of them with few speakers, whose shift to another language would not show up in the statistics. Furthermore, most of the minor languages are spoken in areas of Indonesia which are less developed than the rest of the country, and relatively less affected by urbanization, education, mass media, increased mobility, and easy access, so that a major shift to Indonesian is yet to come. Finally, some unusually large differences between 1980 and 1990 for the ‘other’ category seem to be indicative of a classification problem, rather than of a real increase in ‘other’ languages. Such differences tend to be coupled with unusually high figures for the category tak terjawab, translated as ‘not stated’, but also meaning ‘unanswerable’.

Table 6 gives daily language (Indonesian or ‘other’) per province, both in absolute numbers and as a percentage of the total population of the province (including the ‘not stated’ cases). Javanese has been added,
Table 6. Indonesian and Javanese vis-à-vis the minor regional languages in 1980 and 1990, per province, in absolute numbers, and as a percentage of the total population of the province

| Province              | Census   | Indonesian | 1980 | 1990 | ‘Other’ | 1980 | 1990 | Javanese | 1980 | 1990 |
|-----------------------|----------|------------|------|------|---------|------|------|---------|------|------|
| West Sumatra          |          |            |      |      |         |      |      |         |      |      |
| 1980                  |          |            | 74,387| 2.2  | 72,049  | 2.1  | 55,596| 1.6     |      |      |
| 1990                  |          |            | 80,200| 2.3  | 59,921  | 1.7  | 94,478| 2.7     |      |      |
| Riau                  |          |            | 255,525| 11.8 | 1,390,211| 64.2 | 183,936| 8.5     |      |      |
| 1980                  |          |            | 1990 | 228,763| 13.1 | 921,912| 52.7 | 363,231| 20.8   |      |      |
| Jambi                 |          |            | 430,962| 9.3  | 3,302,751| 71.4 | 573,458| 12.4    |      |      |
| 1980                  |          |            | 1990 | 344,737| 6.3  | 3,871,042| 71.2 | 1,018,461| 18.7  |      |      |
| Bengkulu              |          |            | 59,907| 7.8  | 550,558| 71.7 | 118,094| 15.4    |      |      |
| 1990                  |          |            | 85,761| 8.4  | 651,079| 63.9 | 181,928| 17.9    |      |      |
| Lampung               |          |            | 436,522| 9.4  | 758,827| 16.4 | 2,886,219| 62.4    |      |      |
| 1980                  |          |            | 1990 | 680,956| 13.0 | 797,050| 15.3 | 3,091,330| 59.2  |      |      |
| Jakarta               |          |            | 5,956,863| 91.9 | 81,020 | 1.3  | 235,951| 3.6     |      |      |
| 1980                  |          |            | 1990 | 6,889,081| 93.2 | 162,655| 2.2  | 188,170| 2.5     |      |      |
| West Java             |          |            | 2,769,685| 10.1 | 147,922| 0.5  | 3,652,050| 13.3    |      |      |
| 1980                  |          |            | 1990 | 4,690,654| 15.1 | 278,212| 0.9  | 3,240,577| 10.4   |      |      |
| Central Java          |          |            | 268,353| 1.1  | 36,135  | 0.1  | 24,579,069| 96.9   |      |      |
| 1980                  |          |            | 1990 | 373,106| 1.5  | 19,174  | 0.1  | 24,413,734| 96.0   |      |      |
| Yogyakarta            |          |            | 55,209| 2.0  | 7,978   | 0.3  | 2,682,893| 97.6    |      |      |
| 1980                  |          |            | 1990 | 82,826| 3.1  | 3,682   | 0.1  | 2,584,834| 96.2    |      |      |
| East Java             |          |            | 654,786| 2.2  | 60,908  | 0.2  | 21,719,927| 74.5    |      |      |
| 1980                  |          |            | 1990 | 787,599| 2.7  | 38,258  | 0.1  | 21,947,986| 74.6    |      |      |
| Bali                  |          |            | 81,785| 3.3  | 32,091  | 1.3  | 27,512  | 1.1     |      |      |
| 1980                  |          |            | 1990 | 134,686| 5.3  | 26,174  | 1.0  | 41,492  | 1.6     |      |      |
| West Lesser Sunda      |          |            | 82,734| 3.0  | 2,560,165| 94.0 | 6,959   | 0.3     |      |      |
| 1980                  |          |            | 1990 | 103,728| 3.6  | 2,672,515| 92.6 | 10,024  | 0.3     |      |      |
| Moluccas              |          |            | 374,603| 13.7 | 2,300,688| 84.1 | 2,556   | 0.1     |      |      |
| 1980                  |          |            | 1990 | 515,421| 18.4 | 2,265,739| 80.9 | 2,548   | 0.1     |      |      |
| Irian Jaya            |          |            | 693,651| 49.2 | 694,007| 49.3  | 15,955  | 1.1     |      |      |
| 1980                  |          |            | 1990 | 587,547| 37.1 | 922,638| 58.3  | 54,484  | 3.4     |      |      |
| North Sulawesi        |          |            | 314,364| 28.4 | 622,365| 56.2  | 4,299   | 0.4     |      |      |
| 1980                  |          |            | 1990 | 513,019| 37.4 | 748,291| 54.6  | 74,377  | 5.4     |      |      |
| Central Sulawesi      |          |            | 582,714| 27.6 | 1,499,249| 70.9 | 20,395  | 1.0     |      |      |
| 1980                  |          |            | 1990 | 911,351| 41.0 | 1,264,562| 56.9 | 24,787  | 1.1     |      |      |
| South Sulawesi        |          |            | 288,215| 22.4 | 683,419| 71.6  | 37,369  | 2.9     |      |      |
| 1980                  |          |            | 1990 | 479,512| 32.4 | 711,506| 48.0  | 78,156  | 5.3     |      |      |
| Southeast Sulawesi    |          |            | 477,591| 7.9  | 2,688,893| 44.4 | 44,218  | 0.7     |      |      |
| 1980                  |          |            | 1990 | 861,862| 14.0 | 2,565,259| 41.7 | 108,390| 1.8     |      |      |
|                      |          |            | 99,970| 10.6 | 374,619| 39.8  | 34,228  | 3.6     |      |      |
|                      |          |            | 1990 | 239,673| 21.0 | 660,087| 57.9  | 78,679  | 6.9     |      |
which because of spontaneous and organized transmigration is becoming a major language in several provinces outside Java.\textsuperscript{12}

For Irian Jaya the 1980 census reports a high figure for the category tak terjawab: 161,785 (vs 20,394 for 1990). The reason is that in 1980 the interior of the province was not subjected to a first-hand survey. Probably all of these unclassified ‘respondents’ belong to the ‘other’ category. This also holds for the 327,472 unclassified respondents in Southeast Sulawesi in 1980 (vs only 4,772 in 1990). The discrepancy may be due to local circumstances or to insufficient instruction of census fieldworkers in 1980.

As Table 6 indicates, there must have been classification problems in most of the Sumatran provinces and in the Moluccas. In South Sumatra, for instance, there is an increase in speakers of ‘other’ languages of more than half a million. At the same time the figures show an unexpected decline of Indonesian, while for 1980 there are 224,680 unclassified respondents (vs 51,940 for 1990, which is also a relatively high number). It can be assumed that the Malay-like character of most Sumatran regional languages caused classificatory dilemmas (Indonesian, ‘other’ or tak terjawab), resulting in a different outcome for 1990.\textsuperscript{13} Indonesian shows a decline in the Moluccas as well, whereas ‘other’ languages increase. Apparently a considerable number of speakers of Ambon Malay or another regional language were classified as speakers of Indonesian in 1980, but as speakers of ‘other’ languages in 1990.\textsuperscript{14}

West Java presents another classification problem, since the mixed language of Cirebon may have been classified as Sundanese, Javanese, ‘other’, or tak terjawab. It was probably different ways of census taking in 1990 which resulted in a sharp increase of ‘other’ speakers, while the

\begin{table}
\centering
\begin{tabular}{lcccc}
\hline
Province & Census & Indonesian & ‘Other’ & Javanese \\
& & number & \% & number & \% & number & \% \\
\hline
South Kalimantan & 1980 & 50,842 & 2.5 & 560,216 & 27.2 & 44,218 & 4.7 \\
& 1990 & 65,837 & 2.9 & 59,813 & 2.6 & 198,002 & 8.6 \\
Central Kalimantan & 1980 & 37,880 & 2.9 & 639,711 & 67.0 & 37,369 & 4.9 \\
& 1990 & 60,366 & 5.0 & 579,300 & 48.1 & 124,376 & 10.3 \\
East Kalimantan & 1980 & 335,357 & 27.6 & 560,690 & 46.2 & 122,840 & 10.1 \\
& 1990 & 637,141 & 38.8 & 378,011 & 23.0 & 222,614 & 13.5 \\
West Kalimantan & 1980 & 230,422 & 9.3 & 1,941,533 & 78.1 & 41,424 & 1.7 \\
& 1990 & 233,268 & 8.4 & 2,151,605 & 77.4 & 125,787 & 4.5 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

\textsuperscript{12} The data are from Biro Pusat Statistik 1983:75 and 1992:189. East Timor has not been included in the table, because it was left out of the 1980 census. The figures for 1980 include the age group 0–4.

\textsuperscript{13} Either because of a change in self-perception among the respondents, or because of different instructions to census fieldworkers.

\textsuperscript{14} In 1980, the anti-Indonesian protests by radical Moluccans in the Netherlands in 1975 were still fresh enough in people’s minds for an avowed Ambonese identity to be looked upon with suspicion.
number for the category *tak terjawab* also jumped (120,944 vs only 5,187 in 1980).

It is now clear that the numerical increase of 'other' languages in Table 4 is misleading, since in 12 of the 26 provinces in Table 6, 'other' languages decline. This is the case not only in provinces with no indigenous minor languages (East Java, Central Java, Yogyakarta, Bali, West Sumatra), but also in the Eastern Lesser Sunda Islands and in North Sulawesi. In each of these provinces there is a variety of Malay which is intruding on the minor languages, namely Kupang Malay in the Eastern Lesser Sunda Islands and Manado Malay in North Sulawesi, apparently both counted as Indonesian in the census. A decline also shows up in South Sulawesi and in North Sumatra (in both cases more than matched by an increase in Indonesian), and in South Kalimantan and neighbouring provinces (to the benefit of Banjarese).

As Table 6 shows, Javanese is making inroads in practically every province of Indonesia. The Eastern Lesser Sunda Islands are a conspicuous exception. In the long run, contact with other languages in the transmigration areas may cause language shifts. Such a shift may have caused the relative decline of Javanese in provinces where the Javanese presence dates back several generations, namely Lampung and North Sumatra. However, in the more recent transmigration destinations (South Sumatra, Jambi, Riau, Bengkulu, Southeast Sulawesi, Central Sulawesi, Irian Jaya and Kalimantan) the number of speakers of Javanese is still increasing, presumably because of new arrivals, thus making up for the numerical decline of the language in Java itself.

Transmigration has caused linguistically relatively homogeneous areas to become more heterogeneous, especially Sumatran target provinces such as Lampung, South Sumatra, Jambi, Riau and North Sumatra. To supplement the picture of migration, see Table 7. For each major language except Indonesian and Javanese, this table gives the provinces where the number of daily speakers of the language exceeded 4% of the total population of the province or was more than 100,000, in either 1980 or 1990.\(^{15}\)

Table 7 shows that the most widespread language after Javanese is Buginese (see also Table 6), found in discontinuous areas and increasing in some of them. But again it is Banjarese that appears to show the most growth. Table 8 shows the position of Banjarese vs Indonesian and 'other' languages in South Kalimantan, the homeland of Banjarese, as well as in the other provinces of Kalimantan.\(^{16}\)

---

\(^{15}\) The figures have been calculated on the basis of the data from Biro Pusat Statistik 1983:75 and 1992:189. The data for 1990 do not include the age group 0–4, while those for 1980 do.

\(^{16}\) The data are based on Biro Pusat Statistik 1983:75 and 1992:189. Again it should be stressed that the figures for 1980 include the age group 0–4, while those of 1990 do not.
Table 7. Provinces where a major language other than Indonesian and Javanese was spoken by more than 4% of the population or more than 100,000 speakers, in 1980 or 1990

| Language   | Census | Province          | Number      | Percentage |
|------------|--------|-------------------|-------------|------------|
| Sundanese  | 1980   | West Java         | 20,858,324  | 76.0       |
|            |        | Lampung           | 487,701     | 10.6       |
|            |        | Central Java      | 479,071     | 1.9        |
|            |        | Jakarta           | 151,765     | 2.3        |
|            | 1990   | West Java         | 22,746,859  | 73.1       |
|            |        | Lampung           | 514,749     | 9.9        |
|            |        | Central Java      | 528,625     | 2.1        |
| Madurese   | 1980   | East Java         | 6,705,232   | 23.0       |
|            |        | West Kalimantan   | 143,724     | 5.8        |
|            | 1990   | East Java         | 6,535,702   | 22.2       |
|            |        | West Kalimantan   | 164,589     | 5.9        |
| Batak      | 1980   | North Sumatra     | 2,905,866   | 34.8       |
|            | 1990   | North Sumatra     | 2,806,129   | 31.8       |
|            |        | West Sumatra      | 119,437     | 3.4        |
| Minangkabau| 1980   | West Sumatra      | 3,107,857   | 91.2       |
|            |        | Riau              | 181,697     | 8.4        |
|            | 1990   | West Sumatra      | 3,133,631   | 89.4       |
|            |        | Riau              | 185,760     | 6.6        |
| Balinese   | 1980   | Bali              | 2,315,473   | 93.8       |
|            | 1990   | Bali              | 2,301,337   | 91.1       |
|            |        | Central Sulawesi  | 63,266      | 4.3        |
| Buginese   | 1980   | South Sulawesi    | 2,803,917   | 46.3       |
|            |        | Central Sulawesi  | 152,460     | 11.9       |
|            |        | Southeast Sulawesi| 93,061      | 9.9        |
|            |        | East Kalimantan   | 77,874      | 6.4        |
|            | 1990   | South Sulawesi    | 2,557,690   | 41.6       |
|            |        | East Kalimantan   | 140,504     | 8.6        |
|            |        | Southeast Sulawesi| 126,406     | 11.1       |
|            |        | Central Sulawesi  | 120,078     | 8.1        |
|            |        | Jambi             | 70,911      | 4.1        |
| Banjarese  | 1980   | South Kalimantan  | 1,295,806   | 62.8       |
|            |        | Central Kalimantan| 167,310     | 17.5       |
|            |        | East Kalimantan   | 112,920     | 9.3        |
|            | 1990   | South Kalimantan  | 1,874,015   | 81.7       |
|            |        | Central Kalimantan| 389,409     | 32.3       |
|            |        | East Kalimantan   | 229,761     | 14.0       |
|            |        | Riau              | 137,421     | 4.9        |

It is obvious from Table 8 that Banjarese and not Indonesian is the language to which the other regional languages are losing ground, a process which does not seem to leave much room for Indonesian. In the neighbouring provinces of Central Kalimantan and East Kalimantan, Banjarese is making strong inroads. In Central Kalimantan the other regional languages are still relatively strong. In East Kalimantan, however, the pressure of Indonesian and Javanese (see Table 6) is also considerable, thanks to the oil industry, forestry, and transmigration. West Kalimantan is still the most stable, even showing an absolute increase in the number of
Table 8. Banjarese compared to Indonesian and 'other' languages in the Kalimantan provinces, in absolute numbers of speakers and as a percentage of the total population of the province

| Province             | Census | Indonesian   | Banjarese | percentage | 'Other' |
|----------------------|--------|--------------|-----------|------------|---------|
|                      |        | number       | number    |            |         |
| South Kalimantan     | 1980   | 50,842       | 1,295,806 | 62.8       | 560,216 |
|                      | 1990   | 65,837       | 1,874,015 | 81.7       | 59,813  |
| Central Kalimantan   | 1980   | 37,880       | 167,310   | 17.5       | 639,711 |
|                      | 1990   | 60,366       | 389,409   | 32.3       | 579,380 |
| East Kalimantan      | 1980   | 335,357      | 112,920   | 10.1       | 560,690 |
|                      | 1990   | 637,141      | 229,761   | 14.0       | 378,011 |
| West Kalimantan      | 1980   | 230,422      | 91        | 0.0        | 1,941,533 |
|                      | 1990   | 233,268      | 24,507    | 0.9        | 2,151,605 |

speakers of 'other' regional languages.

The census data on daily language use given in Tables 4 to 8 primarily compare similar groups of respondents. Because of the irregular breakdown into age groups these groups cannot be followed through time. The only age group in 1990 that corresponds exactly to one in the 1980 census data is the 15–24 age group. In Table 9 the data on daily language use for this age group are compared with the combined data for the 5–9 and 10–14 age groups of the 1980 census.17

As Table 9 shows, the total population of these age groups decreased by 9.3% between 1980 and 1990, whether by death or emigration. Under the combined effects of death, emigration and ongoing urbanization (with a 57.3% increase for these age groups in urban areas) the total rural population decreased by 27.2%. Two languages that clearly deviate from the national figures are Balinese and Minangkabau: a high degree of urbanization among groups speaking these languages is not accompanied by a shift to Indonesian (increases of 97.6% and 72.4%). Madurese, Batak and Buginese, on the other hand, participate less in urbanization (with increases of 28.4%, 38.0%, and 39.1%, respectively, well below the national average), or, if they do, they do not maintain their language as well as do Balinese. Use of Minangkabau, though strong in urban areas, is markedly decreasing in the villages (by 39.1%). Batak and Buginese are also losing ground in rural areas. Batak, Buginese, Madurese and Minangkabau all show an overall decline well below the national average of 9.3% (28.8%, 26.0%, 20.3%, and 19.3%). Batak, Buginese and Minangkabau are major languages of the provinces of North Sumatra, South Sulawesi and West Sumatra, respectively (see Table 7). The censuses show a clear shift towards Indonesian for North Sumatra and South Sulawesi, but not for West Sumatra (see Table 6).

The explanation for the relative decline of Minangkabau in West

17 The data are from Biro Pusat Statistik 1983:70-2 and 1992:174, 177, 180.
Table 9. Daily language of the 5–14 age group in 1980 and the 15–24 age group in 1990

| Language | Census 1980 (5-14) | Urban | Rural | Urban+Rural |
|----------|--------------------|-------|-------|-------------|
| Javanese | 2,565,677          | 12,796,259 | 15,361,936 |
| 1990 (15-24) | 3,903,571          | 8,947,967   | 12,851,538  |
| increase abs. | +1,337,894   | -3,848,292  | -2,510,398  |
| in %       | +52.4%            | -30.1%      | -16.3%      |
| Sundanese | 1,129,688          | 4,876,214   | 6,005,902   |
| 1990 (15-24) | 1,619,886          | 3,619,467   | 5,239,353   |
| increase abs. | +490,198         | -1,256,747  | -766,549    |
| in %       | +43.4%            | -25.8%      | -12.8%      |
| Madurese  | 163,786            | 1,435,333   | 1,599,199   |
| 1990 (15-24) | 210,247            | 1,063,832   | 1,274,079   |
| increase abs. | +46,461           | -371,501    | -325,040    |
| in %       | +28.4%            | -25.9%      | -20.3%      |
| Batak     | 85,638             | 843,943     | 929,581     |
| 1990 (15-24) | 118,220            | 543,857     | 661,087     |
| increase abs. | +32,582           | -300,356    | -267,774    |
| in %       | +38.0%            | -35.9%      | -28.8%      |
| Minangkabau| 147,573            | 805,904     | 953,477     |
| 1990 (15-24) | 254,478            | 515,295     | 769,773     |
| increase abs. | +106,905          | -290,609    | -183,704    |
| in %       | +72.4%            | -36.1%      | -19.3%      |
| Balinese  | 78,398             | 581,855     | 660,253     |
| 1990 (15-24) | 154,916            | 433,229     | 588,145     |
| increase abs. | +76,518           | -148,626    | -72,108     |
| in %       | +97.6%            | -25.5%      | -10.9%      |
| Buginese  | 94,212             | 841,998     | 936,210     |
| 1990 (15-24) | 131,081            | 562,946     | 693,127     |
| increase abs. | +36,869           | -279,952    | -243,083    |
| in %       | +39.1%            | -33.2%      | -26.0%      |
| Banjarese | 101,593            | 352,463     | 453,056     |
| 1990 (15-24) | 196,042            | 433,847     | 630,029     |
| Increase abs. | +94,449           | +82,524     | +176,973    |
| in %       | +93.0%            | +23.5%      | +39.1%      |
| Other     | 780,787            | 6,269,876   | 7,050,663   |
| 1990 (15-24) | 1,185,702          | 4,674,126   | 5,859,828   |
| increase abs. | +404,915          | -1,595,750  | -1,190,835  |
| in %       | +51.9%            | -25.5%      | -16.9%      |
| Indonesian| 2,981,617          | 1,608,907   | 4,590,524   |
| 1990 (15-24) | 5,013,797          | 1,361,365   | 6,375,162   |
| increase abs. | +2,032,180         | -247,542    | +1,784,638  |
| in %       | +68.2%            | -15.4%      | +38.9%      |
| Total     | 8,128,969          | 30,411,752  | 38,540,721  |
| 1990 (15-24) | 12,787,940         | 22,154,901  | 34,942,841  |
| increase abs. | +4,658,971         | -8,256,851  | -3,597,880  |
| in %       | +57.3%            | -27.2%      | -9.3%       |

**Bold type** indicates figures that deviate significantly from the average figures (found in 'Total' at the bottom of the table)
Sumatra, and no obvious shift to Indonesian, must be related to the *merantau* phenomenon discussed above. Apparently, sizeable numbers of Minangkabau migrating to other provinces do not maintain their native language.

The general decline of Javanese is also remarkable. The percentages do not deviate very dramatically from the national figures, but the latter are heavily influenced by the figures for Javanese, which outnumbers all other regional languages in Indonesia. The only two languages whose rural and overall figures do not conform to the national pattern of decline are again Indonesian and Banjarese.

**Endangered languages**

I have already pointed out that the data for 'other' languages are not as favourable (in terms of prospects for the survival of the languages) as they may seem to be. In fact, since the time when Wurm and Hattori collected the data for their atlas, several minor languages have become endangered, if not extinct. I present here a list of such languages I have come across.\(^{18}\)

The Moi in the Bird's Head peninsula of Irian Jaya are too close to the town of Sorong not to be affected by urban culture and the variety of Malay/Indonesian that goes with it (Raymond Menick, personal communication). Moreover, reports in Indonesian newspapers in 1993 indicate that maintaining the traditional Moi way of life is made difficult by the aggressive presence of logging companies in their homeland.

The Inanwatan (on the southern coast of the Bird’s Head peninsula) are also shifting to Malay. Children no longer use the language of their grandparents (Lourens de Vries, personal communication).

Malay/Indonesian has also become the main language of the Waropen. A new administrative centre and a road around the swamps along the east coast of Geelvink Bay, the original homeland of the Waropen, has resulted in the abandonment of their traditional villages and in considerable inter-ethnic contact. Waropen people below the age of 40 exclusively use local Malay; the only active speakers of Waropen are old people (over 65). Consequently, the place the language is best preserved is the small community of Waropen immigrants in Serui on the island of Yapen: for the simple reason that life expectancy appears to be higher there than on the mainland (Paul van Velzen, personal communication).

Silzer and Haikkinen (1984:99-103) indicate that in about half of the Yapen villages where one of the languages Ambai, Ansus, Serui–Laut and Woriasi are spoken, ‘the majority of the preschool children use Indonesian when playing’. In the other villages they use ‘non-Indonesian [...] but many adults speak some Indonesian’ (Silzer and Haikkinen 1984:4). Their information is based on a report from 1981. Today the prospects of several

---

\(^{18}\) It should be noted that in the vast majority of language descriptions, ecological information on the language is missing.
of the indigenous languages of Yapen (among them the non-Austronesian Yawa language) seem to be even bleaker than those of Waropen (Paul van Velzen, personal communication).

In Wurm and Hattori (1983:map 45) the Kayeli language of Buru Island is estimated to have 1,000 speakers. Grimes (1991:31) argues that there must have been at least three dialects of this language: Leliale, Kayeli and Lumaete. When he conducted his research on the Buru language in the 1980s people still remembered the existence of the Lumaete dialect, but the dialect had recently become extinct. The last speaker of the Leliali dialect died in March 1989. In that year ‘the four remaining speakers of [the third] dialect [...] were all over 60 years old [and] did not use [the dialect] among themselves’ (Grimes 1991:32).

An earthquake and tidal wave on 30 September 1898 meant the beginning of the end for the Paulohi language in Seram. According to local tradition, the church in which most of the speakers of the language were gathered simply slid into the ocean. Survivors enabled Stresemann to describe the language (Stresemann 1918), but they were unable to preserve their identity in the face of Wemale and Amahai speakers moving down from the interior. In the mid 1970s only a few very old people were able to speak the language (James T. Collins, personal communication). Collins (1983:38, 99) lists Naka’ela, Hulung, Loun, Paulohi, Kamarian–Rumakai, Nusalaut, Amahai and Eti–Kaiibobo as languages near extinction. These languages are marked ‘dying’ in Wurm and Hattori (1983:map 45). For Nusalaut a note is added that the language ‘is today only spoken by the oldest generation in the village of Titawae on the Nusa Laut Island’. In the mid 1970s each of the villages Naka’ela, Hulung and Loun on Seram Island appeared to have only three speakers left for the language of the same name (Collins 1983:38). The original Loun community was decimated by the Spanish influenza in 1919. The survivors fled into the woods and somehow never regrouped afterwards. The last three remaining ‘speakers’ Collins could find in the mid 1970s had only a defective knowledge of their language (James T. Collins, personal communication).

In North Sulawesi Malay has been used since the nineteenth century as the language of the Protestant church and schools. It has greatly enhanced the prestige of the local variety of Malay, Manado Malay, to the detriment of other local languages. The decline of these latter languages is a process which was lamented as early as the 1920s. Today the use of Manado Malay in daily oral communication in North Sulawesi is growing rapidly, spreading from city to town all over the province. According to Akun Danie (1991:31) it is beginning to be used even in parts of the neighbouring province of Central Sulawesi. One of the languages threatened with extinction is Bantik, which is still maintained by older people in five villages which have all recently been absorbed by the city of Manado. In a village that was still Bantik speaking some 25 years ago, but which had been absorbed by the city earlier, all that remains of the Bantik
community is two speakers and a graveyard (George Bawole, personal communication).

Table 8 makes clear the special position of Banjarese vis-à-vis the other regional languages in South, Central and East Kalimantan. The weak position of the 'other' languages is evidenced by various sources. Darmansyah (1985:1), for instance, states that 'most Maanyan speakers speak Banjarese [...] but not vice versa'. Usop et al. (1992:1) observe that the Lamandau language of Central Kalimantan is still used, but that in official, nontraditional meetings it is being replaced by Indonesian and Banjarese; the authors sketch an ongoing process of culture mixing, already visible in the capital of the district, which will eventually result in the complete disappearance of the language.

In his dialectological study of Banjarese in South Kalimantan, Kawi (1991) finds an unusually high number of doublets and triplets claimed to be synonyms. There is little doubt that this points to a variety of substrata. Kawi (1991:11-2) asserts that nearly all speakers of Dayak languages (which constitute the 'other' languages of Kalimantan aside from varieties of Malay) in the provinces of South, Central and East Kalimantan are able to communicate in Banjarese, which is why Banjarese is often used alongside Indonesian in inter-ethnic communication. Soetoso et al. (1989:1) describe how the 4,000 people who constituted the Paku tribe in 1987 had practically stopped using the Paku language as a result of their frequent contacts with speakers of Maanyan, Lawangan and Banjarese. Even at home, the majority of Paku people use Maanyan or Banjarese. Children no longer learn the Paku language.

Nanang et al. (1988:1) observe that the Bayan Dayak are always ready to accommodate visitors, even in their linguistic behaviour. Consequently they often speak Banjarese, Bakumpai or Indonesian. Furthermore, the authors make the important observation that there are also Bayan Dayak communities that have openly given up the Bayan language because of their conversion to Islam.

Durasid (1990:41-2) remarks that the speakers of Malayic languages in Kalimantan have been at an advantage for a very long time – during the sultanates of Pontianak, Kutai and Banjarmasin, under Dutch colonial rule, and in the Indonesian Republic. Politically, economically, and culturally, the coastal Malayic people were more advanced than the inhabitants of the interior. For speakers of the Barito languages the Malayic languages (Iban, Kutai Malay, and Banjarese) have been languages of prestige. For daily communication some speakers of a Barito language therefore prefer to use a Malayic language (Durasid 1990:42).

Factors causing shifts and changes

Language death is a popular topic in linguistics today. Like rape and incest it has always been there, but only now are we aware of it. What is different today is that languages becoming extinct are not offset by the
rise of new ones; these days dialects no longer develop into languages. Also new is the worldwide character and speed of language death.

The general scenario of gradual language death is always the same: external pressure, subsequent changes in language behaviour, and finally interruption of language transmission to a new generation, resulting in semi-speakers who have only a defective command of the language (see Sasse 1992a, 1992b). The details differ from case to case; what deserves systematic study is the relationship between the types of external pressure and the changes in language behaviour they induce, as well as the resulting patterns of decay.

Most external factors capable of initiating gradual language death have been mentioned in passing above (see also Steinhauer 1993). Some of them are typically Indonesian, while others are more general. The particular combination is always community specific.

War, partial genocide, and acts of God may put a language community at such a disadvantage vis-à-vis its neighbours that it succumbs linguistically in the long run. This is what happened to the Paulohi and Loun language communities in the Moluccas. Complete genocide or acts of God with the same effect (as in the case of the Tambora language) cause immediate, rather than gradual, language death, which from a linguistic point of view is a deplorable loss, but not interesting as a process.

War by peaceful means, such as eviction of people from their lands, erodes the prosperity of the people as a community, and inevitably affects their linguistic behaviour. This is what seems to be happening in Kalimantan, where logging concessions and transmigration projects have greatly reduced the traditional territory of the Dayak tribes. On 24 January 1994 the newspaper *Kompas* reported on a Dayak village which was included in a logging concession, so that the people were forbidden to cut down the trees they had planted in their own gardens and were forced to use their front doors for making coffins.

In general, contact with outsiders has linguistic consequences. The more so, if these outsiders are economically or culturally superior, or are perceived as such. This explains part of the success of Banjarese. Traders and government officials who visit the interior of South and Central Kalimantan are mostly Banjarese. Moreover, they are Muslims. Dayaks who give up their tribal religion and convert to Islam appear to consciously abandon their own language and to shift to Banjarese as a sign of total conversion (as in the Bayan Dayak case mentioned above).

Increased mobility as an aspect of modernization has its effects on the language behaviour of individuals. This is the background of the statistical disappearance of many Minangkabau who move out of West Sumatra. Whole communities are affected by being resettled closer to other groups (as in the case of the Waropen). They are also affected when they have to share their traditional lands with other people (loggers, transmigrants, tourists).
On the national level, a very important factor that diminishes the prestige of regional languages is the prevalence of diglossia, whereby Indonesian functions as the national, supra-ethnic, official language, whereas the regional languages are used for unofficial intra-ethnic communication and local cultural events. Mass education and mass communication, along with the omnipresence of government institutions, representatives, and regulations, as well as of religious institutions (given the obligation for an Indonesian citizen to adhere to an officially recognized (world) religion), have created a multitude of domains in which Indonesian is the only appropriate means of communication. Domains in which the regional languages are or were appropriate have been taken over by Indonesian, or have become of secondary importance. ‘Progress cannot be stopped.’ Modernization implies cultural genocide.

But this should not be viewed as entirely negative. In a world in which the ideals of ethnic cleansing have a greater rallying power than traditional-style political programmes, the threat of ethnic strife is never far off. In Indonesia, the Indonesian language is one of the major instruments of national and supra-ethnic unity, and a major counterforce against threats of ethnic divisiveness. A very important factor contributing to the success of Indonesian is the fact that it has never been the language of a specific dominant group. Neither can it be stigmatized as the language of a culturally or economically identifiable section of the population. Moreover, as Indonesian is the language of most mass media and institutionalized instruction, knowledge of it is a precondition for personal development. Consequently, widespread knowledge of Indonesian is a precondition for national development. It is official policy, therefore, that Indonesian be known by every Indonesian.

This state of affairs is the reason why parents of the same linguistic background decide not to transmit their own language to their children. In order ‘not to put them at an educational disadvantage’ they use Indonesian (or, rather, their own variety of Indonesian) instead. This is a frequent phenomenon, especially in urban communities, where ties with traditional culture are weak and career perspectives dependent on diplomas.

On the basis of the figures in Table 3, it can be predicted that if the increase of knowledge of Indonesian is not checked – and there is no reason to assume that it will be – then within two generations all Indonesians will know Indonesian. It should be stressed again, though, that ‘knowledge of a language’ is an elastic notion. And with regard to Indonesian it may indeed be questioned whether all Indonesians will master the one and only ‘good and correct Indonesian’ (bahasa Indonesia yang baik dan benar). The Pusat Pembinaan dan Pengembangan Bahasa (National Center for Language Development and Cultivation), which defines, monitors, and propagates this type of Indonesian, still has a long way to go.
The possible role of linguistics

With regard to Indonesia the following questions should be answered by linguists: what is the linguistic situation now, how did it come about, and what will it turn into?

In broad outlines the situation can now be described as a mosaic of about 500 different languages, most of them constituting chains of dialects (or continua), many of them with sociolectic variation, and with variants for special purposes (such as rituals, oral and written literary performances), and some of them with an ancient written tradition. Genetically they belong to unrelated families; languages of the larger families (Austronesian and the Trans New Guinea Phylum) belong to widely differing subfamilies, with considerable typological variation.

Each language, or rather each variety of language (each dialect, each sociolect) has its own lexicon and structure, and should be described as such. Needless to say, such a description should not be made out of the blue, but against the background of what is known about language structure in general, while phenomena that are more language specific may always be described with reference to comparable phenomena in other better-known languages, especially if they are genetically related or geographically close.

Each language is used in its own way. One language community may highly value understatements and oblique remarks, while another relies on overstatement to get an intention across. In one community a loud voice is appreciated as inspiring confidence; in another, anything else than subduedness is thought to be inappropriate. Inter-ethnic communication (a job interview, for instance) may be seriously hampered by unawareness of differences in language use. Grammar is one thing; the proper way to conduct a conversation is quite another. Each language requires information on both grammar and usage?19

How the Indonesian linguistic situation will evolve depends on the sum total of language ecologies. For each language community it should be determined whether it is isolated or in close contact with other languages. It should be determined whether the nature of the community is rural or urbanized, traditional or modern, open towards other communities or closed off, allowing free communication between its members or having restraints and restrictions. Furthermore, it should be determined what the position of the language is vis-à-vis Indonesian, any local lingue franche, and neighbouring languages. Do all sections of the language community use the language in the same contexts? What are people’s attitudes towards their language and other languages with which they come into contact? Is the language transmitted to new generations? Answers to

19 An excellent illustration of this principle and its practical elaboration is Bird and Shopen 1979.
these and similar questions will give some indication of what the future of the language will be. Other decisive factors are education and language policy, as well as international political, economic, and environmental developments.

The present mosaic of languages arose by historical developments which can only be reconstructed, to a large extent by purely linguistic means. Needless to say, such a reconstruction is a legitimate aim in itself. But it may also reveal unexpected relationships which otherwise would not have been noticed, such as K.A. Adelaar's finding that the Tamanic languages in the interior of West Kalimantan (Kapuas Hulu District) are closely related to South Sulawesi languages, especially Buginese and South Toraja (Adelaar 1994). Insight into the history of development of a less transparently structured language may also be extremely helpful for understanding its structure. A case in point is Noorduyn's fascinating reconstruction of the history of proto-Gorontalo by comparing Gorontalo with Bolaang–Mongondow, thus very much reducing the highly opaque character of the morphology of the former (Noorduyn 1982).

A prerequisite for language reconstruction is of course a fair knowledge of the languages now in use. Because the knowledge of the vast majority of Austronesian languages in Indonesia is still very imperfect, comparative historical reconstructions have been largely confined to sound changes and lexical reconstructions. But the conviction is gaining ground that 'the increased refinement of the reconstructions of proto-Austronesian now demands a close scrutiny of its subgroups so as to proceed with greater confidence and effect' (Collins 1983:3). Reconstruction of language history comprises not only the reconstruction of the phonemes of the earliest proto-language, but also of all changes (as much as possible in their chronological order) which subsequently transformed that proto-language into the daughter languages. Where sufficient data are available – and on the subgroup level this is more often the case – the search for sound changes and proto-phonemes should be supplemented with comparative historical work in the fields of morphology and syntax. In other words, a reconstructed proto-language should resemble real languages. Not only should it have a grammar, but its phonemes should constitute a conceivable system, instead of – as is often the case in current practice – being a mere list of labels, each for a different string of sound correspondences in the languages under consideration.

Finally, concerted action should be taken on Anceaux's admonition that ‘men de Papoea-talen bij de Austronesische studiën […] niet [kan] missen’ (‘one cannot do without the Papuan languages in Austronesian studies’; Anceaux 1971:18), if only because New Guinea is the keystone of Oceanic linguistics (Anceaux 1953). Needless to add, it is the keystone of non-Austronesian linguistics too.

No linguistic change or relation can be described without knowing what it is that is changing or related. In other words, the keystone for all
other linguistic research is synchronic description. This conclusion, although it may seem rather obvious to non-linguists, will probably not be shared by those generative linguists who have adopted the view that it is the main task of linguistics to explain why human infants are able to learn the language of their environment, whether this is a polysynthetic language such as Kwak'wala (Anderson 1985:24-34) or an isolating tone language such as Vietnamese. For a variety of non-linguistic reasons this view has been fashionable since the early 1960s. The fashionable explanation has been that there must be one innate universal grammar of which all observed human languages are variations or realizations. What distinguishes languages can therefore only be secondary (which is why the universal grammar theory was hailed by Christian fundamentalists: it seemed to confirm the historicity of the biblical story of the confusion of tongues at the Tower of Babel). Being secondary, these distinctions were considered less interesting, to the extent that observable linguistic facts were discarded as irrelevant. For adherents of this view, study of the Indonesian linguistic scene would be pointless. For other linguists, the following observations hardly need repeating.

The main function of human language has always been that it enables its users to get ideas across. Any human language, as long as it is still alive, has that capacity, because it is a conventionalized system of signs. This implies that the form and meaning of these signs are invariant. Otherwise, language would be chaos. However, this principle of invariance does not exclude change and variation; in fact, without invariance there would not be any change and variation.

In actual communication this invariant meaning of signs is instrumental (and not more than that) in conveying the speaker's intent, and again in the interpretation thereof by the hearer. Speaker's intent, the referent of the utterance (in the real or imaginary world), and hearer's interpretation should therefore be sharply distinguished from meaning.

Language, being defined as a system of signs, cannot be described formally without reference to meaning. Any formal element which can be distinguished in a language (whether phonemic, morphemic, syntactic or intonational) must have a semantic function. Any set of formally opposed elements must differ in semantic function. The importance of semantic analysis cannot be stressed enough: too many studies on individual Indonesian languages (including Indonesian) overemphasize form and inventories of forms, discussing their meanings only in very broad terms, such as 'reciprocal', 'denominalizing', or even simply 'different from the meaning of the form X'. Even the second edition of the standard grammar

---

20 Illustrative in this connection is what the founder of this approach, Noam Chomsky, says about linguistic facts: 'Even the absolute true grammar would, if it existed, be refuted by masses of counterexamples [...] because we do not know what is the right kind of evidence' (Chomsky 1978:10).
of Indonesian (Alwi et al. 1993) is not free of such descriptions.

As implied in the previous paragraph, intonation is an essential aspect of language: no utterance exists without it, and 'speaking with an accent' is always at least partly a matter of using foreign intonation patterns. Paradigmatically, intonational oppositions tend to distinguish question, statement, member of an enumeration, and possibly other sentence types. Syntactically, intonation functions alongside word order as a means of arranging words and word groups with respect to each other, its semantic correlate being a specific structuring of information. This syntactic function of intonation is rarely discussed in Indonesian linguistics. In this connection it should be stressed again that interpretation is not the same as meaning: what structures the information of sentence X is not its context (a popular view in discourse analysis), but formal elements of X itself, such as its word order and intonation.

The necessary complement to the study of the grammar of a language is the description of its lexicon. Much work is still to be done in the field of lexicology, notably for Indonesian. Being the language of national development and of formal education on all levels, as well as the supra-ethnic access to regional Indonesian cultures, Indonesian covers the widest range of domains. Ever since Indonesian became the official language (at the time of the Japanese occupation), its lexicon has been developing in accordance with its new function. Vocabularies and dictionaries are the means for broadcasting these developments and making them common property. However, a prerequisite for success in this respect is that the definitions of the lexical items be as explicit as possible. In the latest edition of the monolingual standard dictionary (Tim Penyusun 1993), many lexical entries are semantically described by a synonym only. Not only does this practice obscure the shades of meaning which in reality distinguish these 'synonyms', it also creates vicious circles: strings of 'synonyms' which begin and end with the same entry. Another handicap for the lexicography of Indonesian is that the structure of the Indonesian lexicon has never been made explicit, that is, the systematic relationships between the various derivations of individual lexical roots or classes of lexical roots have never been subjected to comprehensive study. As a consequence, entries which belong to the same derivational category are not always explained semantically in the same way. These flaws in lexicographical practice are largely the consequence of the rapid extension of the Indonesian lexicon; only when the language stabilizes will its lexicographers find time for lexicological study and contemplation. Needless to say, lexicographers of the regional languages should avoid the above pitfalls from the start.

A welcome exception is Suparno 1993.
Conclusion

With its extreme linguistic diversity and unique dynamics, Indonesia is a Mecca for linguists and linguistics. For the same reason (the field being too broad), it is in reality rather a backwater, where individual linguists can roam for years without meeting a kindred soul. For the majority of linguists Indonesia is terra incognita, and its linguistic treasures are unknown. For those who do know the treasures (Indonesian linguists included), there is always the matter of money and other obligations. Indonesia does have a growing core of trained linguists, but they are still outnumbered by the languages they have to deal with, not to mention by the research tasks awaiting them. Moreover, their opportunity to do research is largely confined to short-term projects on a low budget. And above all, their first obligation is teaching, whether it is Indonesian or a foreign language.

Given the enormous amount of work to be done, the large number of languages to cope with, and the urgency of the tasks, the international linguistic community can hardly afford to stand aside and wait for something to happen. Concerted action should be taken. Time is running out. What is needed is a ‘Visit Indonesia Decade’ campaign for linguists, with active support from academic institutions and organizations both in Indonesia and abroad, resulting in a special linguistic library or at least in an encyclopaedia of Indonesian languages.

May the coming 150 volumes of Bijdragen be at the forefront of these developments, dedicated as the journal always has been to the understanding of ‘taal’ (language), rather than to universal grammatical ‘kunde’ (sophistication).
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### Table 4. First-language speakers of the regional languages of Indonesia, in absolute numbers and as percentages

| Age group | Javanese | | | Sundanese | | | Madurese | | |
|-----------|----------|---|---|-----------|---|---|-----------|---|---|
|           | 1980     | 1990 | 1980 | 1990 | 1980 | 1990 | 1980 | 1990 | 1980 | 1990 |
| 5-9 U     | 1,320,033 | 1,192,949 | 588,650 | 890,737 | 89,267 | 104,888 |
| R         | 6,897,224 | 6,218,931 | 2,734,935 | 2,760,883 | 862,088 | 781,149 |
| U+R       | 8,217,257 | 7,411,864 | 3,323,585 | 3,651,620 | 951,355 | 886,037 |
| %U        | 31.2%     | 29.9% | 13.9% | 13.8% | 2.1% | 1.6% |
| %R        | 41.0%     | 37.8% | 16.3% | 16.8% | 5.1% | 4.7% |
| %U+R      | 39.0%     | 35.6% | 15.8% | 15.9% | 4.5% | 3.9% |
| 10-14 U   | 1,245,644 | 1,194,945 | 541,038 | 880,585 | 74,519 | 104,081 |
| R         | 5,899,035 | 5,903,749 | 2,141,279 | 2,501,249 | 573,245 | 654,353 |
| U+R       | 7,144,679 | 7,853,694 | 2,682,317 | 3,381,834 | 647,764 | 758,434 |
| %U        | 31.9%     | 30.9% | 13.9% | 14.0% | 1.9% | 1.6% |
| %R        | 43.4%     | 39.1% | 15.8% | 16.6% | 4.2% | 4.3% |
| %U+R      | 40.9%     | 36.7% | 15.3% | 15.8% | 3.7% | 3.5% |
| 15-24 U   | 2,443,298 | 3,903,571 | 970,726 | 1,619,886 | 145,375 | 210,247 |
| R         | 8,985,172 | 8,947,967 | 3,074,785 | 3,619,467 | 971,748 | 1,063,832 |
| U+R       | 11,428,470 | 12,851,538 | 4,045,511 | 5,239,353 | 1,117,123 | 1,274,079 |
| %U        | 32.0%     | 30.5% | 12.7% | 12.7% | 1.9% | 1.6% |
| %R        | 44.0%     | 40.4% | 15.0% | 16.3% | 4.8% | 4.8% |
| %U+R      | 40.7%     | 36.8% | 14.4% | 15.0% | 4.0% | 3.6% |
| 25-49 U   | 3,065,234 | 5,594,355 | 1,179,721 | 2,169,150 | 259,869 | 368,963 |
| R         | 13,938,133 | 15,553,691 | 5,061,225 | 6,214,988 | 2,131,015 | 2,335,526 |
| U+R       | 17,003,367 | 21,148,046 | 6,240,946 | 8,384,138 | 2,390,884 | 2,704,489 |
| %U        | 33.1%     | 31.6% | 12.7% | 12.2% | 2.8% | 2.1% |
| %R        | 43.5%     | 41.1% | 15.8% | 16.4% | 6.6% | 6.2% |
| %U+R      | 41.2%     | 38.1% | 15.1% | 15.1% | 5.8% | 4.9% |
| 50+ U     | 1,337,983 | 2,540,608 | 444,649 | 836,589 | 98,040 | 156,664 |
| R         | 6,311,925 | 7,723,521 | 2,034,506 | 2,661,742 | 828,497 | 1,012,565 |
| U+R       | 7,649,908 | 10,264,129 | 2,479,155 | 3,498,331 | 926,537 | 1,169,229 |
| %U        | 41.4%     | 41.7% | 13.8% | 13.8% | 3.0% | 2.6% |
| %R        | 46.9%     | 46.5% | 15.1% | 16.0% | 6.2% | 6.1% |
| %U+R      | 45.8%     | 45.2% | 14.9% | 15.4% | 5.6% | 5.1% |
| Total U   | 9,412,192 | 15,917,969 | 3,724,784 | 6,396,947 | 667,070 | 944,843 |
| R         | 42,031,489 | 44,347,859 | 15,046,730 | 17,758,329 | 5,366,593 | 5,847,425 |
| U+R       | 51,443,681 | 60,265,828 | 18,771,514 | 24,155,276 | 6,033,663 | 6,792,268 |
| %U        | 33.3%     | 32.2% | 13.2% | 13.0% | 2.4% | 1.9% |
| %R        | 43.6%     | 41.9% | 15.6% | 16.8% | 5.6% | 5.5% |
| %U+R      | 41.3%     | 38.8% | 15.1% | 15.6% | 4.9% | 4.4% |
| Age group | 1980  | 1990  | 1980  | 1990  | 1980  | 1990  |
|-----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
|           | Batak | Minangkabau | Batak | Minangkabau | Batak | Minangkabau |
|           |       |           |       |           |       |           |
| 5-9 U     | 42,957 | 52,442 | 76,581 | 119,463 | 39,135 | 55,608 |
| R         | 451,976 | 482,268 | 442,518 | 417,851 | 324,010 | 249,137 |
| U+R       | 494,933 | 534,710 | 519,099 | 537,314 | 363,145 | 304,745 |
| %U        | 1.0% | 0.8% | 1.8% | 1.8% | 0.9% | 0.9% |
| %R        | 2.7% | 2.9% | 2.6% | 2.5% | 1.9% | 1.5% |
| %U+R      | 2.4% | 2.3% | 2.5% | 2.3% | 1.7% | 1.3% |
| 10-14U    | 42,681 | 51,409 | 70,992 | 117,443 | 39,263 | 63,458 |
| R         | 391,967 | 457,698 | 363,386 | 403,947 | 257,845 | 259,871 |
| U+R       | 434,648 | 509,107 | 424,378 | 421,390 | 297,108 | 323,329 |
| %U        | 2.0% | 0.8% | 1.9% | 1.9% | 1.0% | 1.0% |
| %R        | 2.9% | 3.0% | 2.7% | 2.7% | 1.9% | 1.7% |
| %U+R      | 2.5% | 2.4% | 2.5% | 2.4% | 1.7% | 1.5% |
| 15-24U    | 85,804 | 118,220 | 161,453 | 254,478 | 74,393 | 154,916 |
| R         | 501,164 | 543,587 | 522,815 | 515,295 | 384,263 | 433,229 |
| U+R       | 586,968 | 661,807 | 684,268 | 769,773 | 458,656 | 588,145 |
| %U        | 1.1% | 0.9% | 2.1% | 2.0% | 1.0% | 1.2% |
| %R        | 2.5% | 2.5% | 2.6% | 2.3% | 1.9% | 2.0% |
| %U+R      | 2.5% | 2.4% | 2.5% | 2.4% | 1.7% | 1.5% |
| 25-49U    | 90,993 | 157,724 | 158,265 | 321,573 | 85,806 | 199,753 |
| R         | 648,899 | 825,850 | 734,247 | 823,498 | 620,633 | 745,203 |
| U+R       | 739,892 | 983,574 | 892,512 | 1,145,071 | 706,439 | 944,956 |
| %U        | 1.0% | 0.9% | 1.7% | 1.8% | 0.9% | 1.1% |
| %R        | 2.0% | 2.2% | 2.3% | 2.2% | 1.9% | 2.0% |
| %U+R      | 2.0% | 1.8% | 2.2% | 2.1% | 1.7% | 1.7% |
| 50+ U     | 28,797 | 55,456 | 57,414 | 113,801 | 36,912 | 73,832 |
| R         | 305,470 | 375,271 | 414,234 | 440,250 | 301,344 | 354,234 |
| U+R       | 334,267 | 430,727 | 471,648 | 554,051 | 338,256 | 428,066 |
| %U        | 0.9% | 0.9% | 1.8% | 1.9% | 1.1% | 1.2% |
| %R        | 2.3% | 2.3% | 3.1% | 2.6% | 2.2% | 2.1% |
| %U+R      | 2.0% | 1.9% | 2.8% | 2.4% | 2.0% | 1.9% |
| Total U   | 291,232 | 435,251 | 524,705 | 926,758 | 275,509 | 547,567 |
| R         | 2,299,476 | 2,684,674 | 2,477,200 | 2,600,841 | 1,888,095 | 2,041,674 |
| U+R       | 2,590,708 | 3,119,925 | 3,001,905 | 3,527,599 | 2,162,604 | 2,589,241 |
| %U        | 1.0% | 0.9% | 1.9% | 1.9% | 1.0% | 1.1% |
| %R        | 2.4% | 2.5% | 2.6% | 2.5% | 2.0% | 1.9% |
| %U+R      | 2.1% | 2.0% | 2.4% | 2.3% | 1.8% | 1.7% |
| Age group | Buginese 1980 | Buginese 1990 | Banjarese 1980 | Banjarese 1990 |
|-----------|---------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|
| 5-9 U     | 49,204        | 57,639        | 56,034         | 99,314        |
| R         | 481,651       | 398,853       | 202,525        | 320,850       |
| U+R       | 530,855       | 476,492       | 225,859        | 420,146       |
| %U        | 1.2%          | 0.9%          | 1.3%           | 1.5%          |
| %R        | 2.9%          | 2.4%          | 1.0%           | 1.8%          |
| %U+R      | 2.5%          | 2.0%          | 1.2%           | 1.6%          |
| 10-14 U   | 45,008        | 62,629        | 45,559         | 103,454       |
| U         | 360,347       | 383,687       | 148,938        | 297,351       |
| R         | 405,355       | 446,316       | 194,497        | 400,805       |
| U+R       | 1.2%          | 1.0%          | 1.2%           | 1.6%          |
| %U        | 2.7%          | 2.6%          | 1.1%           | 1.8%          |
| %R        | 2.3%          | 2.1%          | 1.1%           | 1.8%          |
| 15-24 U   | 87,164        | 131,081       | 84,146         | 196,042       |
| R         | 485,417       | 562,046       | 316,785        | 630,029       |
| U+R       | 572,581       | 693,127       | 414,930        | 726,078       |
| %U        | 1.1%          | 1.0%          | 1.1%           | 1.5%          |
| %R        | 2.4%          | 2.5%          | 1.1%           | 2.0%          |
| %U+R      | 2.3%          | 2.1%          | 1.1%           | 1.8%          |
| 25-49 U   | 113,679       | 189,113       | 103,480        | 271,405       |
| R         | 857,092       | 970,350       | 737,671        | 1704,639      |
| U+R       | 970,771       | 1,159,463     | 475,151        | 976,044       |
| %U        | 1.2%          | 1.1%          | 1.1%           | 1.5%          |
| %R        | 2.7%          | 2.6%          | 1.2%           | 1.8%          |
| %U+R      | 2.3%          | 2.1%          | 1.2%           | 1.8%          |
| 50+ U     | 40,846        | 73,949        | 34,056         | 80,486        |
| R         | 335,147       | 399,216       | 140,356        | 247,733       |
| U+R       | 375,993       | 473,165       | 174,412        | 328,219       |
| %U        | 1.3%          | 1.2%          | 1.1%           | 1.5%          |
| %R        | 2.5%          | 2.4%          | 1.0%           | 1.5%          |
| %U+R      | 2.3%          | 2.1%          | 1.0%           | 1.4%          |
| Total U   | 335,901       | 514,411       | 323,275        | 750,701       |
| R         | 2,519,654     | 2,714,152     | 1,096,129      | 2,004,560     |
| U+R       | 2,855,555     | 3,228,563     | 1,419,404      | 2,755,261     |
| %U        | 1.2%          | 1.0%          | 1.1%           | 1.5%          |
| %R        | 2.6%          | 2.6%          | 1.1%           | 1.9%          |
| %U+R      | 2.3%          | 2.1%          | 1.1%           | 1.8%          |
| Age group | 1980 | 1990 | 1980 | 1990 |
|-----------|------|------|------|------|
| 5-9 U     | 409,847 | 645,248 | 1,554,549 | 2,506,397 |
| 5-9 R     | 3,539,150 | 3,807,338 | 891,460 | 1,014,708 |
| 5-9 U+R   | 3,948,997 | 4,452,586 | 2,446,009 | 3,521,105 |
| %U        | 9.7% | 16.0% | 36.8% | 38.7% |
| %R        | 21.0% | 23.1% | 5.3% | 6.2% |
| %U+R      | 18.8% | 19.4% | 11.6% | 15.4% |
| 10-14 U   | 370,940 | 633,041 | 1,427,068 | 2,346,120 |
| 10-14 R   | 2,730,726 | 3,380,659 | 717,447 | 870,111 |
| 10-14 U+R | 3,101,666 | 4,013,700 | 2,144,515 | 3,216,231 |
| %U        | 9.5% | 10.0% | 36.6% | 37.2% |
| %R        | 20.1% | 22.4% | 5.3% | 5.8% |
| %U+R      | 17.7% | 18.7% | 12.3% | 15.0% |
| 15-24 U   | 707,131 | 1,185,702 | 2,884,025 | 5,813,797 |
| 15-24 R   | 4,059,871 | 4,674,126 | 1,219,270 | 1,361,365 |
| 15-24 U+R | 4,767,004 | 5,859,828 | 4,103,295 | 6,375,162 |
| %U        | 9.3% | 9.3% | 37.7% | 39.2% |
| %R        | 19.9% | 21.1% | 6.0% | 6.1% |
| %U+R      | 17.0% | 16.8% | 14.6% | 18.2% |
| 25-49 U   | 865,098 | 1,594,649 | 3,341,550 | 6,847,645 |
| 25-49 R   | 6,160,272 | 7,639,699 | 1,532,897 | 2,013,596 |
| 25-49 U+R | 7,025,370 | 9,234,348 | 4,874,447 | 8,861,241 |
| %U        | 9.3% | 9.0% | 36.1% | 38.7% |
| %R        | 19.2% | 20.2% | 4.8% | 5.3% |
| %U+R      | 17.0% | 16.6% | 11.8% | 16.0% |
| 50+ U     | 315,134 | 579,363 | 837,350 | 1,589,207 |
| 50+ R     | 2,382,554 | 2,930,140 | 406,018 | 478,628 |
| 50+ U+R   | 2,697,688 | 3,509,503 | 1,243,368 | 2,067,835 |
| %U        | 9.8% | 9.5% | 25.9% | 26.1% |
| %R        | 17.7% | 17.6% | 3.0% | 2.9% |
| %U+R      | 16.2% | 15.4% | 7.4% | 9.1% |
| Total U   | 2,668,152 | 4,638,003 | 10,044,542 | 18,303,166 |
| Total R   | 18,872,573 | 22,431,962 | 4,767,092 | 5,738,408 |
| Total U+R | 21,540,725 | 27,069,955 | 14,811,634 | 24,041,574 |
| %U        | 9.4% | 9.4% | 35.5% | 37.1% |
| %R        | 19.6% | 21.2% | 4.9% | 5.4% |
| %U+R      | 17.3% | 17.4% | 11.9% | 15.5% |

U: urban population, R: rural population, U+R: urban plus rural population, %U: percentage of the urban population of that age group, %R: percentage of the rural population of that age group, %U+R: percentage of the total population of that age group. Bold type indicates an increase in percentage of speakers, italic type indicates a decrease in number of speakers.