



Identity Negotiation and Multilingual Innovation: The Dynamics of Mixing Dialects in an Interactive Sociolinguistic Perspective

¹ *Zultiyanti, ²Gatot Sarmidi

¹Indonesian Language and Literature Education, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Ahmad Dahlan University, Indonesia

²Indonesian Language and Literature Education, Faculty of Language and Literature, PGRI Kanjuruhan University, Indonesia

*Corresponding Author e-mail: zultiyanti@pbsi.uad.ac.id

Received: April 2026; Revised: May 2026; Accepted: May 2026; Published: June 2026

Abstract

This study aims to examine the mixture of Yogyakarta-Banyumas dialects as an identity negotiation strategy in daily interactions. The study uses a descriptive-interpretive qualitative approach with data in the form of oral speech collected through listening methods, recording techniques, and notes, then analyzed through reduction, classification, contextual analysis, and interpretation. Based on the data, lexical mixing is the most dominant phenomenon (40%), characterized by the use of Banyumasan vocabulary such as *nyong* and *se kang* in the mixed structure. Pronoun variations (17%) indicate close social relationships through the use of *nyong*, *me*, and *kowe*. Style shifting (13%) shows the ability of speakers to change language styles according to the context. The dominance of the Banyumas dialect (17%) affirms local identity, while the Javanese-Indonesian mix (10%) reflects modern and bilingual identities. Dialect neutralization (3%) was used to improve comprehension in cross-dialect interactions. The conclusion of this study shows that dialect mixing occurs systematically and functionally, where speakers actively choose language forms to affirm identity, adjust social relations, and maintain communication effectiveness in multicultural contexts.

Keywords: Identity negotiation; Multilingual innovation; Variety of languages; Interactive sociolinguistic

How to Cite: Zultiyanti, Z., & Sarmidi, G. (2026). Identity Negotiation and Multilingual Innovation: The Dynamics of Mixing Dialects in an Interactive Sociolinguistic Perspective. *Journal of Language and Literature Studies*, 6(2), 603-617. doi: <https://doi.org/10.36312/jolls.v6i2.4840>



<https://doi.org/10.36312/jolls.v6i2.4840>

Copyright© 2026, Zultiyanti et al.

This is an open-access article under the [CC-BY-SA](#) License.



INTRODUCTION

Language is a dynamic social system that changes through mobility, intergroup contact, cultural transformation, and the continuous negotiation of identity among speakers. In multilingual and multidialectal societies, linguistic variation is not merely a matter of sound, vocabulary, or grammar; it also reflects social history, cultural values, and everyday social relationships. Javanese provides a rich context for examining this relationship because it consists of regional dialects whose differences are closely connected to local identities and social norms (Laili Etika Rahmawati & Vitria Indriyani Setyaningsih, 2021; Scarlet Witch, 2016). Within this context, dialect contact has become increasingly visible as speakers move across regions for education, work, marriage, and digital interaction. Such contact often produces mixed linguistic practices in which speakers combine elements from different dialects to communicate effectively while positioning themselves socially.

One important case of dialect contact occurs between the Yogyakarta and Banyumas dialects. The Yogyakarta dialect is commonly associated with refined speech norms, a strong *upload-unggah* system, and hierarchical language choices shaped by age, status, and social distance. In contrast, the Banyumas dialect, widely known as *ngapak*, is often viewed

as more egalitarian, direct, and expressive. Phonologically, Banyumas speech tends to maintain the vowel /a/ more consistently, unlike some central Javanese varieties in which /a/ may shift toward /ɔ/. These linguistic distinctions are socially meaningful because they represent different orientations toward politeness, solidarity, and group identity. When speakers of these two dialects interact, their choices are social actions through which they negotiate closeness, difference, respect, and affiliation (Deswijaya et al., 2025; Yunidar, 2025).

The mixing of Yogyakarta and Banyumas dialects is especially significant in contemporary spaces marked by mobility and cultural plurality. Border areas, universities, workplaces, urban neighborhoods, and online communities provide opportunities for sustained interaction between speakers from different Javanese backgrounds. In these settings, speakers may use Banyumas vocabulary with Yogyakarta-style intonation, soften Banyumas directness through Yogyakarta pragmatic strategies, or shift between dialectal features within a single conversation. These practices show that dialect boundaries are becoming fluid and that speakers do not always maintain a single linguistic identity. Instead, they draw on available dialectal resources to adapt to contexts, build relationships, and express hybrid belonging (Supeno et al., 2025; Dewi et al., 2017).

Previous studies suggest that Banyumasan speakers do not always use their mother tongue in a complete or stable form. The dialect may undergo semantic shifts, lexical mixing, and the insertion of terms from other varieties, resulting in forms perceived as contemporary or adaptive (Azizi et al., 2025; Hidayah et al., 2018; Wijayanti et al., 2022). Such shifts are linked to speakers' movement between communities and their need to adjust language to new social environments (Mujiastuti et al., 2023; Hidayat & Setiawan, 2015). Therefore, dialect mixing should not be interpreted simply as linguistic decline. It indicates the creative capacity of speakers to reorganize linguistic resources in response to changing social conditions and reveals how local dialects survive by adapting to new communicative demands.

This phenomenon can be explained through several complementary perspectives. Language Contact Theory states that intensive interaction between speech communities can produce lexical, phonological, morphological, and syntactic changes (Thomason & Kaufman, 1988). In the Yogyakarta-Banyumas context, these changes appear in hybrid speech forms that combine elements from two dialect systems. Communication Accommodation Theory explains why speakers adjust their language in interaction. Convergence may create intimacy, solidarity, or group acceptance, whereas divergence may maintain distinctiveness or affirm local identity (Giles, 1973; Salamah & Zultiyanti, 2024). Social Identity Theory adds that language functions as a symbolic marker of group membership, enabling speakers to display, negotiate, or transform social identities (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). These theories show that dialect hybridization is socially motivated and interactionally meaningful.

Research on Javanese dialect variation has contributed important descriptions of regional linguistic differences. Some studies focus on speech levels and the relationship between *krama inggil*, *krama madya*, and *ngoko* in different dialect areas (Misbahudin, 2018; Azizah et al., 2023; Janeko et al., 2023). Others examine lexical and phonological variation, showing that regional origin can produce different forms for the same meaning (Rindiyani, Sujinah, & Beauty, 2024; Santoso et al., 2023). Further studies identify morphological variation, including differences in affixation, reduplication, prefixes, suffixes, and confixes (Darihastining et al., 2023), as well as phonological processes such as prosthesis and apheresis in the Wonosobo dialect (Yahya, 2023). Ulfah (2019) also demonstrates that geographically close regions can display dialect differences because language variation is shaped by geography, mobility, and occupational background.

Although these studies are valuable, most emphasize structural description rather than the social functions of dialect use. They explain how dialects differ, but they do not sufficiently examine how speakers use those differences as strategies in interaction. This gap matters because contemporary Javanese speakers, especially younger speakers in multicultural environments, often perform flexible identities rather than fixed regional identities (Setiawan, 2015). Their speech may combine dialectal features to signal intimacy, reduce social distance, express local pride, or adapt to interlocutors. Therefore, dialect hybridization needs to be studied not only as linguistic variation but also as identity negotiation and meaning-making in everyday communication (Hargita, 2020; Russia, 2021; Himawan et al., 2022).

Based on this research context, the present study focuses on the mixing of Yogyakarta and Banyumas dialects as an interactional sociolinguistic phenomenon. The study is important because it provides insight into how Javanese speakers manage linguistic differences in increasingly mobile and multicultural communities. It also contributes to the broader understanding of language as an arena where social relationships, cultural affiliation, and identity are continuously negotiated. The novelty of this study lies in its integrative approach: it combines linguistic analysis with sociological and psychosocial perspectives to examine dialect hybridization as both a linguistic product and a social practice. Unlike previous studies that primarily describe phonological, lexical, or morphological variation, this research investigates how mixed dialect forms function in interaction and how they represent identity transformation in contemporary Javanese society (Ramadhanti, 2018; Wardaugh, 2021; Gurning et al., 2024; Simarmata et al., 2025; Shabrina & Setiawan, 2022).

The objectives of this study are to identify the forms of Yogyakarta-Banyumas dialect mixing in daily interactions and to analyze how these forms function as strategies of identity negotiation. To achieve these objectives, the study addresses two research questions: (1) What forms of dialect mixing occur between the Yogyakarta and Banyumas dialects in everyday communication? (2) How do speakers use these mixed dialect forms to negotiate identity, social distance, and cultural affiliation in interaction?

METHOD

Research Design

This study employed a qualitative approach with a descriptive-interpretive research design. This design was considered appropriate because the study aimed to understand the mixing of Yogyakarta-Banyumas dialects as a naturally occurring linguistic and social phenomenon. Rather than measuring language use statistically, the study focused on interpreting how speakers use dialectal features in everyday interaction and how these features reflect identity negotiation, social relationships, and cultural affiliation. The descriptive aspect of the design was used to identify and classify forms of dialect mixing, while the interpretive aspect was used to explain the social meanings behind the speakers' linguistic choices.

The study was grounded in an interactional sociolinguistic perspective, which views language as a form of social practice. In this perspective, speech is not analyzed only as a linguistic structure, but also as a meaningful action shaped by context, participants, relationship, and communicative purpose. Therefore, the research examined both the forms of language used by speakers and the social functions performed through those forms. This design allowed the researcher to explore how lexical mixing, pronoun variation, language hybridization, and style-shifting appeared in spontaneous conversations.

The research was conducted in a naturalistic setting in Wonosobo Regency, Central Java. The selected locations were Ngabean Hamlet in Maduretno Village, Kalikajar

District; Kabutih Hamlet in Ngadikusuman Village, Kertek District; and Bener Village in Kepil District. These locations were chosen because they have strong potential for dialect contact between Yogyakarta and Banyumas varieties. Their geographical position, social mobility, and daily interregional interaction provide a relevant context for observing dialect mixing in informal communication.

However, several limitations and potential biases are associated with this design. First, because the study used a qualitative design, the findings are not intended to be statistically generalized to all Javanese speakers. Instead, they provide contextual and analytical insights into specific speech communities. To address this limitation, the study selected multiple research sites so that the data could represent varied interactional contexts. Second, the presence of the researcher and recording device might influence participants' natural speech. This potential observer effect was minimized by conducting observations in familiar community settings and allowing participants to speak in ordinary conversational situations. Third, researcher subjectivity may affect data interpretation. To reduce this bias, the researcher used clear classification guidelines, repeated listening, verbatim transcription, data triangulation, and theoretical references to support the interpretation. In addition, linguistic patterns were compared across several conversations to ensure that the findings reflected consistent tendencies rather than isolated examples.

Research Sources

The sources of data in this study consisted of speakers involved in everyday informal interactions in the selected areas of Wonosobo Regency. The main data were oral utterances containing dialect mixing, pronoun variation, language hybridization, pragmatic functions, and shifts in language style. These utterances were obtained from recorded conversations and were later transcribed verbatim to preserve the original linguistic forms used by the speakers.

The study used purposive sampling because the participants had to meet specific criteria relevant to the research objectives. The participants were selected based on the following criteria: they were residents or long-term community members in the selected research locations; they actively participated in daily conversations using Javanese; they had exposure to either Yogyakarta, Banyumas, or mixed dialectal features; and they were willing to participate in recorded natural conversations. Participants who rarely used Javanese in daily communication or were unfamiliar with local dialectal interaction were not prioritized because their speech might not provide sufficient data for the focus of the study.

The planned sample consisted of 18 participants, with approximately six speakers from each research location: Ngabean Hamlet, Kabutih Hamlet, and Bener Village. This number was considered sufficient for a qualitative sociolinguistic study because the focus was not on numerical representation, but on the richness, relevance, and depth of the speech data. The number could be adjusted if data saturation had not been reached, meaning that additional participants would be involved until no substantially new linguistic patterns appeared.

Demographically, the participants were selected to represent variation in age, gender, educational background, and occupation. The age range included young speakers and adult speakers in order to observe possible differences in dialect use across generations. Younger speakers were important because they are often more exposed to mobility, education, peer-group interaction, and digital communication, while older speakers provided insight into more established local speech practices. Gender balance was also considered to avoid relying too heavily on one group of speakers. Occupational diversity, including students, workers, farmers, traders, and community members involved in local social activities, was included to capture different interactional situations. In addition to

participant speech, field notes served as supporting data. These notes recorded contextual information such as the setting of the conversation, the relationship between speakers, the topic being discussed, and any visible social factors influencing the interaction. Thus, the research sources included both linguistic data and contextual data, enabling a more complete interpretation of the relationship between language form and social meaning.

Research Instruments

The main instrument of this study was the researcher as a human instrument. In qualitative research, the researcher plays a central role in observing, selecting, interpreting, and explaining the data. In this study, the researcher functioned as the observer who identified relevant linguistic phenomena, selected utterances containing dialect mixing, categorized the data, and interpreted the social meanings constructed through language use. The researcher's sensitivity to linguistic forms and social context was important because the analysis required not only identifying words or sounds, but also understanding how speakers positioned themselves in interaction.

Several supporting instruments were used to strengthen the research process. The first instrument was an audio recording device used to record natural conversations among speakers. This instrument helped ensure that the data were accurate and could be reviewed repeatedly during transcription and analysis. The second instrument was a field note sheet used to document important contextual information, including location, participants, conversation topic, interactional situation, and non-verbal or social cues that could help explain the meaning of the utterances. The third instrument was a data classification guideline. This guideline contained categories such as lexical mixing, pronoun variation, language hybridization, pragmatic function, and style-shifting. The fourth instrument was an analysis table used to organize the data systematically by utterance, speaker, dialectal feature, context, function, and interpretation.

The instruments were developed based on the focus of the study and the theoretical framework of interactional sociolinguistics. The classification categories were adapted from the main linguistic phenomena examined in the study, namely dialect mixing and identity negotiation. Before the full analysis was conducted, the instruments were reviewed to ensure that the categories were clear, relevant, and applicable to the data. A small number of recorded utterances were first tested using the classification table to check whether the categories could accommodate the linguistic patterns found in the field.

To ensure validity, the study applied data triangulation by comparing utterances from different conversations, participants, and locations. This helped confirm whether the identified patterns were repeated across contexts. Observation diligence was also applied through repeated listening, re-reading of transcripts, and careful comparison between recordings and written transcriptions. To support reliability, the researcher used consistent coding procedures and maintained an organized data record. The classification guideline helped reduce inconsistency in categorizing data, while the analysis table provided an audit trail showing how each interpretation was connected to the original utterance and interactional context.

Data Analysis

The data were analyzed using an interactive qualitative analysis model consisting of data reduction, data classification, contextual analysis, interpretation, and conclusion drawing. The process began after the recorded conversations were transcribed verbatim. Verbatim transcription was important because the study focused on dialectal forms, pronunciation, lexical choice, pronoun variation, and language style. Therefore, the distinctive forms of speech used by participants were maintained as accurately as possible.

The first stage was data reduction. At this stage, the researcher selected utterances that were relevant to the focus of the study. Not all parts of the conversations were

analyzed. Only utterances containing dialect mixing, hybrid forms, pronoun variation, pragmatic adjustment, or style-shifting were included as research data. This stage helped the researcher focus on data that directly answered the research questions. The second stage was data classification. The selected utterances were grouped into several analytical categories, including lexical mixing, pronoun variation, language hybridization, pragmatic function, and style-shifting. Lexical mixing referred to the use of vocabulary from different dialectal sources in one interaction. Pronoun variation referred to the choice of address terms or personal references that reflected social relation and identity. The third stage was contextual analysis. Each utterance was examined by considering the situation in which it occurred. The researcher analyzed who was speaking, to whom the utterance was addressed, what topic was being discussed, what relationship existed between speakers, and what social meaning could be inferred from the language choice. This stage was essential because the same linguistic form may have different meanings depending on the context of interaction.

The fourth stage was interpretation. At this stage, the researcher connected the linguistic patterns to broader sociolinguistic meanings. The interpretation focused on how speakers used mixed dialect forms to negotiate identity, establish social closeness, mark regional belonging, adjust to interlocutors, or balance local and broader Javanese identities. The analysis did not treat dialect mixing as random or incorrect speech, but as a strategic and meaningful practice. The final stage was conclusion drawing. The researcher identified the dominant patterns of Yogyakarta-Banyumas dialect mixing and explained their social functions in everyday communication. The conclusions were drawn carefully by comparing findings across participants, locations, and interactional contexts. Data validity was maintained through triangulation, repeated observation, reference adequacy, and systematic classification. Through these steps, the analysis was expected to produce a credible and contextual explanation of dialect mixing as both a linguistic phenomenon and a practice of identity negotiation.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The research data is in the form of transcripts of speakers' conversations that show the mixing of Yogyakarta-Banyumas dialects. The following is a presentation of data and analysis of research data.

Distribution of Linguistic Phenomena Mixing of Yogyakarta–Banyumas dialects

Table 1. Distribution of Linguistic Phenomena

Phenomenon Type	Frequency	Percentage	Note
Lexical mixing	12	40%	Dominant
Pronoun variation	5	17%	Social identity
Style shifting	4	13%	Adaptation
Banyumas dialect	5	17%	Local identity
Javanese-Indonesian mixing	3	10%	Modernity
Neutralization	1	3%	Communication strategy

Description of the Linguistic Phenomenon of Mixing the Banyumas-Yogyakarta Dialect

Table 2. Description of the Linguistic Phenomenon of Mixing the Banyumas-Yogyakarta Dialect

No	Data	Linguistics Phenomena	Category	Identity Meaning
1	<i>nyong sekarang kene tak nyusul wae nganggo honda</i>	<i>nyong, sekarang (Banyumas)</i>	Code-mixing	Identity fleksibel

No	Data	Linguistics Phenomena	Category	Identity Meaning
2	<i>ya alhamdulillah sehat kie, prige ana apa edae?</i>	<i>kie, prige</i>	Lexical Banyumasan	Solidarity
3	<i>aku seko Jogja numpak mobil dewe</i>	<i>aku, seko</i>	Style shifting	Identity Adaptation
4	<i>mergane Dieng cuacane agi apik siki</i>	<i>mergane, siki</i>	Dialect Banyumas	Identity stressing
5	<i>nek iso mangkat isuk-isuk</i>	<i>nek, iso</i>	Neutralization	Negotiation identity
6	<i>nyong ke wedine kuwe nyamuk aedes kae lo</i>	<i>nyong, kuwe</i>	Lexical Banyumas	Local identity
7	<i>kan nang kursi kae, nek nyong turu</i>	<i>nyong, nek</i>	Mixing	Flexibility
8	<i>berarti deke melihat ngono memperhatikan ngono</i>	<i>Jawa-Indonesia</i>	Code mixing	Modern identity
9	<i>aku kepikiran pengen dolan neng dieng</i>	<i>aku, neng</i>	Jogja Dialect	Politeness orientation
10	<i>ben iso ndelok sunrise neng sikunir</i>	<i>ben, ndelok</i>	Code mixing	Situasional identity

Lexical Mixing as a Dialect Hybridization Mechanism

Lexical mixing is the most dominant phenomenon found in this study data. This form is characterized by the presence of typical Banyumasan vocabulary such as *nyong*, *kuwe*, *prige*, *sekan*, and *bae* which are inserted in sentence structures that do not fully follow the Banyumas dialect system. In other words, the speaker does not use the dialect in its entirety, but rather chooses certain elements that are considered representative. For example, the phrase "*nyong sekan kene tak nyusul wae nganggo honda*" shows the use of *nyong* and *sekan* as markers of Banyumasan identity (Khasanah et al, 2023). However, the sentence construction does not show the full complexity of the typical Banyumas syntax. This shows that speakers make partial linguistic selection, which is to maintain the element of identity while simplifying the structure to remain communicative (Suswandari, 2017).

The phenomenon can be understood not only as surface variation, but also as a process of reorganization of the linguistic system in dialect contact situations. The integration of lexical elements without being followed by a comprehensive structural change indicates that the speaker is at a stage of linguistic adaptation that still maintains the broader basic framework of the language, but begins to accommodate elements of local identity. In this case, lexical mixing reflects that language is not used mechanically, but rather as a flexible social resource (Rahayu et al, 2025). Speakers actively choose the forms that are considered most effective in maintaining a balance between comprehension and identity representation, so that the linguistic practices that emerge are the result of conscious and contextual social constructions.

This phenomenon can be understood as an early form of dialect hybridization, in which elements of two dialectal systems (Yogyakarta and Banyumas) are integrated in a single linguistic practice. From the perspective of language contact theory, this condition arises due to intensive interaction between speakers with different dialect backgrounds, resulting in continuous linguistic adaptation. Furthermore, this lexical mixing also reflects that language is not used mechanically, but as a modifiable social resource. Speakers do not simply "follow" the dialect, but actively choose the form that best suits the communication needs and identity they want to display. Thus, lexical mixing is not only a linguistic phenomenon, but also a social practice full of meaning.

Pronoun Variations as Representations of Social Relations and Identity

The variation of pronouns in the data shows the important role of language in representing identity and social relations. The use of forms such as *nyong*, *aku*, and *kowe* not only functions grammatically but also has a strong social meaning. The pronoun *nyong* is a characteristic of the Banyumas dialect which is egalitarian and does not recognize complex language stratification. Its use in various contexts shows that the speaker wants to assert his local identity. In contrast, the pronoun *I* tends to be more neutral and can be used in a variety of situations, including in cross-dialect interactions.

In the words of "*Are you going to join me?*", the use of *kowe* indicates close and equal social relations. This choice indicates that the speaker and the opponent are in a relatively equal social position, so there is no need for a more formal or hierarchical form of language. However, if analyzed more deeply, the use of this pronoun not only reflects proximity, but also indicates an implicit understanding of the norms of interaction that apply between speakers. This means that *your* choice is not purely spontaneous, but is based on the reading of social situations carried out quickly by the speaker.

Interestingly, the speaker can move from *nyong* to *me* in different contexts. This shift suggests that identity is not fixed, but situational and contextual. The speaker chooses certain pronouns based on who the speaker is talking to, in what situations the interaction takes place, and the purpose of the communication to be achieved. In this context, the transition from *nyong* to *me* can be understood as a form of adjustment to a wider or heterogeneous space of interaction, where the use of overly specific local forms has the potential to limit understanding or create social distance.

Furthermore, this variation of pronouns reflects the existence of a complex layer of social meaning (multi-layered indexicality). For example, the use of *nyong* does not only refer to "I", but at the same time indexes regional origin (Banyumas), egalitarian values, and non-hierarchical social closeness. Meanwhile, *I* indexed a more neutral and flexible position, which allowed the speaker to adapt in a variety of contexts without losing clarity of meaning. *kowe* as a second persona pronoun also functions as a marker of horizontal relations, which confirms that interactions take place within the framework of social equality (Nugroho et al, 2023).

In an interactional sociolinguistic perspective, the choice of pronouns shows that the speaker has the ability to do social positioning, that is, placing himself and the other speaker in a certain relational structure through language. Pronouns become the main tool in this process because they directly refer to the participants in the interaction. By choosing *nyong*, the speaker presents himself as part of the Banyumasan community; by choosing *me*, the speaker adopts a more neutral position; and by using *you*, the speaker establishes a relationship that is intimate and informal.

In addition, the variation of pronouns also indicates a dynamic and continuous negotiation of identity. Identity does not exist as something ready, but rather is constructed and negotiated continuously through the practice of language. Each pronoun choice represents the social decisions that the speaker makes in a particular moment of interaction. Thus, small changes in the form of pronouns actually reflect larger social processes, i.e. how speakers manage proximity, distance, affiliation, and acceptance in interactions.

Thus, the variation of pronouns in this study can be understood as a form of indexicality, which is the ability of language to refer to a certain social identity. However, more than that, pronouns also serve as a strategic mechanism in establishing and negotiating social positions directly. Speakers not only use pronouns to refer to themselves or others, but also to convey who they are, how they relate to the other speaker, and how they want to be perceived in the interaction.

Style Shifting as an Indication of Sociolinguistic Competence

The practice of *style shifting* found in the data shows that speakers have high sociolinguistic competence (Himawan et al, 2022). They are not tied to a single dialect, but are able to move between language variations according to the context of interaction. This ability is not only technical, but also reflects the speaker's social sensitivity in reading communication situations quickly and accurately.

For example, in one interaction found in this study, the speaker may use *the form nyong* to mark closeness, then switch to *me* when the context of the conversation changes to be more general. This shift shows an awareness of social norms and communicative expectations. The speaker not only considers the content of the message, but also how the message is received by the opponent. Thus, the change in language style that occurs is the result of a social evaluation process that takes place simultaneously with the process of speech production.

In the framework of communication accommodation theory, this phenomenon can be explained as a form of convergence, which is the speaker's attempt to adjust the language style to be closer to the speech counterpart. However, in some cases, speakers retain certain dialectic elements as a form of divergence, i.e. affirmation of group identity. This shows that the speaker is not completely integrated into the style of the opponent's language, but still maintains the boundaries of certain identities that are considered important.

Further, the data show that convergence and divergence do not present as two conflicting strategies, but rather as complementary practices in a single interaction. Speakers can adjust the structure of certain sentences or word choices to improve comprehension (convergence), but still retain distinctive elements such as pronouns or local lexicons as markers of identity (divergence). This condition indicates the existence of partial accommodation, where adjustments are made selectively, rather than totally.

If analyzed more deeply, *the style shifting* in this data also shows that speakers have a multi-layered linguistic repertoire. This means that speakers not only master one language system, but have a wide selection of variations that can be activated as needed. The shift in language style is proof that language is not stored as a single system, but rather as a collection of resources that can be used flexibly.

In addition, this practice also reflects the identity negotiation process that takes place in real-time. In each change of language style, the speaker not only adjusts to the situation, but also actively shapes how he or she wants to be perceived. The shift from *nyong* to *me*, for example, shows not only a change in style, but also a change in the social position it wants to show—from a strong local identity to a more neutral and inclusive identity.

Thus, *the style shifting* in this study not only shows language variation, but also reflects the speaker's strategic ability to dynamically manage identity and social relations. This practice shows that language is used not only to convey information, but also as a tool to organize social proximity, maintain a balance of identity, and ensure the success of communication in the context of diverse interactions.

The Dominance of the Banyumas Dialect as a Marker of Cultural Affiliation

Despite the mixing of dialects, the results of the analysis show that the Banyumas dialect still has a dominant position in the linguistic practices of speakers. This can be seen from the relatively high frequency of use of Banyumasan vocabulary compared to other dialect elements. This dominance suggests that the speaker does not fully adopt another dialect but rather retains his local identity as part of a cultural affiliation. The Banyumas dialect in this context serves as a symbol of identity that connects the speaker with his or her community of origin.

This dominance is not only quantitative in terms of frequency of use, but also qualitative in terms of its social function. The Banyumasan vocabulary that appears in

speech often occupies a strategic position, such as as a conversation starter, an emotional marker, or an expression of familiarity. This shows that the Banyumasan element is not just present as a variation, but has an important role in building an atmosphere of interaction. Thus, the existence of the Banyumas dialect in speech cannot be seen as a remnant of the speaker's background alone, but as an active choice that has a certain social value.

In addition, the character of the Banyumas dialect is more egalitarian and expressive, making it more flexible to use in informal interactions. This allows speakers to express themselves more freely without being bound by strict linguistic norms as in the Yogyakarta dialect. In this context, the use of the Banyumas dialect is not only based on the origin factor, but also on functional considerations, namely the ease of conveying emotions, closeness, and spontaneity in communication.

If analyzed further, the dominance of the Banyumas dialect can also be understood as a form of language ideology embraced by speakers. The choice to continue using the Banyumasan element shows that the speaker gives a positive value to the dialect, even though it is in an interaction situation involving other dialects that are often considered more socially prestigious. Thus, the use of the Banyumas dialect not only reflects the habits, but also the attitude and orientation of the speaker towards the language.

In the context of a multicultural society, this condition can be read as a form of symbolic resistance to the homogenization of language (Suparman, 2019). Speakers do not fully follow the trend of standardization or dominance of certain dialects, but rather retain their local characteristics. This resistance is not done explicitly, but is manifested in consistent everyday linguistic practice. In other words, every use of Banyumasan vocabulary becomes a form of identity affirmation that is done subtly but sustainably.

Furthermore, the dominance of the Banyumas dialect also shows that the process of dialect mixing does not always result in a total fusion of identities. Instead, what happens is coexistence between language variations, where one dialect can remain dominant while interacting with other dialects. This shows that hybridization does not mean loss of identity, but can instead strengthen it through selective adaptation (Rahayu et al, 2025; Suryadi et al, 2024).

Thus, the dominance of the Banyumas dialect in the data not only reflects the background of the speaker, but also shows the existence of social and ideological strategies in the use of language. Speakers actively maintain local identities in the midst of multicultural interactions, while leveraging language flexibility to adapt to diverse communication contexts.

Javanese-Indonesian Mix as a Reflection of Modern Identity

In addition to the mixing between Javanese dialects, the data also shows a mixture between Javanese and Indonesian. This phenomenon reflects the condition of bilingualism that is common in Indonesian society. In speech such as "*it means that deke sees ngono paying attention to ngono*", the use of Indonesian indicates that the speaker has access to a wider language system. Indonesian in this context is often used to convey more formal or abstract concepts.

If analyzed more deeply, the use of Indonesian in speech does not appear randomly, but has a specific pragmatic function. The words *see* and *pay attention* are used to provide more explicit affirmations of meaning, while Javanese elements such as *deke* and *ngono* maintain a familiar and contextual sense of interaction. This shows that speakers consciously take advantage of the different functions of the two languages, where Indonesian plays a role as a medium of clarification and elaboration, while Javanese functions to maintain social closeness and smooth interaction.

This phenomenon can be understood as a form of *code-mixing* that is functional, not just a mixing without a pattern. Speakers choose certain language elements based on communication needs, such as to clarify meaning, emphasize important information, or adjust to the topic of conversation. Thus, the transition between languages in one speech reflects the existence of a complex and directed communication strategy (Istiqomah et al, 2018).

Furthermore, this practice shows that speakers have integrative bilingual competence, namely the ability to combine two language systems in one speech framework without losing the coherence of meaning. Javanese and Indonesian are not hierarchically positioned as "main" and "additional" languages, but rather as two complementary linguistic resources. This shows that the boundaries between languages are becoming more fluid in everyday communication practices.

This mixture also reflects the speaker's identity as part of a modern society that is educated and exposed to various sources of information. The use of Indonesian does not replace Javanese, but complements it in certain situations. In this case, the speaker displays a multi-layered identity, namely as a member of the local community as well as part of the national community. Thus, language choices are based not only on communicative functions, but also on broader representations of social identities.

In addition, this mixed Javanese-Indonesian practice also shows an orientation towards modernity and social mobility. The Indonesian language is often associated with the formal realm, education, and access to knowledge, so its use in everyday speech can strengthen the impression of competence and education of the speaker. However, the existence of the Javanese language is maintained to maintain social closeness and cultural continuity.

Thus, the Javanese-Indonesian mixture in this study can be understood as a form of functional and strategic bilingual practice. Speakers do not simply mix languages, but actively select and combine language elements to meet communication needs while negotiating their identities in diverse social contexts.

Dialect Neutralization as an Inclusive Accommodation Strategy

Dialect neutralization is a phenomenon in which speakers use language forms that do not reflect one of the dialects dominantly. Forms such as "*nek iso mangkat in the morning*" indicate this tendency. The speech does not strongly represent the characteristics of Banyumasan or Yogyakarta, so it can be widely understood by speakers from various Javanese dialect backgrounds. This strategy is used mainly in situations where the speaker comes from a different dialect background. By using a neutral form, speakers can improve understanding and avoid potential misunderstandings (Putri et al, 2024).

If analyzed more deeply, this dialect neutralization is not just the elimination of linguistic characteristics, but is a form of strategic simplification of the language system. Speakers selectively avoid elements that are too specific or potentially incomprehensible to the speaker, such as regional vocabulary or certain phonological patterns. Instead, the speaker chooses a form that is considered "safe" and has a wider range of understanding. This shows that in communication practice, the effectiveness of message delivery is often a top priority compared to overly strong expression of identity (Yuliawati et al, 2020).

In the perspective of interactional sociolinguistics, this neutralization indicates the existence of linguistic awareness of diversity in interactions. Speakers not only focus on self-identity, but also consider the needs of the speaker. In other words, speakers carry out the audience design process, which is adjusting the language based on the characteristics and background of the audience (Blommaret, 2007). This process takes place quickly and often unconsciously, but it has a significant impact on communication success.

Furthermore, dialect neutralization can also be understood as a form of preventive linguistic accommodation. Speakers do not wait for misunderstandings to occur, but have anticipated this possibility from the beginning by choosing a more universal form of language. This shows an orientation to successful interactions, where smooth and effective communication is the main goal.

This phenomenon also indicates the flexibility of linguistic identity. In certain situations, the speaker is willing to lower the prominence of his dialectal identity in order to reach a common understanding. However, this does not mean that the identity is lost, but rather that it is simply not explicitly displayed in a particular context. Thus, dialect neutralization is part of a broader strategy for situational identity management.

In addition, neutralization also reflects a tendency towards the interdialectal variety, which is a form of language that is between several dialects and serves as a bridge of communication. This variety does not belong entirely to one particular group, but emerges as a result of intensive interaction between speakers from different backgrounds. In this context, neutralization not only functions individually, but also contributes to the formation of new language patterns within the speaking community.

Thus, dialect neutralization can be understood as a form of inclusive and strategic linguistic accommodation. Speakers actively adapt the language to create a more open space for communication, reduce the potential for exclusivity, and ensure that interactions can take place effectively in a multicultural and heterogeneous social context.

CONCLUSION

Based on the results of data analysis, the mixing of Yogyakarta-Banyumas dialects in this study showed a systematic and non-random linguistic pattern. The most dominant phenomenon was lexical mixing with a percentage of 40%, followed by variations in pronouns and the use of Banyumas dialects at 17%, respectively, as well as other phenomena such as *style shifting* (13%), Javanese-Indonesian mixing (10%), and dialect neutralization (3%). This distribution shows that speakers actively make linguistic selection in using dialect elements according to communication needs.

The dominance of lexical elements and the Banyumas dialect confirms that local identity remains the main reference in the speakers' linguistic practices. However, the existence of pronoun variations, *style shifting*, and language mixing suggests that these identities are not singular, but flexible and situational. Speakers are able to move between language variations, such as from the use of *nyong* to *me*, or from the local dialect to a more neutral form, as a form of adaptation to the counterpart and the context of interaction.

In addition, the use of Javanese-Indonesian mixture shows an orientation towards modernity and the expansion of the realm of communication, while dialect neutralization shows an accommodation strategy to improve understanding in multicultural situations. This indicates that the speaker not only maintains an identity, but also strategically adjusts it to keep communication effective. Thus, the dialect mixture in this study does not simply represent linguistic variation, but is a social practice that reflects dynamic identity negotiations. The dialect hybridization that occurs shows that the speaker's linguistic identity is adaptive, where local elements are maintained while being integrated with other language forms in one flexible communication system.

Declaration of Using AI Tools

The author declares that artificial intelligence (AI) tools were used to assist in the preparation of this article, particularly for language refinement, grammar checking, organization of ideas, and improvement of clarity and coherence. The use of AI tools was limited to supporting the writing process and did not replace the author's intellectual contribution, critical analysis, interpretation of data, or responsibility for the content. All

arguments, research findings, citations, and conclusions presented in this article were reviewed, verified, and finalized by the author. The author takes full responsibility for the accuracy, originality, and integrity of the submitted work.

REFERENCES

- Azizah, D. D., & Subrata, H. (2022). Implementation of Javanese *krama inggil* in Javanese language learning in elementary schools in the Trenggalek region. *Jurnal Review Pendidikan Dasar: Jurnal Kajian Pendidikan dan Hasil Penelitian*, 8(2), 161–166.
- Azizi, M. S., Sahari, D. R., Neina, Q. A., & Yuniawan, T. (2025). Conversation analysis between Ngapak Javanese speakers from Brebes and Javanese speakers from Semarang in online WhatsApp conversations. *Socius: Jurnal Penelitian Ilmu-Ilmu Sosial*, 3(5), 161–175. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17844059>
- Blommaert, J. (2007). Sociolinguistic scales. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 4(1), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1515/IP.2007.001>
- Darihastining, S., Dwijonagoro, S., Sulistyowati, H., Setianik, Maisaroh, S., & Wahyudi, H. H. (2023). Comparative study of Jombang Javanese language variation and standard Javanese. *Journal of Education Research*, 4(1), 404–412. <https://doi.org/10.37985/jer.v4i1.172>
- Dewi, F., Widayati, W., & Sucipto, S. (2017). A dialectological study of the Bangkalan dialect of Madurese. *Fonema*, 4(2), 60–77.
- Deswijaya, A., & Wibowo, S. (2025). Register of moderation in Javanese speech ecology: Indonesian as a strategy for negotiating intimacy and hierarchy. *Filitra Cultura*, 1(2). <https://doi.org/10.20961/filitra.v1i2.3168>
- Djokowidodo, A. (2022). Speech levels in the Madiun Javanese dialect: A comparative review of speech levels in the Yogyakarta Javanese dialect. *Jiip: Jurnal Ilmiah Ilmu Pendidikan*, 5(4), 1227–1232. <https://doi.org/10.54371/jiip.v5i4.550>
- Gurning, R. A., Sipayung, W. W., Sinurat, E., & Saragih, Y. S. (2024). Sociolinguistic analysis: Language perspectives in society. *Realisasi: Ilmu Pendidikan, Seni Rupa dan Desain*, 1(4), 238–245.
- Handayani, A. D., & Dhamina, S. I. (2021). Analysis of Javanese phonological errors in the online information media “SetenPo.” *DIWANGKARA: Jurnal Pendidikan, Bahasa, Sastra dan Budaya Jawa*, 1(1), 1–6.
- Hargita, B. S. (2020). Instagram as an innovative medium for Indonesian language learning based on blended learning: A preliminary study. In *Seminar Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia* (Vol. 2, No. 1, pp. 213–218).
- Hidayah, N. (2018). Negotiation of cultural identity through language. *Ar-Risalah: Media Keislaman, Pendidikan dan Hukum Islam*, 16(1), 15–37.
- Hidayat, R., & Setiawan, T. (2015). Javanese interference in Indonesian in the speaking skills of students at SMA Negeri 1 Pleret, Bantul. *LingTera*, 2(2), 156–168. <https://doi.org/10.21831/lt.v2i2.7374>
- Himawan, R., Suhardi, S., & Prihadi, P. (2022). Varieties of language use in AMOEBA youth organization meetings and social gatherings in Yogyakarta: A sociopragmatic perspective. *Lingua Franca*, 1(2), 1–11. https://doi.org/10.37680/lingua_franca.v1i2.1612
- Istiqomah, D. S., Istiqomah, D. S., & Nugraha, V. (2018). Analysis of the use of prokem language in social media. *Parole: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia*, 1(5), 665–674.
- Janeko, J., Na'im, M. A., Marzuqoh, E. L., & Nigtiaz, R. A. (2023). Preserving refined Javanese (*krama inggil*) among children as a form of local language empowerment and strengthening national identity in Kedungbanjar Village, Sambeng, Lamongan.

- Santri: *Journal of Student Engagement*, 2(2), 30–44. <https://doi.org/10.55352/santri.v2i2.560>
- Jannah, R., Saryanti, E., & Perdana, D. A. (2026). Changes in language patterns in adolescents' digital communication: A qualitative study of linguistics, sociology, and information technology. *Sociale: Journal of Social Science*, 1(1), 26–39.
- Khasanah, I. L., & Kurnia, H. (2023). Preserving Banyumasan culture through the Ngapak language dialect. *Kulturistik: Jurnal Ilmu Bahasa dan Budaya*, 7(2), 43–53. <https://doi.org/10.22225/kulturistik.7.2.7135>
- Laili Etika Rahmawati, & Vitria Indriyani Setyaningsih. (2021). Students' independent learning in online Indonesian language learning. *KEMBARA: Journal of Scientific Language Literature and Teaching*, 7(2), 353–365. <https://doi.org/10.22219/kembara.v7i2.16326>
- Misbahuddin, M. (2018). Habituating *krama inggil* language use from an early age: Strengthening the role of local wisdom in children's character formation. *RAHMATAN LIL ALAMIN: Journal of Peace Education and Islamic Studies*, 1(1), 21–28.
- Mujiastuti, G., & Rahardjo, T. (2023). Banyumasan dialect identity as a cultural construction: A study of Banyumasan dialect use among native Banyumas speakers living in Semarang. *Interaksi Online*, 11(3), 300–309.
- Nugroho, C., & Kusuma, I. P. (2023). Banyumasan cultural identity in the Ngapak dialect. *Jurnal Ilmu Komunikasi*, 21(2), 333–347.
- Putri, M., Jannah, M., Safitri, H., Aprilia, S., & Fitriani, R. (2024). Morphophonemics in slang: From phonemes to social phenomena. *Jurnal Pendidikan dan Konseling*, 6(2), 48–57.
- Rahayu, T., & Suryadi, S. (2025). Legal register in cultural village regulations in the Special Region of Yogyakarta. In *International Conference Entitled Language, Literary, and Cultural Studies (ICONLATERALS 2024)* (pp. 226–233). Atlantis Press. https://doi.org/10.2991/978-2-38476-404-4_18
- Rahayu, T., & Suryadi, S. (2024). Development of a textbook for critical reading of legal documents in compulsory university courses in higher education. *Jurnal Kependidikan: Jurnal Hasil Penelitian dan Kajian Kepustakaan di Bidang Pendidikan, Pengajaran, dan Pembelajaran*, 10(2), 679–690. <https://doi.org/10.33394/jk.v10i2.11507>
- Rahayu, A., Meliyana, R., Mukaromah, S. L. N., Hutabarat, E. N., & Baehaqi, I. (2025). Contrastive phonological analysis of the Temanggung Javanese dialect and the Banyumas Javanese dialect. *Paramasastra: Jurnal Ilmiah Bahasa, Sastra dan Pembelajarannya*, 12(1), 63–81. <https://doi.org/10.26740/paramasastra.v12n1.p63-81>
- Ramadhanti, D. (2018). Characteristic behaviour in students' speech with Minangkabau cultural setting: Interactional sociolinguistics approach. *Jurnal Gramatika*, 4(2), 290–303.
- Rindiyan, Sujinah, & Hermoyo, R. P. (2024). Javanese dialect variation among Indonesian Language and Literature Education students, class of 2020, FKIP Universitas Muhammadiyah Surabaya: A sociolinguistic study. *Proceeding Fakultas Keguruan Ilmu Pendidikan*, 1(1), 160–173. <https://doi.org/10.30651/pc.v1i1.24070>
- Rosiana, C. (2020). Productive reading activity in studying sociology and linguistics. *Historis: Jurnal Kajian, Penelitian dan Pengembangan Pendidikan Sejarah*, 5(2), 129–135.
- Salamah, S., & Zultiyanti, Z. (2024). Exploring pragmatic development in 4-year-old children: An interactionalist perspective. *English Review: Journal of English Education*, 12(1), 373–384. <https://doi.org/10.25134/erjee.v12i1.9355>

- Santoso, A., & Taufiqurrahman, F. (2023). Phonological processes of Generation Z slang on social media: A generative phonology analysis. *Jurnal Onoma: Pendidikan, Bahasa, dan Sastra*, 9(1), 80–88. <https://doi.org/10.30605/onoma.v9i1.2126>
- Setiawan, T. (2015). The personal deixis system in communicative acts. *Diksi*, 13(5), 77–91. <https://doi.org/10.21831/diksi.v13i5.6995>
- Shabrina, S. N., & Setiawan, T. (2022). Analysis of hoax texts about bank information: A language study from the perspective of critical discourse analysis and forensic linguistics. *KEMBARA: Jurnal Keilmuan Bahasa, Sastra, dan Pengajarannya*, 8(2), 492–507. <https://doi.org/10.22219/kembara.v8i2.21478>
- Sholihah, R. A. (2018). Language contact: Bilingualism, code-switching, code-mixing, interference, and integration. In *Proceeding: The Annual International Conference on Islamic Education* (Vol. 3, No. 1, pp. 361–376).
- Simarmata, J. (2025). Code-switching and social identity in urban adolescents' digital spaces: A variationist sociolinguistic perspective. *Sinonim: Journal of Language and Literature*, 3(2), 68–77.
- Suparman, N. F. N. (2019). Lexical innovation in the Wotu language. *Ranah: Jurnal Kajian Bahasa*, 8(2), 219–236.
- Supeno, M. Y., de Fretes, D., & Firanda, E. (2025). Negotiating local cultural identity through the *cetik* musical instrument: Dynamics of denominational debate in Lampung society. *Prosiding ISBI Bandung*, 79–89.
- Suswandari, M. (2017). Construction of the Banyumasan dialect at Universitas Sebelas Maret. *Edudikara: Jurnal Pendidikan dan Pembelajaran*, 2(3), 257–267. <https://doi.org/10.32585/edudikara.v2i3.57>
- Ulfah, I. H. (2019). Comparison of Javanese language variation in Pati and Juwana: A dialectological study. *Seminar Nasional Literasi IV*, 4(1), 145–150.
- Warami, H. (2016). The ontological perspective of language and culture. *Jurnal Triton Pendidikan*, 1(1), 35–42. <https://doi.org/10.30862/jtp.v1i1.793>
- Wardhaugh, R., & Fuller, J. M. (2021). *An introduction to sociolinguistics*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Yahya, M. (2023). A contrastive phonological study of the Wonosobo Javanese dialect and the Solo-Yogyakarta dialect. *Sutasoma: Jurnal Sastra Jawa*, 11(1), 54–64. <https://doi.org/10.15294/sutasoma.v11i1.66703>
- Yuliawati, R. D., & Maryadi, M. A. (2020). *Register used in NBA Instagram: A sociolinguistics perspective* [Doctoral dissertation, Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta].
- Yunidar, M. (2025). *Language, culture, and society: Contemporary sociolinguistic perspectives*. Kaizen Media Publishing.