Plagiarism Percentage

6%

sources:

1. 2% match (publications)
   Gunawan, Samuel. "Driving Home Persuasive Messages in Barack Obama's Closing Argument "One Week"". k@ta, 2013.

2. 1% match (Internet from 01-Apr-2010)

3. 1% match (Internet from 06-Dec-2016)

4. 1% match (Internet from 29-Nov-2017)
   http://digilib.unimed.ac.id/4433/9/9.%208126111035%20Bab%201.pdf

5. 1% match (publications)

6. < 1% match (Internet from 02-Nov-2017)
   http://repository.petra.ac.id/15975/1/Reviving_Rhetoric_Samuel.pdf

7. < 1% match (Internet from 29-Jun-2010)

8. < 1% match (Internet from 13-Mar-2016)

9. < 1% match (publications)

10. < 1% match (publications)
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ABSTRACT

Language variation in Indonesia provides rich resources for the building blocks of casual style of Indonesian. Among those linguistic resources are style shift, code switch, and code mix. They allow speakers, depending on their speech repertoire and the socio-pragmatic demands, to choose and use the linguistic resources of the speech community by shifting the codes within the major code, or by switching between different codes to and fro, and/or even mix up the elements of the existing codes. Based on a close scrutiny of the informal speech habits of Indonesian bilingual/multilingual speakers in an urban setting, this paper elucidates the distinction between those linguistic phenomena. Despite their distinctions, they display their unique regularities and contribution toward the most common formation of casual style of Indonesian as well as an informal in-group style of the major language in a conversation. KEYWORDS: Style shifting, Informal style, Code switching, Code mixing, Casual style. 1. Introduction It has been well recognized that there are no single style speakers in the real world of language (see Labov, 1972: 208; Selting, 1985: 179-197). This means that speakers tend to shift styles as the the socio-pragmatic conditions demand. Sankoff (1972) recognizes that the network of communication among multilingual speakers allows them to shift between styles of the major language, and even to switch among various codes in their speech repertoire. Referring to Hymes (1967) and Gumperz (1970), Sankoff highlights that the choice of alternates of the same language by monolinguals, i.e. in the form of style shifting (hereafter SS), may have the same significance as that of alternates from other languages by bilinguals/multilinguals, i.e. in the form of code switching (hereafter CS). This paper is to explore the characteristics of a casual style of Indonesian which give way to the incorporation of CS, or even code mixing (hereafter CM), among its subjects, 4 coordinate adult bilinguals of Javanese and Indonesian. 2. Theories Studies on style-shifting is often framed after Joos’ seminal work (1977) on styles in English as

(1) Frozen style, (2) Formal style, (3) Consultative style, (4) Casual style, and (5) Intimate style. Different groups of styles can be identified along the stylistic continuum within one major variety (Labov, 1972; Selting, 1985). In this paper, I interchangeably use the the term “a casual style of Indonesian” and “an informal style of Indonesian” as a cover term for a variety of Indonesian other than the formal one. Indonesian linguists such as Moeliono (1980) and Kridalaksana (1981) long recognized the existence of different ingredients for styles of Indonesian. However, the main focus of their attention was mostly directed toward promoting the standard variety of Indonesian. With such orientation, undoubtedly there was a dichotomy between standard and nonstandard variety (see Moeliono, 1980: 16-17; Kridalaksana, 1981: 18- 22). Some linguists, such as Tampubolon (1978), Poedjososedarmo (1978), Soewito (1982), under the credential of sociolinguistics applied the sociolinguistic perspectives on the nature of Indonesian. In this paper, I explore the characteristics of a casual style of Indonesian and how such phenomena give way to the incorporation of CS, or even CM among my subjects. CS may be either intersentential or intrasentential, but this paper restricts its focus on intrasentential CS. Myers-Scotton (1997: 3; 2010,
3) defines CS as “the selection by bilinguals or multilinguals of forms from an embedded variety (or varieties) in utterances of a matrix variety during the same conversation”. The matrix language (hereafter ML) is the main language providing the morphosyntactic structure in CS, whereas the embedded language (hereafter EL) refers to other languages which participate in CS, but with a lesser role.

Under Myers-Scotton’s (1997: 3-7)

**Matrix Language Hypothesis** (hereafter MLH), the ML sets the morphosyntactic frame of sentences showing CS as ML + EL constituents. Whereas under the Blocking Hypothesis (hereafter BH)

any EL content morphemes which are not congruent with ML counterparts will be blocked. The MLH is realized in two principles: (1)

**the Morpheme Order Principle** (hereafter MOP), i.e.

**morpheme order must not violate ML morpheme order, and (2) the System Morpheme Principle** (hereafter SMP), i.e. all syntactically relevant system morphemes must come from the ML.

Any EL morpheme which is constrained by either MLH or the BH creates an obligatory EL island. What seems problematical with reference to Myers-Scotton’s scheme is probably the notion of
CM as commonly understood in Indonesian linguistics. Myers-Scotton (2010, pp. 3) avoids using the term “mixing”, of which to her implies the creation of a new language. Instead, she uses the term “mixed constituent” to refer to any EL constituent with morphemes from two or more languages (p. 15). In this paper, I choose to use the term “mixed constituent” or simply as CM whereby the constituent is made of content morpheme from the ML and bound (system) morpheme from the EL. 

3. Method
Since this study was to focus on the formation of casual style of Indonesian among bilinguals of Javanese and Indonesian, the recording of the speakers’ speech exchanges containing the linguistic phenomena were done in the natural speech events. In comply with the Observer’s Paradox (Labov, 1972: 208, 209), over a period of one months, I recorded the data and immersed in some naturally occuring speech exchanges/conversations without giving the impression to the speakers that they were being systematically observed. The subjects were 4 coordinate adult bilinguals, 2 males and 2 females, who spoke both Indonesian and Javanese in the course of their everyday lives. By immersing in the most informal occasions with the subjects and recording their speech exchanges at their consent, I was able to collect a corpus of speech exchanges containing the phenomena under study of 10 hours long.

The data for this paper were linguistic units in the forms of words, phrases, and clauses or sentences that were used to characterize the use of casual style of Indonesian, and that of CS and CM within a casual style of Indonesian. Therefore the sources of the data were the subjects' naturally occuring speech exchanges. The analysis was qualitative as

4. Findings and discussion
For most speakers of Javanese background speaking Indonesian in less formal context of situation would give way to the employment of a congruent variety of speaking known as informal style of Indonesian. This style is dominantly made of speech variation within Indonesian as displayed in Script 1. Since the grammatical constraints of the formal (=standard) variety is lifted in a casual variety, this phenomena give way to the employment of CS (see 4.2) and/or CM (see 4.3) in the use of the casual style of Indonesia as the socio-pragmatic conditions demand.

4.1 Style shift
The phenomena of style shift are realized as a speaker shifts between existing different grouping of linguistic resources of a single (usually major) variety known as styles which are characterized by some distinct style markers (see Selting 1985; Joos, 1977). Along the existing continuum of styles, the casual style may often be observable in the casual context of situation. The following sample of naturally occuring speech exchanges may show some of the characteristics of the formation of casual style as shown by its distinctive style markers. In using the informal style/variety, a speaker was fully aware of the congruent linguistic forms. Both speakers in Script 1 basically had a talk in the casual style of Indonesian as obvious from its style markers. The nuance of the casual context of situation gives way to the employment other linguistic features such as borrowing, CS, and CM. 

Script 1
The host (=A) was having a talk with his guest (=B) about statues for home decoration. They were talking in casual Indonesian to be dispersed with a CS/El island in Javanese A (=guest : Patung-patungnya beli di mana, pak? ‘Where did you buy the
Some characteristics of the casual style known as style markers can be identified: 1) Deletion Some phonological reductions: (I)tu, t(e)rima, (su)dah, (k)ok, b(e)rapa, s(e)ratus, 2) Diphthong ? monothong: mau ? mo; sampai ? sampe; pakai ? pake 3) Vowel substitution: macam-macam ? macem-macem 2) Choice of lexicon Particular list of words characterizing the style: tidak ? 'ndak, 3) Nasal verbalizer milih = {N + pilih} 4) Others a) Borrowing from Javanese: ijo-ijo b) CS in Javanese: the EL from Javanese bongso wong katok koloran. 4.2 Code switching In the use of an informal style of Indonesian, the grammar of the formal style of Indonesian is lifted; and what concomitantly applies is the adherence to the grammar of an informal style. It follows that speakers may have more flexibility of expression; and this allows the activation of the constituent of their speech repertoire involving another language variety to be employed in the forms of CS. The following sample of speech exchange shows the casual conversation involving the ML in Indonesian, the EL in Javanese, CS, and CM/mixed constituent. Script 2 A and B were talking about their obstinate friend. A : Lha saya sudah jelaskan ning dheke tetep ngeyel.(CS) ‘You know, I have already explained but he is still stubborn’. B : Mungkin dia ‘nggak ngerti.(CS) ‘Perhaps he doesn’t understand’. A : ‘nggak mo ngerti, bukan ‘nggak ngerti.(CS) ‘Not wanting to understand, not doesn’t understand.’ B : Ya (be)gitulah rambut podo irenge tapi p(e)rangai beda-beda. (CS) ‘Yes like that, (we have) the same black hair, but different character’. In Script 3 both speakers had a talk in an informal Indonesian which allows the employment of CS and CM. The informal style of Indonesian provides the frame for the whole chunk of talk – the ML – whereas the EL was done in Javanese. It also involves a CM “S-duane”. Script 3 C and D were talking about their friend. C: Dia (s)udah s(e)lesai S-2 di Gama. Tapi s(e)karang malah njaluk b(e)rhenti kerjo.(CS, CS) ‘He has finished S-2 at Gama. But now (he) is even asking to resign work’. Alesannya macem-macem. Alasannya kar(e)na orangtuanya wis seda; (CS) ‘His reasons are various. His reason was that his parent is no more’. t(e)rus adik-adiknya masih kecil. ‘and his younger brothers are still kids’. D: Tapi S-duane wis mari ta? (CM, CS) ‘But his S-2 has been completed, hasn’t it?’ C: Sudah, lamanya rong tahun setengah.(CS) ‘It has, it took two years and a half.’ 4.3 Code mixing/ mixed constituent There is no doubt that the flexibility of expression in the informal style of Indonesian in Script 4 also allows the use of a mixed constituent, of which in this paper I consistently refer to as CM. Script 4: A : Coba sinio, liaten dulu. Yang ini punyae s(i)apa? (CM,CM) ‘Please, come here, have a look first. This one belongs to whom?’ B : Yang jelas bukan punyae bojoku. ‘Obviously it doesn’t belong to my wife’. A : Punyae bojomu. Dia lupa ‘ngkali. ‘It belongs to your wife. She could have forgotten’. B : Nanti tak sampekno dia. Dia suka lupa lek lagi banyak urusan. (CM) ‘I’ll tell her later. She is often forgetful if (she) has a lot of things to do.’ The forms such as sinio, liaten, were the product of a mixture between content morphemes in Indonesian and the imperative bound morphemes in Javanese, and punyae was the product of a mixture between a content morpheme in Indonesian and a possessive bound morpheme in Javanese. The flexibility of expression in the informal
style of Indonesian in Script 5 allows the use of the mixed constituents dibuking and dikensel made of the Indonesian prefix and the borrowing content morpheme from English and the mixed constituent dikensal-kansel made of the Indonesian bound morpheme prefix and the established borrowing kansal-kansel from English content morpheme cancel that has undergone a reduplication as found in Javanese. Script 5: C: Kapan b(e)rangkat? ‘When are you leaving?’ D: Kamis depan, tapi tiket belum dibuking. (CM) ‘Next Thursday, but the ticket has not been booked’. C: Eh, ... aku denger, kar(e)na cuaca, belakangan plane sering dikensel. (Borrowing; CM) ‘Well, ... I have heard, due to the weather, planes have often been cancelled recently’. D: Dari itu aku mo buking tiket jadi ragu-ragu. (Borrowing) ‘For that reason, I become in doubt to book’. Wah, yo susah kalo mo terbang s(e)lalu dikensal-kansel. (CM) ‘It's really difficult if (we) want to fly’. 