

- Word Count: 7060

Plagiarism Percentage

**1%**

Seriawan, Ph.D.

**sources:****1**

1% match (Internet from 21-Dec-2016)

<http://e.bangor.ac.uk/6592/1/PhD%20TERFYNOL%20MP%20%282016%29.pdf>**paper text:**

COLLOQUIAL INFORMAL STYLE OF INDONESIAN Samuel Gunawan Petra Christian University, Surabaya - Indonesia Email: samgun@petra.ac.id Abstract Sociolinguistically, social situations within which a speech interaction occurs may vary along a continuum of the most formal occasion of the social situations to go down to the most informal one. The same may also be true regarding the use of language; it also varies

**along a stylistic** continuum **from the most formal** variety **to** go down to **the most informal**

**1**

one. In other words, particular constellations of social situations tend to co-vary with a group of the linguistic subsystems of a major code called a language variety. Varieties within a major code, like Indonesian, constitute a stylistic continuum. Thus, there exists a continuum of social situations which exists side by side and co-vary with that of language varieties known as a stylistic continuum. This paper examines a style known as a language variety, its style markers, and other varieties with which it interacts, and the social meaning it carries in speech exchanges. The style under investigation is referred to as colloquial informal style of Indonesian (CISI), an informal variety which co-varies with the informal constellations of situational situations. This variety is worth of an academic inquiry on account of its insight into the interactions between different language varieties that make it up in the speech habits of Indonesian speakers in most informal social situations. As the informal social situations demand, speakers tend to shift to the use of this style so as to create congruent situational situations. This style may be recognized by the presence of its style markers which are becoming more established as part and parcel of the variety. The CISI is enriched by the presence of both codeswitching and code mixing which further highlights its concomitant informal social meaning. The data were collected from informal configurations of situational situations whereby interethnic speech participants interacted in particular time or topics and settings that concomitantly gave way to the use of the style. Keywords: Informal Indonesian, colloquial informal style, style markers, code switching, codemixing. INTRODUCTION Sociolinguistically, social situations within which speech interactions occur may vary along a continuum of the most formal occasion of the social situations, down to the most informal one. The same may also be true regarding the use of language; it also varies

**along a stylistic** continuum **from the most formal** variety down **to the most**

**1**



one (cf. Labov, 1972, pp. 208, 209). In other words, particular constellations of social situations tend to co-vary with a group of the linguistic subsystems of a major code called a language variety. Varieties within a major code, like Indonesian, constitute a stylistic continuum. Thus, there exists a continuum of social situations which exists side by side and co-vary with that of language varieties known as a stylistic continuum. Meanwhile, the constellation of particular situations co-varies with a particular congruent variety of the language known as a style. Along the stylistic continuum, different varieties can be identified. A particular constellation of social situations may trigger the use of particular congruent varieties of language. The shift between different varieties within a single major code is understood as style-shifting (cf. Selting, 1985). It has also become a common knowledge that in the real world of language use, there is no single style speaker (cf. Labov, 1972, p. 208; Selting, 1985, pp. 179-197). The same may be true in the case of language use among Indonesian speakers as investigated in this article. Those who pick up their Indonesian later after acquiring their mother tongue, mostly from formal educational setting, feel that their Indonesian sounds formal and reserve it only for formal occasions. As they pursue

their day-to-day lives, now and then, in the course of

1

their lives, they have to shift to less formal social situations, of which concomitantly trigger their use of a particular variety characterised by some obvious structural characteristics called style markers. This study focuses on studying the structural characteristics of informal Indonesian as spoken by its inter-ethnic speakers in most informal social situations. As they were speaking strictly within the confine of Indonesian as the major code in informal social situations, they activate the constituents of their speech repertoire by shifting to the use of the most congruent informal style within the major code of Indonesian, of which the characteristics of colloquial informal style of Indonesian (henceforth CISI) are becoming more obvious. Furthermore, Indonesian speakers may also activate other varieties of other major codes at their command, giving way to the employment of code switching and code mixing. Such sociolinguistic phenomena were observed by Sankoff (1972; cf. also Bullock & Toribio, 2009, p. 2), who stated that multilingual speakers have the capacity to shift back and forth between styles of the major language (commonly recognised as style-shifting), and they may even have the capacity to switch back and forth among the various codes of other major code(s) in their speech repertoire known as code switching (henceforth, CS). Sankoff highlighted that the choice of alternates of the same language by monolinguals (i.e. style shifting) might have the same significance as that of alternates by multilinguals (i.e., CS). It is noteworthy to consider that Grosjean (1982) identified the recurring patterns of linguistic behaviour among members of bilingual or multilingual speech communities in the use of their linguistic resources that took three common patterns as: (1) an exclusive use of a single (usually major) language variety or code, (2) CS, and/or (3) code mixing (henceforth, CM). Altarriba and Basnight-Brown (2009, p. 3) also noted similar options among bilinguals such as producing utterances in a single language, switching between languages and even mixing the language. De Bot, Broersma and Isurin (2009, p. 86) reported that such speakers chose to use only the most appropriate linguistic means in a given setting. In Indonesian context, early—not necessarily the earliest—scholarly writings only mentioned both CS and CM on a scanty, passing thought of the use of the two terms, but yet no serious and evaluative attempts were made to discover how the two were related to each other (Nababan, 1979, p. 280; Wojowasito, 1980; Suwito, 1982, p. 48). Among scarce papers in Indonesian linguistics, Gunawan (2003) was an attempt to understand CS, and Gunawan (2008) was an



attempt to explore CM in the Indonesian context. More copious papers were devoted to exploring the functions of CS involving Indonesian and English in classroom settings (cf., for instance, Abdulmanan, 2007, pp. 90-94; Helmy, 2007, pp. 104-109).

**PURPOSE OF THE RESEARCH** The research undertaken in this article focused mainly on identifying the structural characteristics of CISI in most congruent and natural social situations involving inter-ethnic speech participants, who interact with each other on a particular topic and/or time, and locale within school/education domain. The research focused on identifying the CISI within the major code of Indonesian which is also enriched by the employment of CS and CM, its style markers and their concomitant social meanings.

**SCOPE AND LIMITATION OF THE RESEARCH** The scope of the research is on the sociolinguistic study of the CISI and its social meaning, as commonly enacted by Indonesian speakers of different ethnic backgrounds in most congruent, natural and informal social situations, within the school/education domain.

**REVIEW OF LITERATURE** Co-variation between Social Situation and Style Fishman (1975, p. 33) posited the theoretical concept of "domain" as the highest cluster of social situations. He most formal most formal co-vary STYLE ? SOCIAL SITUATION most informal most informal Figure 1. Covariation between social situations and styles proposed five domains: home, school and culture, work, government, and church. In this study, the researcher restricted his research to speech exchanges among close friends outside class rooms in education/culture domain. The concept of social situation is found in face-to-face talks, which are realised by the interplay between its components such as the social roles of speech participants, place (locale) and time/topic (cf. Fishman, 1968, p. 41; 1975, pp. 47, 55). These components can be understood as social roles of participants, topic/time and setting. The constellation of social situations co-varies with a stylistic group known as style (see Figure 1). The focus of this study is on the CISI, which co-varies with the informal constellation of social situations. The Notion of Colloquial Informal Style of Indonesian The bulk of literature on Indonesian deals mostly with the formal variety of Indonesian. This is well understood as most Indonesian linguists in the past were more concerned with the full swing of the standard variety of the national language on every walk of life on the national level (Moeliono, 1980; Kridalaksana, 1981). However, other varieties of Indonesian were known among Indonesian sociolinguists (Tampubolon, 1978, Poedjosoedarmo, 1978). If any, informal varieties of Indonesian were only mentioned on a passing thought. Mostly, the notion style is known through Joos' framework (1977), which identifies five different styles of English. In this research, I focus more on the existence of varieties, other than the formal one, under the umbrella of an informal variety – one that shares things in common in the speech habits of young interethnic speakers of Indonesian

**in their day- to-day walks of lives in informal social**

**1**

situations in Surabaya. The style which becomes the focus of this article is called the Colloquial Informal Style of Indonesian (CISI). The whole constellation of the CISI among the small social group of speakers in focus can be diagrammed, as follows: Most formal STYLE Most formal co-vary ? SOCIAL SITUATION Code switching Code mixing Most informal Most informal Figure 2. Narrow and broad notions of CISI This paper recognises the two distinctions of informal varieties of Indonesian – the narrow and the broad notions. The former refers to the styles existing within the confine of the major code – Indonesian (cf. Eckert & Rickford, 2001, p. 25 for such a notion); the latter covers beyond the boundary of the major code of Indonesia resulting from the interactions with other varieties of the local languages in the forms of CS and CM. The varieties investigated in this research are identified by the existence of their style markers in terms of some linguistic features. Thus, the use of CISI may correlate to the whole constellation of the informal social situations consisting of speech participants, setting, and topic/time. Code Switching CS may either be inter-sentential or intra-sentential, but this paper mostly focuses on intra-sentential CS on the reason that the



speakers under investigation tend to enact the minimal (intra-sentential) CS. For the former, following Gumperz (1982, p. 59; cf. Bullock & Toribio, 2009: pp. xii-1; cf. Gunawan, 2003), this study defines inter-sentential CS as the juxtaposition of speech passages belonging to two distinct grammars of the participating languages. Whereas, intra-sentential CS, following Myers-Scotton (1997, p. 3; 2010, p. 3), is defined as the use of sentences in CISI, in which the Matrix Language Frame (MLF) is Indonesian that provides the morphosyntactic structure and within which it incorporates the Embedded Language (EL) element from another language. In such a case, the EL follows the morphemic structure of the MLF. As a result, the EL does not violate the morphemic structure of the MLF. A speaker may have a choice to activate the constituent of his/her speech repertoire involving another language variety to be employed in the forms of Intra-sentential CS. This may simply be illustrated as follows: Morphemic structure ? EL of MLF ? Morphosyntactic structure of MLF ? MLF (Matrix Language Frame) of Indonesian = MLF having the morphosyntactic structure of Indonesian EL (Embedded Language) = Javanese (SVJ = Surabaya Variety of Javanese) or other varieties Figure 3. Intrasentential Code Switching Since all the speakers under study have been residing in Surabaya for some years, the typical variety of the local language tends to be Surabaya Variety of Javanese (SVJ). Code Mixing CM is different from CS (cf. Bullock & Toribio, 2009, p. 6). In this paper, I use the term CM to refer to the employment of a sentence having the MLF from the major code – Indonesian – and within which, it contains the use of any content morpheme from the MLF which is mixed up with the use of the bound (system) morpheme from the EL. ML content morpheme + bound morpheme of EL (Mixing) ? Morphosyntactic structure of ML Figure 4. Code mixing METHOD This study focuses on language use in the speech habits of a small social group of interethnic speakers in informal social situations within one domain: school/education. Obtaining data of the most natural social situations is a big and challenging job, especially when recording speech exchanges intentionally, with style and style markers expected often may not appear. Conversely, when they are not intentionally observed, they may appear as stated in the Observer's Paradox (cf. Labov, 1972, pp. 208, 209). Hence, to overcome that possible difficulty, the research collected and used a whole bunch of data to be taken as purposive samples, i.e. sample elements of the study that are deemed to be typical and representative of the focus of the inquiry (cf. Ary, Jacobs, & Sorensen, 2010, p. 156; cf. Dörnyei, 2007, p. 126). They were collected by two different techniques – participant recording and participant observation – within a period of three months. The researcher used eight research assistants, who were also part of the small social group under investigation.

**Speech Participants, Setting, Time/Topic** The speech participants of the research were students of the same university in Surabaya. Based on their role relationships, they know each other very well. These speech participants constitute a small social group of speakers. Their speech exchanges involved their common, everyday chit-chats, which took place in the settings identified as informal ones. The speech exchanges (SEs) were the interplays between the role relationships of the speech participants, settings and time/topic most congruent for the production of CISI. The SEs were recorded, or observed, and collected in most natural social situations. The term "natural" implies that most speech participants were not aware that their speech exchanges, especially those parts containing target characteristics of the style markers of CISI were being recorded or observed. In the case of direct observation, due to memory limitation, data were mostly recovered in the form of short speech exchanges containing target characteristics of the style markers of CISI that were then recalled and jotted down in situ.

**Data and Sources of the Data** Data were gathered from the domain of school and its surroundings. The sources of data were speech exchanges involving participants who talked to each other in particular informal settings, time, or topics. The participants were speakers who employed naturally some varieties of Indonesian in their speech habits. The data for this research were linguistic units/items collected from the speech habits of the speakers under study. They contained distinctive characteristics of CISI, involving some samples of both narrow and broad CISI. Thus, sources of the data were the participants' speeches that naturally occur during their speech exchanges. The



analysis was descriptive-qualitative as the focus of the data analysis was directed toward the description of the phenomena as they were (cf. Seliger & Shohamy, 1990, pp. 124, 125; Ary, Jacobs & Razavich, 1990, p. 381); and being qualitative as it was sought to analyse the phenomena of the focus of inquiry, which includes human behaviours, linguistic units/items, and human perspectives or opinions related to the use of CISI (cf. Ary, Jacobs & Sorensen, 2010, pp. 420-423; cf. Dömyei, 2007, pp. 24, 38; Seliger & Shohamy, 1990, pp. 38, 39).

### FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

#### Narrow Notion of CISI

The speech participants in this research were in close social relationships as close friends; therefore, they know each other very well. They were treated as a small social group whose speech habits were investigated in this study. The phenomena of the CISI were realised as they talked about informal topics in informal settings. The topics mostly centred around their daily activities as students and social lives as young people. The settings were also indicative of informal occasions as found outside classrooms, at school corridors, parking lot, in cafeteria, or in students' lounge. Their CISI was obviously recognised by their consistent use of its style markers. In such informal social situations, they employed CISI naturally as the congruent language variety. This was the kind of variety, whereby in its production, they paid less attention to. Therefore, in some way, it met the criteria of being the "vernacular" of this small social group of the speakers (cf. Trudgill, n.d., pp. 304-307; cf. Holmes, 2013, p. 77). The narrow notion of CISI as studied in this research reflects the production of a colloquial variety of Indonesian having some sociolinguistic characteristics as follows:

1. The speech participants who employ narrow CISI under observation can be referred to as a small social group of interethnic speakers who know each other very well. In other words, they always spontaneously enact close role/social relationships as reflected in their speech habits whenever the components of the social situations are congruent.
2. Narrow CISI is a variety that its speakers employ naturally, and the speakers' shift toward which could be qualitatively observed. The constellations of the social situations are also qualitatively perceived as being informal/casual.
3. Narrow CISI is a variety which its speakers produce with minimum attention.

#### Style Markers of Narrow CISI

Narrow CISI is characterised by its concomitant style markers as follows:

1. Phonological level
  - ? Glotalisation in the final syllable of some words: \_\_\_\_# ? \_\_\_\_?#.
  - ? The schwa sound deletion: /ə/ ? /ɤ/. ? Deletion or reduction of the initial syllable of some words: /#syl\_\_\_\_/ ? /ɤ\_\_\_\_/
  - ? Simplification of diphthong: /aɪ/?/eɪ/; /aʊ/?/ɔɪ/
  - ? Informal schwa sound: /a/?/ə/
2. Morphological level
  - ? Substitution of prefix: {meN\_\_\_\_}? {N\_\_\_\_} ? Omission of prefix: {ber\_\_\_\_}? {ɸ\_\_\_\_}
3. Syntactic level
  - ? The use of question marker "apa" (literary 'what') ? Paraphrasing
4. Informal lexical items

The style markers mentioned above were drawn from the data of the speech habits of the small social group of the speakers under study. Those style markers are selectively exemplified in the following (the data in CISI are italicised; the features being examined in passages are underlined; and translations are given in parentheses). The following is a discussion of the use of CISI by the small social group under study.

#### 1) Phonological level

##### a) Glotalisation in the final syllable of some words: \_\_\_\_# ? \_\_\_\_?#

/bawa/ ? /bawaʔ/ 'take' /tjuma/ ? /tjumaʔ/ 'only, just'

Based on the observation on the participants' speech habits, it was obvious that the addition of the glottal sounds at the end of some words in CISI was used to correlate to the social meaning of the group solidarity. This was reflected in speech exchange (henceforth, SE (1)) as follows:

A: Lu kemarin bawa /bawaʔ/ oleh-oleh nggak? 'You brought a gift yesterday, didn't you?' B: Ya kalo cuma /tjumaʔ/ sperti biasanya ada. Kapan ke rumah? 'Yes, if only as usual, I brought. When are you coming to my house?' A: Mungkin besok malam ya. 'Maybe tomorrow evening.'

##### b) The schwa sound deletion: /ə/ ? /ɤ/

The casual nuance of both the social situation and the speech interaction were characterised by the use of the schwa sound deletion. Belajar /bəladʒar/? blajar /bladʒar/ 'study' semua /səməua/?smua /smua/ 'all' terus/tərs/? trus /trɔs/ 'then'

As found in the following SE (2) taking place in the school corridor, B, who comes from Surabaya, greeted C, her closed friend from another ethnic background, Kupang. Both consistently applied /ə/ deletion to express the informal nuance of both the social situation and the speech exchange.

(2) B: Hai! 'Hi!' C: Oh, hai! 'Oh, hi!' B: Wah 'dah balik smua ya? 'Wou, all of you have come back, right?' C: Sudahlah...



. Blajar lagi ehh... . 'Yes, we have ... . Studying again ehh ...'. B: Iyalah.... Masa mau libur trus? 'Of course...  
. How come (we wish) to continue on holiday?' C: Kau masih ingat semua semester lalu? 'You still remember  
all (from) last semester?' B: (Laughing) Kamu sendiri gimana? 'How about you, yourself?' C: (Just laughing).

c) Deletion or reduction of the initial syllable of some words: /#sɪl\_\_\_/ ? / ɸ\_\_\_/ To render the informal  
nuance of both the social situation and the speech exchange, deletion or reduction of the initial syllable of  
some words was made in CISI, as found in sudah /sudah/? udah /udah/ 'already'; saja /sadaʒa /ʔaja /adʒa/  
'just' as found in SE (3). (3) A: Tadi di jalan mobilku ditabrak dari belakang. 'Just now in the street, my car  
got hit from the rear'. B: Loh trus gimana? Pesok ta? 'Then, how was it? Was it smashed?' A: Iya, untung  
aku udah minta SIM sama nomer hp-nya. Nanti mau aku telfon dia. 'Yes, fortunately I have asked for the  
driver's license and cell phone number. Later, I am going to give him a call.' B: Bener! Ya udah jangan kaco  
lagi hatimu, kan bukan salahmu juga. 'Right! Then, don't be panicked any more; anyway, it's not your fault.'

C: Iya, nanti tinggal kamu telfon aja orangnya; minta dia ganti rugi. 'Yap, you'll give him a call later to ask for  
a compensation.'

d) Simplification of diphthong: /aɪ/?/e/; /au/?/ɔ/ The feature of diphthong simplification, as  
found in ramai /ramay/?rame /ramɪ/, sampai /sampay/?sampe /sampi/, were used to characterise the  
informal nuance of both the social situations of the use of CISI in SE (4). (4) G: Kemarin ke bazaar? 'Did you  
go to a bazaar yesterday?' H: Iya, kamu juga? 'I did; you also went?' G: Nggak ... gak dapet parkir,rame

/rame/ banget ya kemarin. 'No, ... no parking lot available. Quite a lot of people there yesterday, right?' H:  
Iya, rame /rame/ banget, untung aku datengnya sorean. Malemnya kan baru rame /rame/. 'Yes, quite a lot of  
people. Fortunately, I came earlier. It was in the evening that a lot of people came.' G: Oliv ke bazaar? 'Did  
Oliv go to the bazaar?' H: Kurang tau, coba tanya dia. 'I've no idea. You'd better ask her.' G: Aku sampe

/sampe/ udah puter-puter basement sama parkir; di luar juga full. Pokoknya kaco /katʃɔ/. 'I did go around  
the basement and the parking lot; it was also full in the outside. It became a confusion.' e) Informal schwa  
sound: /a/?/ə/ This feature of the informal style marker is used intensively in the following informal  
conversation in SE (5). (5) E: Ulangan business-mu kemarin dapet /dapet/ brapa? 'What grade did you get  
for your business test yesterday?' F: Biasa aja sih, cuma 80. Kamu brapa? 'Just as usual, only 80. What did  
you get?' E: Aku Cuma 75. Kalo kamu brapa? 'Mine was just 75. And you, what grade did you get?' D: Aku  
dapet/dapet/85. Eh, si Melita dapet /dapet/ brapa ya? Kalian tau nggak? 'I got 85. Eh, what grade did Melita  
get? Do you know?' C: Kemarin sih waktu aku tanya dia dapet/dapet/ 95. 7 'Yesterday, when I asked her,  
she got 95.'

2. Morphological level a) Substitution of prefix: {meN\_\_\_}? {N\_\_\_} These are found in menyuruh  
/menyuruh/ ?nyuruh /nyuruh/ 'to command' menonton /mənɔntɔn/ ?nonton /nɔntɔn/ 'to watch' menyesal  
/mənyəsəl/?nyəsəl /nyəsəl, njesəl/ 'to regret' Some verbs having the prefix {meN\_\_\_} in the formal variety of  
Indonesian get prenasal verbalizer /#N\_\_\_/ in CISI. Therefore, this prenasal verbaliser is indicative of some  
verbs in CISI, as found in SE (6). /#N\_\_\_/ + {word root} buat ?mbuat 'to make' antar ?ngantar /ŋantar/ 'to  
send; to accompany' (6) F: Yang sperti ini nggak susah mbuatnya lho. 'The one like this is not really difficult  
to make it, you know.' G: Ya tapi kalo nggak pernah nyoba, susah lho. 'Yes, but if you have never done it  
before, it's difficult, you know.' F: Aku pulang duluan ya, mau ngantar mamaku ke dokter. 'I've got to go, I'll  
have to send my mom to the doctor.' G: Sakit ta mamamu? 'Is your mom ill?' F: Nggak cuma /tʃumaʔ/ check  
up rutin aja. 'No, not really, it's just a regular check up.' In some cases, there are some co-occurring features  
of CISI, which could have been resulted from two different processes; the first one is the stylistic variation of  
CISI in a narrow sense resulting from a simplification process in the morphological structure of Indonesian  
as the major code (STYLE), and the second one is from that of CISI in a broader sense resulted from the  
morphological structure of Javanese (CS). In other words, despite the fact that these two features have  
resulted from two distinct processes, they share the surface forms that serve similar stylistic functions.

Indonesian Javanese {meN-} + {bɔrɔŋ} ? memborong /mɛNbɔrɔŋ/ ? 'to buy all' {øN} + {bɔrɔŋ} ? mborong  
/Nbɔrɔŋ/ ?? {#N-} + {bɔrɔŋ} mborong /Nbɔrɔŋ/ This can be found in the following SE (7): (7) A: Mborong ya?  
'You bought all, didn't you?' B: Ndak sih, cuma /tʃumaʔ/ beli ini kok. 'Not really, only buy this one.' Hence, in



the case of the negation *ndak* 'no', this one was derived from the application of the initial syllabic deletion /#syl\_\_\_/?/#Ø\_\_\_/ to be followed by the addition of the prenasal verbaliser / #N\_\_\_ / as follows: /#syl\_\_\_/?/#Ø\_\_\_/?/#N\_\_\_/ tidak ? dak ? ndak 'no' b) Omission of prefix: {ber\_\_\_}? {Ø\_\_\_} The omission of the prefix occurs as found in the following: *berbelanja* ? *belanja* /bəlandʒa/?blanja/blandʒa/ (to go shopping) *berjualan* ? *jualan* /dʒualan/(to sell) *berkumpul* ? *kumpul*/kumpol/ (to get together). In the case of *berbelanja*, in addition, it also follows the deletion of the schwa sound to result in *belanja*. These can be exemplified in SE (8): (8) A: Aku nggak pernah belanja di Cito. (I've never shopped in Cito). B: Mulai rame lho, banyak orang jualan pakean jadi. (It's been more alive, there are a lot of people selling ready-to-wear clothes). A: Banyak ya anak-anak muda kumpul di sana? (Many young people get together in there, right?) B: Ya cukup banyak kalo malam minggu, sayangnya jam 9 udah tutup. (Yes, relatively plenty on Saturday nights. Unfortunately, it's already closed at 9 p.m.) A: Jam 9 sih rasanya masih sorean. (For me, nine o'clock is still too early).

3) Syntactic level a) The use of the question marker "apa" Etymologically, the use of the question marker "apa" (literally "what") is influenced by the use of the Javanese question marker "apa"/ꦑꦸꦥꦸ/. This feature is used as a question marker in CISI. Formal Informal a. Marahkah dia? (Is he/she angry?) b. Dia marah? (the use of falling intonation) Apa dia marah? (Is he/she angry?) a. Pacarmyakah cowok itu? (Is he her boy friend?) b. Cowok itu pacarnya? (the use of falling intonation) Apa cowok itu pacarnya? (Is he her boy friend?) This question marker of CISI can be found in the following SE (9): (9) A: Apa dia marah sama cowoknya yang dulu? (Is she angry with her former boy friend?) B: Menurutku nggak kok. Mereka masih pacaran. (In my opinion, she is not. They are still dating.) A: Aku lihat dia datang sama cowok lain. Apa yang itu pacarnya? (I saw her coming with another boy. Is that her boy friend?) B: Aku denger yang itu masih sodara dekat gitu. (I heard that one is still a close relative.) A: Ngomong-ngomong, apa kamu datang ke HUT-nya nanti malam? (By the way, are you going to her birthday party this evening?) B: Tentu, soalnya dia slalu datang ngrayain HUT-ku juga. (Of course, I am. Because she always attends my birthday anniversary, too) b) Paraphrasal form This type of syntactic construction was resulted from a replacement of some words with prefixes as commonly found in formal variety of Indonesian by their corresponding paraphrasal forms that characterise CISI. To the speakers involved in the speech exchanges, the exclusive use of prefixes correlates with the formal (written) variety of Indonesian. Formal Informal Jangan kuatir, nanti saya memberitahu temanmu. (Don't worry, later I'll let your friend know) Jangan kuatir, nanti aku kasih tahu temenmu /təmənmu/. Tidak usah; membuat pusing. (No need; causing confusion) Nggak usah; bikin pusing. Saya cuma ingin memberitahu. (I just want to inform (you) a. Saya cuman ingin kasih tahu. b. Saya cumak /cuma?/ingin kasih tahu. The paraphrasal form can be found in the following SE (10): (10) D: Aku belum beritahu dia. Gimana kalo dia datang /datəŋ/? (I haven't let her know. What if she comes?) E: Jangan kuatir, nanti aku kasih tahu temenmu /təmənmu/. (Don't worry, later I'll let your friend know) Nggak usah; bikin pusing. (No need; causing confusion) This type of style marker is also found in the following SE (11). (11) A: Aku sih nggak nglarang, tapi cuman ingin kasih tahu. (As for me, I don't prohibit, but just want to let [you] know). B: Biar dikasih tahu, dia tetep aja nggak mau tahu. (Though [you] let her know, he remains ignorant) A: Trus orang macem gini, kau sebut apa? (Then, how do you call such a person? B: Ya, orang mentingkan maunya sendiri. (For sure, a person who prioritises her own interest)

4) Informal lexical items In using CISI, speakers have to use lexical items commonly spoken in informal situations. Notice that the use of paraphrasing in SE 10 is often accompanied by that of informal lexical items. Formal Informal Bagaimana kalau dia datang? Gimana kalo dia datang /datəŋ/? (What if she comes?) Tidak usah buat pusing. Nggak usah; bikin pusing. (No need; causing confusion) Broad Notion of CISI: Casual Style Created by Code Switching and Code Mixing The sociolinguistic phenomena of both CS and CM, as previously stated, may serve to extend the functional power of the linguistic resources to create CISI in a broader sense by involving other varieties that are recognised by the speakers in their speech repertoire as the varieties beyond the boundary of the major code, Indonesian. This may involve CS and/or CM mostly using the Surabaya Variety of Javanese (SVJ), a



local language of Surabaya. Within the speech habits of the small social group undertaken in this study, the use of CS tends to be in the internal structure of a sentence. A close scrutiny into instances of the CS shows that those instances of CS tend to be in the form of lexical insertion from the EL element; whereas CM tends to be in the form of bound morpheme from EL. In this way, the utterances going on result in CISI in the broader sense. Although it occurred rarely among the speakers under investigation, the use of the Jakarta Variety of Indonesian (JVI) could be detected such as “ngrayain” (i.e. to celebrate; to attend) in SE (9) and “ngapain” (what happens) in SE (14). This could happen as those varieties share the characteristics of being congruent to the informal social situations (see Figure 2 and Figure 5). Sometimes, the speakers also used some lexical items from English, such as “check up” which occurs more as a borrowing. However, if some sociolinguistic configurations allow the speaker and his or her interlocutor, they have the sociolinguistic competence to select and use a congruent variety out of the whole options of the linguistic resources at their command. As a whole, their choices of the linguistic resources can take the following order of frequency of occurrences: 1) adherence to a single major variety, which is mostly in Indonesian, 2) the use of Indonesian as the Matrix Language Frame (MLF) with Javanese as the linguistic resource to create CM, or 3) the use of Indonesian as the MLF with CS in SVJ or a little in JVI. Therefore, the whole range of the linguistic resource uses can be diagrammed as in the following.

Most formal INDONESIAN STYLE ? SOCIAL SITUATION Code switching Code mixing Most informal Most informal SVJ, JVI Figure 5. Narrow and broad notion of CISI

As found in SE (12), CS has a characteristic of a lexical insertion “ta” from Javanese into the MLF in Indonesian, whereas CM has a characteristic of the use of the bound morpheme of Javanese {-e} to be attached to a basic word in Indonesian {kelas} to result in {kelase} (the class). The former shares the characteristic of the so-called “emblematic CS” (cf. Poplack, 1980, p. 589) or “tag CS” (cf. Stockwell, 2002, p. 33), which bears the social meaning as the ethnic or solidarity marker of the speakers’ social group, as found in most sociolinguistic literatures (cf. Hauser, 2000, p. 52). The following examples (the data in CISI are italicised; the data being identified as CS(J) means CS in Javanese was written in bold; CS(JVI) means CS in the Jakarta Variety of Indonesian was written in bold; CM(J) means CM in Javanese and was written in bold. (12) A: Kamu udah ngambil Amstud? (Have you taken American Studies?) CS(J) B: Udah, kamu belum ta? (I have. You haven’t taken it, have you?) CM(J) CS(J) Belum, tapi skarang lho kelase wis ga dibuka. (Not yet, but – you know – now the class is no longer made available) In SE (13), the CM still shows the characteristics as found in SE (12), i.e. the use of a bound morpheme from the EL, whereas CS elements are indicative of intra-sentential CS by the introduction of the EL in the form of the bound morpheme from Javanese into the MLF in Indonesian. (13) A: Besok kamu ke kampus ndak? (Tomorrow, are you going to the campus or not?) CM (J) CS(J) B: Rasae besok aku mesti ke kampus. Opo’o /ɔpɔ’ɔ/? I think, I’ll have to go to the campus tomorrow. What’s the matter?) CS(J) CS(J) A: Aku pingin ke GM, koncoi po’o /pɔ’ɔ/. (I’d like to go to GM, accompany [me], will you? Nyari buat kado papaku. [I’m] looking for a gift for my daddy) CS(J) B: Nggak janji ya. Besok tak kabari wis. (I don’t promise. Tomorrow, I’ll let you know) CS(J) CS(J) A: ‘Ntik malem, kabari aku ya. Kalo kamu ga isa, aku tak (This evening, let me know, o.k.? If you are not able, I’ll ngajak yang lain. invite somebody else) In SE (14), repetitive instances of the CM are in the form of the bound morpheme {-e} from the EL in Javanese into the MLF in Indonesian. The CS takes the form of adjective as qualifier “banget”/baŋɔt/ (very). (14) C: Tadi kamu masuk kelas? (Just now, have you attended the class?) D: Iya. Lho, kamu nggak masuk? (Yes. You didn’t come, did you? CM(J) CM(J) C: Soale tadi pagi aku ‘lat bangun. Dosene enak gak? (Because I got up late this morning. Was the lecturer o.k.?) CM(J) D: Kan baru pertemuan pertama, kliatan ngajare enak. (It’s the first class, you know. It looks fine with his teaching.) CS (JVI) C: Trus, trus, ngapain aja di kelas? (The, then, what else did you do in the class?) CS(J) D: Tadi udah ada tugas lho. Dosennya rajin banget. Minggu (Just now, we have been given an assignment. The lecturer is very dilligent. depan, kita disuruh buat refleksi. Next week, we are to write a reflection) CS(J) CM(J) C: Oya? Aduh males banget. Kelase anak sasing aja? (Really? Oh, [I am] very lazy.



Is the class attended only by English dept. students?) CM(J) CM(J) D: Rasae arek sasing aja; soale arek sasting nggak kliatan. (I think, just English dept. students, because the Chinese dept. students were not seen.) In the following SE (15) and (16), instances of the CS include a lexical item such as "lek" (if), "nunggu" (wait), question word "yo opo" (how about), negated predicate adjective "ga bosen" (don't get bored), up to a full sentence level in "Yo wis cepetan tak tunggu!" (It's okay, come quickly, I'll wait!). CS(J) CS(J) (15) G: Kamu, lek malem gini ga bosen? (You, in the evening like this, don't get bored?) H: Ya bosen sih. Tapi kan udah biasa. Jadi, ya ndak masalah. (Of course, I do. But I am used to it already. So, it's not a problem) CM(J) G: kamu brarti biasae ke Nadia? (It means that you are usually with Nadia?) H: Iya, biasanya ke Padang Pasir cari makan gitu. (Yes, usually I go to Padang Pasir to have dinner) CS(J) G: Trus kalo liburan yo opo? (Then, how about if (you are) on holiday?) H: Kalo liburan langsung pulkam (tertawa). (If I have a holiday, usually I get back home (laughing). CM(J) Soale males di kost trus. (Because (I) get bored to stay in the dorm.) CS(J) G: Oalah, iya sih, di kost sepi juga ya lek liburan. (Yes, certainly, it's also quiet during the holiday in the dorm) (16) (Waiting for a friend to come) A: (on the phone) 'Bentar masih macet nih, sabar.... (A minute, it's still a traffic jam, be patient ... ) Apa yang lain dah pada dateng? (Is everybody already in there?) CM(J) CS(J) B: Udah, soale tinggal nunggu kamu nih. (Already, because we'll have to wait for you) CM(J) A: Oalah, yo wis maino dulu aja.... (Yes, do what you can do first ...) Ini lima blas menitan lagi aku nyampe. (I'll be there in about fifteen minutes) CM(J) CM(J) B: Ndak isa... ganjil areke soale. (No, [we] can't ... because we have odd total of students. hurry!) CS(J) Yo wis cepetan tak tunggu! (It's okay, come quickly, I'll wait!)

**CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS** This article has attempted to capture and identify the existing regularities of the CISI commonly employed by a small social group of speakers as their daily speech habits. The speakers employ CISI as a variety, to which they usually pay less attention to whenever they talk in the natural settings. This CISI co-varies with the whole constellation of social situations as being informal/casual. The informal or casual context of situation concomitantly requires the use of a congruent variety involving both the narrow and broad dimensions of CISI, as enacted by the small social group of speakers under study. In the use of CISI, the grammar of the formal style is lifted, giving way to the employment of the informal style of Indonesian in its narrower sense and that of the informal style of Indonesian in its broader sense. The latter was resulted from the use of CS and CM. The CS was identified mostly as the intra-sentential CS, of which the features of minimal CS occurred more dominantly in the form of lexical insertion. In addition, instances of CS were identified as emblematic CS, which signals the social meaning of group solidarity among members of the small social group who are on good terms with each other. Meanwhile, CM was characterised by the use of bound morpheme from the EL to be attached to the root word in Indonesian. Thus, by such linguistic occurrences, the use of CISI is additionally enacted and enriched by CS and CM. Speakers' speech habits in their social groups in multilingual settings may provide some useful insights into the working of some sociolinguistic principles. At these stages, more exploration and research on similar issues as studied in this research need to be done in order to obtain deeper understanding for better language policies and education. **Acknowledgements** \* The author was indebted to the small group of eight students who served as his research assistants. \*\* The author also acknowledges the help of his colleagues who gave constructive comments on the earlier draft of the article on focus group discussion. **REFERENCES** Abdulmanan, U.M. (2007). Code switching made by English postgraduate students in classroom presentation. In Fourth Conference on English Studies (CONEST 4). Jakarta: Universitas Katolik Atma Jaya. Altarriba, J., & Basnight-Brown, D.M. (2009). Empirical approaches to the study of code-switching in sentential contexts. In L. Isurin & D. Winford (Eds), *Fulfilling multidisciplinary approaches to code switching*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing. Ary, D., Jacobs, L.C., & Sorensen, C. (2010). *Introduction to research in education* (8th ed.). Belmont: Wadsworth Cengage Learning. Bullock, B.E. & Toribio, A.J. (2009). Themes in the study of code-switching. In B.E. Bullock, & A.J. Toribio (Eds.), *Linguistic code-switching*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP. De Bot, K., Broersma, M., & Isurin, L. (2009).



Sources of triggering in code switching. In L. Isurin & D. Winford, (Eds.), Fulfilling multidisciplinary approaches to code switching. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing. Dömyei, Z. (2007). Research method in Applied Linguistics. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Eckert, P & Rickford, J.R. (2001). Style and sociolinguistic variation. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Fishman, J.A. (1968). Sociolinguistic perspective on the study of bilingualism. *Linguistics*, 39, 21-49. Fishman, J.A. (1975). Sociolinguistics: A brief introduction. Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House Publishers. Grosjean, F. (1982). Life with two languages: An introduction to bilingualism. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP. Gumperz, J.J. (1982). Discourse strategies. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Gunawan, S. (2003). Toward a theoretical inquiry of codeswitching: The Indonesian experience. *Jurnal Kata*, 5(2). Surabaya: English Dept., Faculty of Letters, Petra Christian University. Gunawan, S. (2008). Codemixing on the language of the SMS code. In *Kajian wacana dalam konteks multikultural dan multidisiplin*. Jakarta: Universitas Indonesia. Helmy, J. (2007). Code switching in EFL classroom. In *Fourth Conference on English Studies (CONEST 4)*. Jakarta: Universitas Katolik Atma Jaya. Holmes, J. (2013). An introduction to sociolinguistics. (4th Ed.). London: Routledge. Hymes, D. (1967). Models of the interaction of language and social setting. In *Journal of Social Issues*, 23(2), 8-28. Joos, M. (1977). The isolation of styles. In A. Joshua & Fishman (Ed), *Readings in the Sociology of Language*. The Hague: Mouton. Kridalaksana, H. (1981). Bahasa Baku. *Majalah Pembinaan Bahasa Indonesia*, 2, 17-24. Jakarta: Bhratara Karya Aksara. Labov, W. (1972). Sociolinguistic patterns. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. Myers-Scotton, C. (1997). Duelling languages: Grammatical structure in codeswitching. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Myers-Scotton, C. (2010). Contact linguistics: Bilingual encounters and grammatical outcomes. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Moeliono, A.M. (1980). Bahasa Indonesia dan ragam-ragamnya. In *Majalah pembinaan Bahasa Indonesia*, 1(1), 15-34. Nababan, P.W.J. (1979). Languages of Indonesia. *Papers on Southeast Asian languages, RELC Anthology Series*, 5(1979), 259-291. Singapore: SEAMEO Regional Language Centre. Poedjosoedarmo, S. (1978). Interferensi dan integrasi dalam situasi keanekaragaman. In *Pengajaran Bahasa dan Sastra*, 4(2), 21-43. Poplack, S. (1980). Sometimes I'll start a sentence in Spanish YTERMINO EN ESPANOL: toward a typology of code-switching. In *Linguistics*, 18(7/8), 581-618. Sankoff, G. (1972). Language use in multilingual societies: some alternative approaches. In J.B. Pride and J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics* (pp. 33-51). Middlesex: Penguin Books Ltd. Seliger, H.W. & Shohamy, E. (1990). Second language research methods. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Selting, M. (1985). Levels of style-shifting. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 9, 179-197. Suwito. (1982). Pengantar awal sosiolinguistik: Teori dan problema. Surakarta: Henary Offset. Tampubolon, D.P. (1978). Ragam standar dan monostandar Bahasa Indonesia. In *Pengajaran Bahasa Indonesia*, 4(1), 9-25. Trudgill, P. (n.d.). Vernacular universals and the sociolinguistic typology of English Dialects. Retrieved from [portal.uni-freiburg.de/angl/seminar/abteilungen/sprachwissenschaft/ls\\_kortmann/Courses/Kortmann/DandT/trudgill\\_sociolinguisticstypology.pdf](http://portal.uni-freiburg.de/angl/seminar/abteilungen/sprachwissenschaft/ls_kortmann/Courses/Kortmann/DandT/trudgill_sociolinguisticstypology.pdf) Wojowasito, S. (1980). Fungsi dan kedudukan bahasa daerah. In Amran Halim (Ed.), *Politik Bahasa Nasional*, 2 (pp. 67-88). Jakarta: Balai Pustaka. 1 2 3 4 5 6 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15