Howard Manns

YOUTH RADIO AND COLLOQUIAL INDONESIAN IN URBAN JAVA

Few studies have explored colloquial Indonesian in the media outside of Jakarta. This article examines language policies at two youth radio stations in Malang, East Java, as well as the perceptions of these policies by targeted audiences. Results show that notions of the 'authentic' Indonesian speaker and the 'appropriate' use of Indonesian come to the fore in the design of Indonesian radio language. Radio station staff and audiences agree that it is neither authentic nor appropriate to speak Indonesian with a Javanese accent in radio broadcasts or in the community. Beyond this point, however, the two radio stations differ in what they consider to be authentic or appropriate in Indonesian radio broadcasts. These differences, I argue, hint at tensions between Jakartan and Javanese linguistic practices in the Malang community. However, audience members indicate they strategically manage these tensions through the authentic use of language in the appropriate context. Thus, I argue that rather than representing differing views of the authentic Indonesian speaker, the radio stations' approaches reflect the varied and fluid senses of self in post-Reform Indonesia.

Introduction

Jakarta Indonesian has long been a model for the informal language of urban Indonesians outside of the capital (Tanner 1967; Poedjosoedarmo 1982; Oetomo 1990). It has come to influence these other varieties due to its social prestige, and because the mass media are Jakarta-centred. Oetomo (1990: 71) writes:

[t]he role of Jakarta as the capital city where the most powerful, the most wealthy and the most attractive people are thought to live has been important in popularising the language. In addition, the fact that Jakarta is the centre for the mass media (television, film, publishing) has contributed greatly to popularising the lifestyle and values of prestigious social groups – values which are conveyed in [Indonesian], often the Jakarta dialect. Witness how young people from the regions who stay only briefly in Jakarta nevertheless immediately strive to adapt their [Indonesian] – changes which they carry with them when they return home.

The influence of Jakarta Indonesian has grown even stronger in recent years with the emergence of a national youth identity known as *gaul*, literally 'sociable'. *Gaul* has emphasised the role of Jakarta as a reference point for upwardly and outwardly looking youth in many areas of Indonesia (Ibrihim 2007; Smith-Hefner 2007).

The mass media have played a major role in the dissemination of Jakarta Indonesian. From the final few years of the New Order, regional radio stations began to adopt a more Jakarta-oriented format, often at the expense of regional content and language. Since that time, private media outlets have been in fierce competition for audiences and advertising dollars (Kitley 2000; Sen & Hill 2000). This has forced outlets to focus on very specific target demographics (Lindsay 1997; Suryadi 2005). At the close of the New Order, many radio stations targeted the lucrative youth market and this particularly influenced the adoption of a more Jakarta-influenced image (Lindsay 1997: 118). These Jakarta-centric practices continued throughout the decade following Suharto's fall. The media's use and spread of Jakarta Indonesian was arguably at its height ten years after the fall of Suharto due to the popularity of *gaul*.

Yet, Jakarta Indonesian's popularity also reached its zenith amidst a revalorisation of ethnicity in Indonesia and this had implications for radio, which had already been more permissive than other media in terms of ethnic influence. In the decade after Suharto's fall, radio, perhaps more than television, remained the domain of regional content and language (cf. Suryadi 2005). Local languages like Sundanese (Jurriëns 2004, 2007), Osing (Arps 2003) and Madurese (Sen & Hill 2000) continued to be used in radio broadcasts. As a result of radio's local content and focus, Sen & Hill (2000: 101) posited that, 'radio [would] be significant in the process of Indonesia's democraticisation; it will be a source of diverse, regionalised public opinion and a means for political actors to reach the diverse voting publics'. At the outset, this suggests that the radio will be a useful domain for a study of colloquial Indonesian.

Few, if any studies have examined colloquial Indonesian in the media outside of the capital. Such an investigation is particularly warranted in light of the simultaneous popularity of Jakarta Indonesian and a regional sense of self in the post-Reform era. The current study examines the use of Indonesian in Malang, East Java, in 2007–2008. At the time, many Malang Javanese were openly opposed to the use of Jakarta Indonesian in the local community. Yet, some Jakartan features were openly used by young people in the malls, in the traditional kampung and, most relevant to the current work, in the local media. This contrast and the resulting tensions made Malang a relevant site for a study of colloquial Indonesian both in the mass media and in the local community.

This study's results are relevant to those engaged in media studies as they provide information on regional radio policies from the perspective of the media planners themselves. The current work also speaks to Jurriëns' (2011: 214) call for an increased focus on 'media ecology' in Southeast Asia for understanding how 'media shape virtual environments that affect people in almost every aspect of their "real" lives . . . '. Lastly, the results are relevant to scholars and teachers of the Indonesian language. There has been much discussion about the relevance of colloquial Indonesian to tertiary pedagogy and to the Indonesians themselves (e.g. Turner 1995; Goebel 2002a; cf. Smith-Hefner 2007). The current study provides information on colloquial Indonesian as it is spoken in a regional Javanese city outside of Jakarta.

Indonesian and the mass media

Indonesian is the variety of Malay which was selected to be *Bahasa Indonesia* (the language of Indonesia) in 1928. This language has been propagated and spread through by the government, schools and the mass media. When Suharto came to power in 1966, Indonesian became an integral part of the *pembangunan* 'development' programme, instituted by his New Order government to centralise and control Indonesia's population under the guise of nationalism. Standard Indonesian's role in *pembangunan* is outlined by Errington (1998: 2):

> Every aspect of the New Order's 'development' of Indonesia has been subserved by the Indonesian language. As the language of state, Indonesian is infrastructural for institutional development; as the language of the nation, it effaces differences between citizens who live in antecedent, ethnolinguistically distinct communities.

Indonesian was propagated in a number of ways by the New Order government. Suharto directly called on Indonesians in his yearly Independence Day speech to speak *Bahasa Indonesia yang baik dan benar,* 'Indonesian that is good and correct' (Sneddon 2003a: 128). The New Order's efforts were arguably successful. In 1966, less than half of the country's population claimed to be Indonesian speakers (Sneddon 2003a: 200). By 1990, that number had grown to 83%. This successful imposition of Indonesian on a nation as geographically vast and ethnolinguistically diverse as Indonesia was deemed 'miraculous' by one sociolinguist (Fishman 1978).

Yet, the selection, engineering and propagation of Indonesian as a superposed language variety has resulted in high and low forms of the national language, a situation known as diglossia (cf. Ferguson 1959; Sneddon 2003b). From its earliest days, the choice, cultivation and propagation of Standard Indonesian has occurred largely independent of the spoken realities of Malay/Indonesian in local communities. Standard Indonesian in its purest form is usually limited to the most impersonal and formal of domains, such as news reports and editorials in the mass media, legal documents and formal speeches (Sneddon 2004). Most people speak a geographically and ethnically-based variety of Indonesian and/or a local, ethnic language in ordinary conversations and strive to speak their best approximation of Standard Indonesian in formal situations. Sneddon (2004: 37) presents Standard Indonesian and these local varieties of Indonesian as existing on a continuum whereby:

> [a]t the 'low' extreme only features of the [low] variety will occur. As the social situation shifts from very informal, elements of the high variant will begin to appear and will occur with increasing frequency as the situation becomes more formal.

Young people in many areas of Indonesia often adopt Jakartan language features in informal, low contexts, especially when speaking to other young people (cf. Smith-Hefner 2007).

With regard to language and the media, the decade following Suharto's 1998 fall saw a climate of increased media freedom (Sen 2003; Kakiailatu 2007). There was a significant increase in the number and variety of media sources and there was no longer an

insistence by the government on the use of Standard Indonesian (Suryadi 2005). As a result, and in no small part due to *otonomi daerah* (regional autonomy), Standard Indonesian has faced competition in the media from various language varieties (Suryadi 2005: 133). Paramount among those Indonesian language varieties has been Jakarta Indonesian (Sneddon 2006). Smith-Hefner (2007: 198) writes:

> if there is an exemplary center informing the language choices of middle-class youth today, it has less to do with the centers and standards of Java's courts or other indigenous aristocracies than it does with the example provided by a diverse array of new media and institutions . . .

The arguable centre of these new media and institutions is the capital city, Jakarta (cf. Oetomo 1990).[1]

Yet, local languages and Indonesian varieties have remained prominent in local radio. By the end of the New Order, urban FM radio stations were broadcasting in varieties of Indonesian in spite of broadcasting to first-language speakers of local, ethnic languages (Lindsay 1997). However, these radio stations also endeavoured to include some elements of local languages in their broadcasts. This practice was noted in a number of non-Javanese stations around the time of the current study. For instance, Jurriëns (2007) shows how one Bandung radio station includes Sundanese in its broadcasts to create an intimate and trusting bond with listeners. Among other things, one talk show at this station creates 'a relaxed an intimate atmosphere' by including Sundanese-Indonesian code switching and Sundanese expressions (Jurriëns 2007: 83). Similar language strategies have been noted in Bali, where audiences at one station are implored in Balinese *de koh ngomong* (don't be afraid to talk) (Jurriëns 2009).

The current data was collected in Malang, East Java, in 2007–2008, ten years after the fall of Suharto. The aim was to explore to what degree Jakarta Indonesian influenced (and/or sat alongside) the Malang variety of Indonesian and to measure whether any tensions existed between Jakarta Indonesian and this variety. Malang is located more than 600 km east of Jakarta and is the second largest city in East Java after Surabaya. Malang has a predominantly Javanese population with smaller communities of Madurese, *Peranakan* Chinese, Arabs and increasing numbers of students from eastern Indonesia. The Surabaya-Malang variety of Javanese remains the language of choice for informal, intra-ethnic communication among Malang's Javanese residents. However, use of a local variety of Indonesian is increasing in these interactions, especially among middle class interlocutors. More so, young interlocutors are especially prone to using Indonesian in inter-ethnic interactions and in intra-ethnic interactions where a speaker or addressee has reduced abilities in Javanese and as an in-group code for projecting a youth identity (Manns 2011).

A note should be made about the labels used to discuss the Indonesian varieties here. Jakarta Indonesian is used here to refer to the variety of Indonesian spoken by the middle class in casual interactions with friends (cf. Sneddon 2006). Malang Indonesian, in this study, refers to the Indonesian variety spoken by young people in Malang in casual

---

[1]One reviewer notes that the nationalisation and centralisation of local radio for increased profit may be part of a wider global trend. See Klineberg (2007) for a discussion of the nationalisation of US local radio stations.

interactions with friends. *Bahasa gaul,* the language of 'sociability', is used in the current study rather broadly and loosely. It refers to the casual language used by young people in social interactions. *Bahasa gaul* in Malang may refer, among other things, to casual slang, Jakarta Indonesian, Malang Indonesian and Javanese. I would admittedly dispense of the label *bahasa gaul* altogether were it not difficult to discuss Indonesian in Malang without it.[2]

The mass media airwaves in Malang are saturated with 11 national television stations, 9 local television stations and dozens of local FM radio stations (Asiawaves 2008). National and local television stations in Indonesia are mostly owned by conglomerates and are frequently subject to tight control by the national and local governments (Suryadi 2005). The radio airwaves in Malang are managed less stringently than television and this has led to fierce competition between dozens of legal and illegal radio stations. In 2005, there were 99 legal and 378 illegal radio stations in East Java (Nugroho 2005). There were 52 unlicensed stations in Malang alone (Nugroho 2005).[3] Fierce competition between these stations has forced station owners to focus on very specific target demographics (Lindsay 1997; Suryadi 2005).

A number of radio stations in Malang target the lucrative youth market. One Malang station was particularly renowned for its use of Jakarta Indonesian in targeting young people. Preliminary discussions with staff at this radio station revealed that the station modelled itself on certain stations using Jakarta Indonesian and aimed for a general, national radio style. Initial discussions suggested that this style did not specifically encourage Jakarta Indonesian. However, this station's national orientation meant that its broadcasts were largely purged of regional identity and language. This made it an interesting focus for the extent to which Jakarta Indonesian would be permitted in the Malang context as well as the degree to which Javanese influence would or would not be tolerated in a national sphere. This station is referred to as the 'national station' here.[4]

A second radio station was selected for the current study because it had a reputation for broadcasting in a local variety of youth Indonesian. Initial discussions with this station's programme director revealed that it had a strict policy against the use of Jakarta Indonesian. It specifically sought to target the local audience in a language designed to speak to that audience, Malang Indonesian. The selection of this second station enabled an investigation of local attitudes influencing the choice of local Indonesian styles and the rejection of Jakarta Indonesian styles in the mass media and by extension in the local community. This station is referred to as the 'Malang station' here.

[2]Nancy Smith-Hefner's (2007) discussion of *bahasa gaul* in Yogyakarta is thorough, sophisticated and largely applicable to the situation in Malang.

[3]It should be noted that unlicensed stations were often professional and sophisticated affairs. It was difficult if not impossible at times to tell whether a station had a license or didn't. A few programme directors (but not those interviewed in this study) indicated that it could be easier, quicker and cheaper to obtain unofficial permission from local officials. Local anecdotal evidence suggests these local officials freely granted such unofficial permission without liaising with other departments. This reputedly accounted for the large number of stations in Malang at the time of this study.

[4]Both stations and informants must remain unidentified as per the ethics agreement between Monash University and the stations.

It was hoped that explorations of the attitudes of staff at both stations as well as their targeted audiences would reveal the underlying tensions between Malang Indonesian and Jakarta Indonesian. It was also hoped that these individuals would be able to delineate local and supra-local Indonesian language features. This, in turn, would inform discussions regarding the emergence of a national, informal variety of Indonesian, heavily influenced by Jakarta Indonesian (cf. Englebretson 2003; Ewing 2005). Ewing (2005) presents general colloquial Indonesian as a social style and provides a short typological description of the variety. Englebretson (2003, 2007) presents it as the variety of Indonesian used in everyday conversations. Jakarta Indonesian has long been a prestige model for young urbanites and often reaches speakers through the mass media and geographic migration. Yet, few if any studies have explored this influence in the media or in the community outside of Jakarta. More so, little work has been done to show how this variety sits alongside regional languages and cultures in the post-Reform era.

Methodology

Two sets of interviews were conducted. Interviews were firstly conducted with the designers of media language, that is, the programme directors and announcers at the two Malang radio stations mentioned above. Interviews were secondly conducted with 73 potential recipients of this language (38 females and 35 males), that is, individuals falling within the targeted demographics of these stations. For both sets of interviews, two one-minute extracts from radio broadcasts were chosen as stimuli. The goal in choosing these broadcasts was to provide participants with, as closely as possible, examples of the two Indonesian varieties in question: Malang Indonesian and Jakarta Indonesian. For consistency, the selected extracts were broadcast by female announcers and consisted of what is often labelled as announcer patter, unscripted language. Bell (1991) posits that radio stations are more likely to mirror the language of their targeted audiences in announcer patter than in scripted talks or interviews.

The Malang extract was drawn from the Malang station's own broadcasts (see Appendix A). The goal was to provide participants with a wide variety of accent, grammatical and lexical features associated with a Malang, informal variety of Indonesian. The Malang extract's language style is marked as informal through certain accent features, such as the pronunciation of 'o' in final closed, stressed syllables where formal Indonesian prescribes a 'u' (e.g. *masuk* 'enter' is pronounced as *masok*), grammatical choices, such as the use of the suffix *−in* (instead of the formal *−i* or *−kan*) and lexical choices such as the use of *demen*, 'to like a non-food item' (instead of the formal *suka*). Notably, most of the accent features in this broadcast also occur in Jakarta Indonesian. It was hoped that participants might shed some light on the acceptability of variants with Jakartan provenance in the local community. Among other things, this broadcast style is marked as Javanese-specific through the use of the Javanese kin term, *mbak* (older sister) and *mas* (older brother), though these are reputedly becoming more widely used in non-Javanese communities.

The Jakarta Indonesian extract is announcer patter from a show in which listeners are invited to call, e-mail or SMS/text to *curhat*, 'pour their hearts out' (see Appendix B). Unlike the previous extract, this was drawn from a radio broadcast of a station using Jakarta Indonesian rather than the national station in the current study. The goal was to

provide participants with a wide variety of accent, grammatical and lexical features associated with Jakarta Indonesian. Among other things, this broadcast's language style is marked as Jakarta Indonesian through the use of the suffix −in (instead of the formal −i or −kan)[5] and use of the Jakartan pronouns *gué* (first-person singular) and *elo* (second-person singular). There are also a number of Jakarta Indonesian-derived accent features in this broadcast, but these overlap with accent features found in the local variety of Indonesian. For example, the pronunciation of *masuk* as *masok* is a feature of both Jakarta Indonesian and Javanese-influenced Indonesian (cf. Kartomihardjo 1981; Poedjosoedarmo 1982).

Interviews firstly explored radio staff's motivations for using the Indonesian variety as well as its acceptability to targeted audiences. Next, I examined whether each variety was acceptable beyond the airwaves. In other words, I sought to understand whether the Indonesian varieties were respectively acceptable only within media broadcasts or whether the linguistic variety would also be acceptable in other contexts (e.g. cafes and/or with friends). In any and all cases, where Indonesian varieties were deemed unacceptable, I further inquired which linguistic features (e.g. words, intonation) made the language style unacceptable. The participants and I often listened to the extracts multiple times in order to focus in on the relevant linguistic features.

Colloquial Indonesian, authenticity and context(s)

Audience expectations come to the fore in the design of radio talk in Malang. Radio station staff and targeted audience members discuss these expectations in terms of authenticity and the selection of contextually appropriate language. Indeed, these notions of authenticity and appropriate language choice also prove relevant to discussions of Indonesian in the wider community. The two radio stations differ in what they consider to be authentic and appropriate and this is in part due to how they envision their respective audiences. Yet, discussions with targeted audience members suggest that in spite of perceived differences both radio stations' visions of audience (and language use) are appropriate. That said, the degree to which audience members mobilise radio language outside of radio contexts varies and carries its own rules and expectations.

Staff at both stations insisted that they generally met audience expectations by mirroring the linguistic practices of their audiences. Staff at these stations made this point by referring to the extracts (Malang or Jakartan respectively) which most closely resembled practices at their own stations. For instance, upon hearing the Jakartan radio broadcast, the programme director at the national station outlined this imperative: '*Radio ini memang harus bicara dengan pendengar yang memang berdialek seperti itu*' (This radio station really has to speak with the listeners who actually speak that kind of dialect). The programme director at the Malang station shared a similar view of the Malang broadcast, which had been drawn from his station:

---

[5]The −in suffix has its origins in Jakarta Indonesian but has become a more general marker of informality in colloquial Indonesian (cf. Ewing 2005). This was among the variables under investigation in the current study.

> Researcher: *Apakah Anda rasa para pendengar Anda, seperti itu yang SMP, SMA,*
> *memang memakai dialek ini?*
> Ervin: *Ya ... rata rata di Jawa.*[6]

The strategy of 'speaking like your audience' may be understood in terms of market trends and linguistic practice within the media known as 'audience design' (cf. Bell 1991). With regard to the former, the Malang station's programme director includes language as part of his station's wider market research:

> Ervin: *Kita mengikuti dengan ini, ya, dengan trend pasar, jadi, kita bukan survey*
> *langsung di radio, cuman, survey kita, di tempat keramaian, ke mana*
> *mungkin terus mengumpulkan sepuluh, dua puluh ... mereka kita tanya ini,*
> *kamu suka lagu seperti apa, dengan bahasa seperti apa ... ?*[7]

Jurriëns (2009) found that such strategies could be understood in terms of 'segmentation'. In short, radio stations design identities 'by imagining and thus partly creating a target audience or segmentation of the Indonesian listener's market' (Jurriëns 2009: 39).

This overlaps in theoretical terms with audience design, which was derived in, and remains applicable in radio contexts more broadly. Studying radio broadcasts in New Zealand, Bell (1991: 105) deduced that '[t]he essence of style is that speakers are responding to their audiences'. Further, '[i]t is typically manifested in a speaker shifting her style to be more like that of the person she is talking to' (ibid). With regard to media contexts, Bell (1991) pointed out that media audiences are huge and that media outlets have a financial imperative to win over these audiences. Bell posits that audience design is one of the ways in which these outlets do so with regard to language. Though audience design has been called into question by some researchers (e.g. Custillas-Espinosa & Hernandez-Campoy 2006),[8] suffice it to say in the current context both stations claim to design their broadcast language to mirror the linguistic practices of their respective audiences.

Tensions notably emerged when staff at each station listened to the stimulus broadcast of the 'other' station. In other words, the national station raised issues with the Malang broadcast and the Malang station objected to the Jakartan broadcast. For example, the Malang station's programme director did not view the Jakartan broadcast as contextually appropriate for Malang audiences:

---

[6]Researcher: Do you think that your listeners, like those in junior and senior high school, actually use language like this?
 Ervin: Yeah ... generally on Java.
[7]Ervin: Yeah, this is how we follow it, using market trends. So, we don't do surveys directly on the radio, our surveys are in busy places, we go where it's possible to bring together, ten or twenty people, ... we ask them what kinds of songs do you like, in which language ... ?
[8]See Manns (forthcoming) for a nuanced discussion of audience design as well as competing theories in the Indonesian context.

Kita tinggal di Jawa, kita bukan tinggal di Jakarta. Gaul salah sampai merupakan seperti itu, jadi pakai bahasa sehari hari kita aja.[9]

He accepted the use of certain Jakarta Indonesian language features in radio broadcasts but believed that the Jakartan broadcast had gone too far. Among other things, he cited the use of English and the Jakartan pronouns.

The tensions between Jakarta Indonesian and Javanese are echoed by staff at the national station. More so, the national station's staff made this point while listening to the Malang station's broadcast. Staff at the national station cited the Malang broadcast as inauthentic and the announcer's way of speaking as *dibuat-buat* (contrived). One announcer at the national station explained:

Memang, kalo menurut saya sendiri, dua duanya sama formal. Cuma ini, yang paling natural, yang dia berbicara, ini yang natural. Dan ini yang lebih dibuat-buat, dua, ada berberapa hal yang di situ, kalo saya tangkap, dia dibuat-buat ngomongnya. Dan ini, dia nggak dibuat-buat, dia memang seperti itu.[10]

In short, the national station viewed the Malang and the Jakartan extracts as informal and contextually appropriate for youth audiences. However, they perceived that the announcer in the Malang extract did not naturally use this language. More specifically, they noted that this announcer was from Java and her use of Jakarta Indonesian was contrived. This was, they claimed, due to the announcer having a Javanese accent, a point which is returned to below.

Audiences generally cited both of these broadcasts as acceptable within Malang radio contexts. One female listener echoed earlier comments by the national programme director: '*Di semua siaran itu, harus menggunakan bahasa seperti ini karena audiencenya seperti ini*' (In all of their broadcasts, they have to use language like this because their audiences are like this). She was speaking about the Malang extract at the time but she was equally as enthusiastic about the national broadcast. However, authenticity was also a matter of concern for audience members. Some raised issues with one broadcast or the other if they believed that the announcer's way of speaking was *dibuat-buat*. This was normally based on the perception that one or the other broadcaster was Javanese. This centred on the notion that the linguistic performance in one or the other broadcast was not appropriate for a Javanese announcer in a Malang context.

Audience members were less in agreement about whether they themselves used the language style found in one extract or the other. Their reticence to lay claim to one or both Indonesian varieties could be also be linked to notions of authenticity and appropriateness. Many, like the audience member below, enthusiastically laid claim to the language in both extracts:

---

[9]We live in Java, we don't live in Jakarta. It's wrong to extend *gaul* like that. So [we] just use our own everyday language.

[10]Certainly, if you want my opinion, both of them are the same level of formality. It's just this, the most natural one, is the one she is speaking, this is what is natural. And this one is more contrived, secondly, there are a few things there, if I'm getting it right, shows she is contrived when she's talking. And this isn't contrived at all, she really speaks like this.

Biasanya kalau di media ini, biasanya kan penyiar menggunakan khusus ini untuk komunitas anak muda, penyiar itu, menggunakan bahasa, bahasa yang, ok lah, dialek yang gaul seperti itu, biasanya mempengaruhi para pendengar itu . . . ikuti gaya penyiar itu, gitu lho, karena gaya itu, trendsetter.[11]

Yet, others posited a more limited use of these language styles. For example, some pointed out that use these styles of language was strictly limited to youth contexts. Still others argued that this language should only be used with non-Javanese friends or when travelling outside of Malang:

Denis: *Di Malang, aneh, sok. Ketika itu, bukan dialek local . . .*
Shamsir: *Kebanyakan kalau remaja di sini lebih cenderung menggunakan bahasa Jawa, untuk percakapan dengan temen, kecuali memang temen itu dari luar Jawa.*[12]

Other audience members were less concerned with whom they used this language and more with the domain and purpose of its use. They noted that both broadcasts were associated with places of *hiburan* (recreation, leisure) and with topics which are *lebih santai* (more relaxed): 'Kalau di geng tupang sehari-hari, saya tidak suka, tapi kalau di acara hiburan, kita datang ke bar, ke kafe, itu biasa' (If in [your] everyday crowd, I don't like it, but if it's during off-times, going to a bar, to a café, it's normal). Indeed, some rejected the use of Jakarta Indonesian as much for its links to such contexts as for its links to an external cultural group:

Lia: *Biasanya aneh mungkin seperti itu, anak yang bukan dari Malang itu, di Jakarta itu biasanya banyak.*
Researcher: *Kenapa tidak disini di Malang?*
Lia: *Karena, kenapa tuh, kurang berdugem.*[13]

In sum, some audience members indicated a likelihood of using Jakarta Indonesian or Malang Indonesian regardless of the context. Others showed a concern with the inter-locutors with whom one used these language varieties and/or the situation of use. Some of these language features were linked to outside (Jakartan speakers), and this raised issues regarding their authentic and appropriate use.

---

[11]Normally, for media like this, normally the broadcaster uses specific language for the youth community, and that announcer, [they] use language that is, ok, it is a dialect that is *gaul* like that, normally, this influences the listeners . . . they join in the style of that announcer, like that, because this style is trendsetting.

[12]Denis: In Malang it's weird, put on. As for that, it's not the local language . . .

  Shamsir: Most [people], if you're young here tend to use Javanese, for conversations with friends, unless in fact the friends are from out of Java.

[13]Lia: Generally it's kind of strange when it's like that, that kid that's not from Malang, in Jakarta, there's usually lots like that.

  Researcher: Why not here in Malang?

  Lia: Because, why is it, there's less clubbing here.

Notions of authenticity and appropriateness come to the fore in Indonesian usage in radio broadcasts and in the wider community. The national and Malang stations respectively show some differences in the ways in which they conceptualise and design language for their audiences. However, these differences seem less relevant to the audience members themselves. In the following sections, I explore the nuances of how the radio stations conceptualise their audiences in terms of the ethnic and the national. In doing so, I focus on the salient linguistic practices which speak to local, Malang and national subjectivities. This enables a concluding discussion of what it means to be *asli* (authentic) (cf. Boellstorff 2004) within a Javanese/Indonesian sphere in the post-Reform era.

Javanese influence and authenticity

Sen & Hill (2000: 94) write that '[a]lmost all private radio stations make some use of the languages of the location in which they broadcast'. The Malang station uses some Javanese features in its broadcasts to speak like its listeners. This station does so at least in part to position itself as a friend and even confidant of its listeners. Jurriëns (2009) has noted that there are two styles of address used in Indonesian radio broadcasts. Stations either refer to their listeners' status or these stations position listeners as friends or family members. The Malang station may be easily categorised as the latter.

This station positions its listeners as friends through mode of address, the use of excited and quickly spoken colloquial language and some Javanese features. Malang audiences are generally accepting of Javanese lexical influence on radio broadcasts. Many audience members made this point by citing the Malang station's use of lexical items with Javanese provenance. Specifically, many audience members noted the presence of the kin terms *mbak* and *mas*, *ganteng* (handsome) and *cakep* (good looking) in the Malang station's broadcast. Yet, while young audiences accepted and even embraced the use of certain Javanese lexical items, the Javanese accent was evaluated negatively in radio broadcasts. This female audience member makes this point:

> *Sebenarnya dialek Jawa tuh tidak tepat, kalau dia ngomong dengan bahasa Jawa, dialek Jawa, it's ok, tapi bahasa Indonesia, dialeknya Jawa, itu kita mendengarkan, aneh dan terkesan dia pura pura*.[14]

In this instance, and for a majority of audience members, a Javanese accent is a critical determiner in whether the announcer is authentic. The audience member notes that a Javanese accent makes it sound like the announcer is *pura pura* (faking, pretending) to be someone she is not.

Radio stations recognise this perspective and consider the Javanese accent when hiring announcers. A Javanese accent would not necessarily prevent an announcer from being employed. However, accent reduction was included as part of an announcer's

---

[14]Really, that Javanese dialect, it's out of place here, if he were speaking in Javanese, in a Javanese dialect, it's ok, but Indonesian, in a Javanese dialect, it sounds to us strange, it gives the impression that the person is faking it.

initial training. This was even the case at the Malang station as noted by this station's programme director:

Researcher: *Orang katakan [sic] saya, program director, dan boss di stasiun radio di sini di Jawa mencari orang yang, orang penyiar yang tidak punya logat, tidak punya accent yang kuat sekali, karena bicara seperti ini aneh . . . apakah Anda setuju?*

Ervin: *Setuju, cuman setiap orang pasti ada kesempatan untuk belajar. Kita coba, kalau bisa menghilangkan, kita coba . . . .*[15]

Stations and audience members described the Javanese accent derisively in terms of a person's, or in the case of radio, an announcer's being *medok* (accented). Many emphasiaed the Javanese pronunciation of the 'd' in *medok* when making this point. When a 'd' or a 't' falls between two vowels in Javanese, they are often pronounced with the tongue further back in the mouth (Kartomihardjo 1981). A radio announcer from the national station (himself from Jakarta) used this pronunciation along with the Javanese word for 'village' (*deso*), to poke fun at the announcer responsible for the Malang extract:

Ada orang di sini yang bukan asli seperti saya . . . yang asli Malang, itu tidak boleh menggunakan kayak gini, takut medok . . . deso, katrok.[16]

Some, but not many, identified the local announcer as being Javanese. She was born and raised in a medium-sized village not far from Blitar, East Java. The links between village life and the Javanese accent are well entrenched in Malang and other areas of Java. Similar links and negative evaluation of the Javanese accent have been noted by Smith-Hefner (2007: 187) in Yogyakarta. She positions *medok* in opposition with the youth identity *gaul*:

the ideology of *gaul* sociability poses *bahasa gaul* in opposition to the other varieties with which it contrasts in the larger sociolinguistic field – most notably, the Indonesian standard, but also regional varieties labeled *kampungan* ('rustic, bumpkinish') and *medok* ('heavily accented'). Rural, regional dialects are widely stereotyped by the media and by middle-class youth as unsophisticated and plodding, the antithesis of *gaul*'s easy fluency and self-confidence.

This view is mirrored to a certain degree by the staff at both radio stations as well as their audiences. It would seem then that limited code switching to Javanese is

---

[15]Researcher: People have told me that programme directors, and bosses in radio stations here in Java, look for people, for DJs, who don't have an accent, who don't have a strong accent, because talking like this is strange . . . do you agree?

Ervin: I agree, but every person is given the opportunity to learn. We try, if we can to get them to lose it [the accent], we try . . . .

[16]There are people here that are not native like me . . . those who are originally from Malang, [they] can't use [language] like this, [they're] scared of sounding like they have a thick accent . . . too villagey, coarse.

acceptable within Malang radio contexts. However, speaking Indonesian with a Java-nese accent is considered inauthentic and inappropriate, especially within youth con-texts. This point becomes even more salient in a discussion of Jakarta Indonesian and authenticity.

Jakartan influence and authenticity

Both radio stations in the current study include features of Jakarta Indonesian in their broadcasts However, as has been established, one station has a local reputation for using Jakarta Indonesian whereas the other does not. This station, labelled the national station here, claimed to aim for a national rather than a Jakarta image. Notably, in con-trast to the Malang station, the national station referred to its audience's status rather than trying to position its audience as a friend and a confidant. The national station con-structs its audience as *eksekutif muda* (young executives). This strategy arguably extends to its broadcast practices, including language. Whereas regional language features are used to establish intimacy and trust (cf. Jurriëns 2007), this station purges its broadcasts of such influence when speaking to *eksekutif muda*. Therefore, the national station rejected the use of Javanese lexical items in addition to the Javanese accent.

The national station agreed that the Jakartan broadcast mirrored the kind of language used at their station. Yet, the programme director was adamant that Jakarta Indonesian could only be used in Malang with the following caveat regarding authen-ticity: *'Siapapun, begitu, mereka berasal dari Jakarta, begitu, dari manapun, ketika dia bisa menyampaikan dengan pas'* (Whoever, like this, they are from Jakarta, like this, wherever they are from, when they put something across [like this, they] should be able to use it correctly). Many audience members agreed that Jakarta Indonesian was appropriate in the local community, provided it was limited to media contexts and with this same caveat. However, some cited this language as inappropriate and this begs the question of what elements of Jakarta Indonesian might be considered inappropriate in the Malang contexts. Indeed, there were features of Jakarta Indonesian in both the local and the Jakartan broadcasts, including the suffix −*in* and the discourse marker *deh*.

Jakarta Indoesian pronouns were most saliently considered taboo and consequently censured within the Malang media context. These are the Hokkien-Chinese derived first-person *gué* (also *gua*) and the second-person *lo* (also *lu*, *elu*,[17] or *elo*). Audience members who deemed the Jakarta Indonesian broadcasts to be inappropriate almost always cited these pronouns as the reason as did the staff at the Malang station. Audi-ences were tolerant and even encouraged the use of Jakarta Indonesian lexical items in Malang but drew the line at its pronouns:

> Ira: *Mungkin dialognya aja yang menikutin mereka, cuman lu/gué, nggak pernah pake . . .*
> Lita: *Gué bahasa mereka, aku bahasa kita.*[18]

---

[17]*Elu* also appears in Chinese Malay/Indonesian varieties in East Java (Rafferty 1982) as well as in a number of eastern archipelago Malay varieties.

[18]Ira: Maybe we would just join in with the conversation, only *lu/gué* is never used.

  Lita: G*ué* is their language, *aku* is our language.

More so, many cited the Jakartan announcer's way of speaking in the broadcast as *dibuat-buat* and *pura pura* (pretending). This audience member explained:

> *Dia membawa budaya Jakarta ke Malang, gitu. Di Malang sendiri, yang gué/lu sendiri, belum bisa, saya pikir, ya gimana? Terlalu dipaksakan.*[19]

Many believed that this announcer was Javanese but they could not cite Javanese features in her speech (not surprisingly as she was born and raised in Jakarta). In any case, the announcers at the national station were aware of the critical need to sound natural when using these pronouns. This announcer, born and raised in Malang but employed by the national station, explained:

> *Kalau stasiun ini sendiri, pernah ngobrol sama boss, itu, boleh memakai gué, boleh makai bahasa seperti itu, but don't be too much … Ketika pas memang itu pakai, kalau nggak pas, jangan.*[20]

Speaking correctly in media contexts referred to not sounding Javanese. This included whether the announcer was either known to be or perceived to be Javanese. In broadcasts at the national station, this also included whether the announcer had a Javanese accent or used Javanese lexical items. This marked a contrast between the national and the Malang station, with the latter permitting Javanese lexical items in its broadcasts.

Beyond these pronouns, audience members and staff at the Malang station generally accepted the Jakartan broadcast as appropriate for Malang. Audience members rarely cited the presence of the Jakartan discourse marker *deh* or the suffix −*in* in the broadcasts as Jakartan. These features are noted as Jakarta Indonesian by Sneddon (2006) among others and colloquial Indonesian by Ewing (2005). Focusing on the suffix, the verbal, transitive suffix −*in* is often selected in lieu of two verbal suffixes (*-kan* and −*i*) prescribed by Indonesian grammars (Ewing 2005; Smith-Hefner 2007). This suffix has provenance in Jakarta and the stations and audience members were aware of these links. However, the local announcer discussed her use of this suffix in Malang broadcasts: '*Waktu dipakai disini, lebih kurang bahasa informal, bercampur sama gaul*' (When it is used here, more or less as informal language, it's mixed with *gaul*). In short, this announcer acknowledged that *-in* has links to *gaul*, but considered it to be part of a wider, informal variety of Indonesian spoken in Malang.

Discussion and conclusion

Jurriëns (2009) notes how radio stations in regional contexts like Bandung, Denpasar and Padang introduced less formal, colloquial language in the post-Reform era. The

---

[19]She is bringing Jakarta culture to Malang, it's like that. In Malang itself, *gué/lu* alone can't be used, yet. I think, how can I say this? It's too forced.

[20]As for this station, [we] have spoken with the boss, [he said] we were allowed to use *gué*, allowed to use language like this, but don't be too much … When it really fits, use it, if it doesn't fit, don't.

current study shows that this seemingly leads to some tensions in defining an authentic Indonesian speaker in Malang radio contexts. However, for the remainder of this article, I argue that notions of the authentic Indonesian speaker are less controversial than they seem. An authentic Indonesian speaker, even in the media, exists in multiple spheres. Consequently, this speaker uses multiple varieties of Indonesian and shifts between these varieties to meet the demands of the immediate context. In intimate or friendly contexts, this includes code switching to Javanese but does not include the use of Javanese accents. In professional contexts, it includes the selection of Jakartan lexical items and suffixes but does not extend to Jakartan pronouns. There are clearly some tensions in the negotiation of the authentic Indonesian self and the projection of self by media announcers. This articles closes by teasing out authenticity, context and Indonesian varieties with regard to historical context.

The New Order government wanted Indonesians to perceive their identity as multiple (Goebel 2012). Indonesians, regardless of their ethnicity, were to view themselves as Indonesians as first and ethnic, second.[21] In order to position the ethnic as secondary, Suharto and his New Order 'colonized and contained public understandings of "culture"' (Lysloff 2002: 1), positioning the ethnic as provincial, archaic and backward (save the privileged position of the Javanese). In any case, at the end of the New Order, Lindsay (1997) observed that regional identity and culture were ambiguous. Lindsay writes (1997: 122) that these were, on the one hand, 'often backward, lower-class, *kampungan* ['rustic, bumpkinish'] and traditional and on the other hand, intimate, necessary, part of daily life, and at times, a status symbol'. More recently, Smith-Hefner (2007) has positioned the youth identity and *gaul* as the antithesis of *kampungan*. This may seem to further complicate the already ambiguous nature of regional identity.

Yet, the same socio-cultural forces which have led to the emergence of *gaul* have also led to the revaluation of pluralism as a positive rather than a controlling force. For instance, in the arts, Cole (2010: 6) writes that '[w]riters and artists are encouraged to explicitly address pluralism, so that the Indonesian people will not be cheated out of their potential to appreciate their own plurality'. Cole argues that such activities led to a post-Reform unearthing of diversity, which had been buried by New Order policies. Jurriëns (2007: 58) reviews Suryadi's work on media activities in Riau and posits a 'rediscovery and redefinition of ethnic identity' in the post-Reform era. Indeed, this is arguably what is taking place in Malang. *Gaul* was often described to me in Malang as a way of expanding one's social network. From their perspectives, a person who is *gaul* socialises easily with others allowing greater access to social and cultural capital. A research assistant with whom I worked noted: '*Kalau menurutku gaul itu bagaimana kita bisa menempatkan posisi diri kita dimanapun kita berada*' (In my view, *gaul* is how we can establish a place for ourselves wherever we go).

The young, middle class and *gaul* in Malang are upwardly and outwardly looking (cf. Smith-Hefner 2007). Many middle class radio listeners are, or aspire to be, *eksekutif muda*. At the very least, this is how the national station here constructs and imagines

---

[21]The Javanese certainly held a privileged position within the New Order government as many, if not most, of its officials were Javanese. This often led to certain contradictions in speech and behaviour. For instance, the pronunciation of the transitive suffix −*kan* with a Javanese accent (i.e. −*ken*) was marked as low class in Malang in the early 1980s. Yet, within government contexts, this pronunciation was prestigious because it was linked to Suharto (Kartomihardjo 1981).

its audience to be. Jakarta Indonesian has clearly become linked to the concept of *eksekutif muda* in the Malang media context. This is hardly surprising in light of perceptions that Jakarta is home to the richest, most powerful and most attractive Indonesians (cf. Oetomo 1990: 71). However, upwardly mobile and outwardly looking listeners also need intimate friends. There are radio stations, like the Malang station, which cater to this need as readily as those which cater to its lifestyles and aspirations. The language of intimacy and friendship in Malang remains Javanese. As Goebel (2002b, 2005) has noted elsewhere, Javanese remains the language of intimacy in Javanese contexts, even where there are inter-ethnic interactions.

The New Order government emphasised the need to speak good and correct Indonesian. Whereas in the New Order, the focus was on *benar* (correct), in the post-Reform era, there has been a shift towards *baik* (good). Rather than focusing on an inflexible 'correct' across contexts, current discussion focuses on the need to vary one's language to suit the context. Yet, in contemporary Indonesia, the notion of the *asli* is also critically relevant (cf. Boellstorff 2004; Goebel 2012). In his discussion of gay subjectivities in Indonesia, Tom Boellstorff (2004: 196) notes: '[p]ostcolonial societies are by definition a "derivative discourse" (*palsu*) striving for a sense of authenticity (*asli*)'. The struggle for *asli* is playing out in the Malang media and among targeted, mostly Javanese audiences. The resources used in this struggle are clearly in flux. Ten years after the fall of Suharto, in Malang, Javanese accents were considered *palsu* in the Indonesian national sphere. However, one could code switch to Javanese to index intimacy and still be considered *asli*. After all, Javanese is the language one uses with intimate Javanese friends (even projected friends, as in the audience targeted by the Malang station). Yet, Jakarta Indonesian is linked to upward mobility and an outward-looking self. In this regard, one would expect young executives to use Jakarta Indonesian in their struggle for *asli*. Jakartan pronouns, however, at the time of this study, were a bridge too far and thus *palsu* within the Malang context.

In conclusion, discussions of the Indonesian language and Indonesian selves in the post-Reform era are complex, ephemeral and shifting. This is reflected in this study's findings and further supported by the ways in which post-Reform researchers have discussed Indonesian and Indonesians. For instance, Boellstorff (2003) forgoes using the word 'identity' when discussing Indonesians instead selecting 'subjectivities'. He posits that the latter speaks more accurately to an Indonesian's sense of 'selves' rather than 'self'. Djenar (2008) draws on self-categorisation theory to describe Indonesian language variation in relation to the construction of Indonesian identity categories because of the theory's focus on moment-to-moment and fluid construction of such subjectivities. The current study contributes to discussions of fluid notions of colloquial Indonesian and Indonesian subjectivities. It also highlights a critical and somewhat less fluid emphasis on the authentic presentation of selves through the appropriate use of Indonesian across contexts.

References

Arps, B. 2003. Letters on air in Banyuwangi (and beyond): radio and phatic performance. *Indonesia and the Malay World* 31 (91): 301–316.

Asiawaves. 2008. Radio Stations in Malang, East Java. <http://www.asiawaves.net/indonesia/malang-radio.htm> Accessed 23 July 2013.

Bell, A. 1991. *The language of news media*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Boellstorff, T. 2003. Dubbing culture: Indonesian gay and lesbi subjectivities and ethnography in an already globalized world. *American Ethnologist* 30 (2): 225–42.

Boellstorff, T. 2004. 'Authentic of course!': Gay language in Indonesia and cultures of belonging. In W. Leap & T. Boellstorff (eds). *Speaking in queer tongues: globalization and gay language*. Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press, pp. 181–210.

Cole, D. 2010. Enregistering diversity: adequation in Indonesian poetry performance. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 20 (1): 1–21.

Custillas-Espinosa, J. and Hernandez-Campoy, J. 2006. Nonresponsive reporting in radio broadcasting: A case study. *Language Variation and Change* 18: 317–30.

Djenar, D.N. 2008. Which self? Pronominal choice, modernity, and self-categorizations. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 189: 31–54.

Englebretson, R. 2003. *Searching for structure: the problem of complementation in colloquial Indonesian conversation*. Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.

Englebretson, R. 2007. Grammatical resources for social purposes: some aspects of stance-taking in colloquial Indonesian conversation. In R. Englebretson (ed.), *Stancetaking in discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 69–110.

Errington, J. 1998. *Shifting languages: interaction and identity in Javanese Indonesia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ewing, M. 2005. Colloquial Indonesian. In S. Adelaar and N. Himmelmann (eds), *The Austronesian languages of Asia and Madagascar*. London: Routledge, pp. 227–58.

Ferguson, C. 1959. Diglossia. *Word* 15: 325–40.

Fishman, J. 1978. The Indonesian planning experience: what does it teach us? In S. Udin (ed.), *Spectrum: essays presented to Sutan Takdir Alisjahbana on his seventieth birthday*. Jakarta: Dian Rakyat, pp. 333–339.

Goebel, Z. 2002a. When do Indonesians speak Indonesian? *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 23 (6): 479–89.

Goebel, Z. 2002b. Code choice in inter-ethnic interactions in two urban neighbourhoods of Indonesia. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 158: 69–87.

Goebel, Z. 2005. An ethnographic study of code choice in two neighbourhoods of Indonesia. *Australian Journal of Linguistics* 25 (1): 85–107.

Goebel, Z. 2012. Enregisterment, communities, and authenticity: Watching Indonesian teledramas. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 22 (2): E1–E20.

Ibrihim, I. 2007. *Budaya populer sebagai komunikasi: dinamika popscape dan mediascape di Indonesia kontemporer*. Yogyakarta: Jalasutra.

Jurriëns, E. 2004. *Cultural travel and migrancy: the artistic representation of globalization in the electronic media of West Java*. Leiden: KITLV Press.

Jurriëns, E. 2007. Indonesian radio culture: modes of address, fields of action. *Review of Indonesian and Malaysian Affairs* 41 (1): 33–70.

Jurriëns, E. 2009. *From monologue to dialogue: radio and reform in Indonesia*. Leiden: KITLV Press.

Jurriëns, E. 2011. A call for media ecology: the study of Indonesian popular culture revisited. *Indonesia and the Malay World* 39 (114): 197–219.

Kakiailatu, T. 2007. Media in Indonesia: forum for political change and critical assessment. *Asia Pacific Viewpoint* 48 (1): 60–71.

Kartomihardjo, S. 1981. *Ethnography of communicative codes in East Java*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.

Klineberg, E. 2007. *Fighting for air: the battle to control America's media.* New York: Metropolitan Books.

Kitley, P. 2000. *Television, nation and culture in Indonesia.* Athens, OH: Ohio University Press.

Lindsay, J. 1997. Radio and local identities in Indonesia. *Indonesia* 64: 105−23.

Lysloff, R. 2002. Rural Javanese 'tradition' and erotic subversion: female dance performance in Banyumas (Central Java). *Asian Music* 33 (1): 1−24.

Manns, H. 2011. Stance, style and identity in Java. PhD thesis. Monash University.

Manns, H. forthcoming. Scripting radio talk amidst language shift in Indonesia. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication.*

Nugroho, I. 2005. Local television stations develop at faster rate in greater Malang area. *Jakarta Post*, 29 August.

Oetomo, D. 1990. The Bahasa Indonesia of the middle class. *Prisma* 50: 68−79.

Poedjosoedarmo, S. 1982. *Javanese influence on Indonesian.* Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.

Rafferty, E. 1982. *Discourse structures of the Chinese Indonesian of Malang.* Jakarta: NUSA, Universitas Atma Jaya.

Sen, K. 2003. Radio days: media-politics in Indonesia. *Pacific Review* 16 (4): 573−89.

Sen, K. and Hill, D. 2000. *Media, culture and politics in Indonesia.* Jakarta: Equinox.

Smith-Hefner, N. 2007. Youth language, gaul sociability and the new Indonesian middle class. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 17 (2): 184−203.

Sneddon, J. 2003a. *The Indonesian language.* Sydney: University of New South Wales.

Sneddon, J. 2003b. Diglossia in Indonesian. *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 159: 519−49.

Sneddon, J. 2004. The sociolinguistic nature of Indonesian today. In K. Sukamto (ed.), *Manabur Besih, Manuai Kasih, Persembahan Karya Bahasa, Sosial dan Budaya untuk Anton M. Moeliono Pada Ulang Tahunnya yang ke-75.* Jakarta: Yayasan Obor Indonesia, pp. 33−51.

Sneddon, J. 2006. *Colloquial Jakartan Indonesian.* Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.

Suryadi. 2005. Media and the margins: radio in Pekanbaru, Riau (Indonesia). *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies* 36 (1): 131−51.

Tanner, N. 1967. Speech and society among the Indonesian elite: a case study of a multilingual community. *Anthropological Linguistics* 9 (3): 15−39.

Turner, B. 1995. Teaching formal and informal Bahasa Indonesia. *Wacana − Journal of Australian Society of Indonesian Language Educators* 2. <your.usc.edu.au/Wacana/2/formal_informal_90s.htm> Accessed 23 July 2013.

Appendix 1: Malang Indonesian extract

ok tapi sebelom informasi dari malang malang aja kali ya malang malang putung allah/makasih ini dia nih/mule nam belas agustus sampai dua puluh empat agustus dua ribu tujuh di taman krida budaya jawa timur/itu dia mereka ganteng dan juga cakep waduh kayaknya mbak mbak mas mas ini emang bener bener jodoh deh ok deh kita tinggalin tommy soo dan juga ruby linn/wah jadi ngomongin soal waktu kita teros jalan teros jalan teros jalan teros yah maksudnya apa/di rumah aje dengarin [radio station name] pastinya bikin/yang ngaku banget seneng dengan dunia model/uh ni ni ni ni ni ni ni ni langsung aja [address term used for audience] semuanya pasti pingin tau dong/yah uda lah buat yang ngaku demen banget sama original soundtracknya mars/siap mas mas ganteng allah vina bukan sih nggak tau deh/ok ya . . . Ida . . . semuanya mau kasih informasi dulu

Appendix 2: Jakarta Indonesian extract

gue cape deh all pilih gitu ya pilih gue atau pilih keluarga elo/ya lakinya pasti juga mikir aduh/ cium-ciuman uda uda lewat itu semua uda deh/teros ada leo nih kalo gue sih pur asyik asyik aja cewe gue beda ama gue tujuh tahun/masih bisa dingomongin sih nggak ada masalah/ok dan cepet married tentunya/dan tapi emang bener cinta banget sama partnernya susah ya di indonesia sekerang/teros ada juwita juga gue mo request lagu dong pur buat kakak gue hare ini ulang tahun tapi gue lagi nggak punya duit yah udah yang belum dapat kado dari siapa pun akhirnya gue cuman bisa kasihin lagu/tolong puterin kahitna oh ya nanti dicariin ya sebentar katanya gitu lagi nanti saya bacain gitu aquariusnya ditunggu ya deh/telat nih pur dengar topik ini lagi ngo- mongin apa sih dan dia Chinese gue jawa aja aduh ini berat yah tapi kalo dua duanya ngerti sih maksudnya dua dua keluarga besar ya kalo elo berdua sih udah pasti namanya juga cinta

Author biography

Howard Manns is Lecturer in Linguistics at Monash University, Melbourne, Australia, where he researches social and linguistic change. Before coming to Monash, he taught English in Indonesia and worked as a specialist in Iranian languages and cultures for the US Navy. Email: Howard.Manns@monash.edu