

Tilburg Papers in Culture Studies

Paper 143

**Localising person reference among  
Indonesian youth**

by

*Michael C Ewing*<sup>©</sup> (University of Melbourne)

m.ewing@unimelb.edu.au

September 2015



This work is licensed under a  
Creative Commons Attribution-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License.  
To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nd/4.0/>

# Localising person reference among Indonesian youth

Michael C Ewing  
University of Melbourne

## Abstract

Person referring terms are an important linguistic resource and are often the site of social action and stance taking in conversational interaction. Speakers of Indonesian can access a range of pronouns, kinship terms and names for referring to self and other. In this paper I examine first and second person reference among young Indonesian speakers in the city of Bandung, a city with a vibrant youth culture, a strong cultural identity as the dominant city of the Sundanese ethno-linguistic region, and one which is also strongly influenced by the socio-cultural trends of the nearby Indonesian capital, Jakarta. The young Indonesian speakers in this study use pronouns and other forms of person reference associated with standard Indonesian, colloquial Jakartan Indonesian and Sundanese. By examining data from focus group discussions about identity and language usage together with transcripts of natural occurring conversation, I show how choice of person reference in conversation arises from both perduring semiotic resonances and the moment-by-moment deployment by interlocutors in conversation. In this way the construction of stance flexibly emerges from the shifting social needs of face-to-face interaction.

## Key words

Indonesian, youth language, person reference, pronouns, stance

## 1. Introduction<sup>1</sup>

This paper examines first and second person reference among young Indonesian speakers in the city of Bandung. Youth are currently a salient category in Indonesia (Parker and Nilan 2013), and the contemporary language of youth – often labelled *bahasa gaul* or ‘gregarious language’ – has become the focus of both local popular commentary (BeritaSATU TV, 2013; Januar, 2014; Tasai, 2006) and international academic research (Djenar and Ewing, 2015; Manns, 2011; mith-Hefner, 2007; Tamtomo, 2012). Localising the language of youth is essential in understanding how young people employ language resources in the construction of social meanings (e.g., Bucholz, 2002; Manns, 2011) and the city of Bandung is a productive site to do this. As the third largest city in Indonesia, a major university city and an important centre for the creative industries, Bandung is home to a thriving youth culture. It is located about 150 km southeast of the Indonesian capital, Jakarta,

---

<sup>1</sup> I wish to thank Enung Rostika, Asdit Leonitara, Refdinal Hadiningrat, Alfatihatus Sholihatunissa and Hanni Nurliani for assistance with recordings and transcriptions, as well

and this proximity means Jakarta exerts a strong cultural influence on Bandung. At the same time Bandung maintains a strong sense of independent identity, grounded in its position as the dominant city of the Sundanese ethno-linguistic region.

The linguistic complexity of Indonesia (e.g. Foulcher et al., 2012; Maier, 1993) means that the rapidly changing language of youth displays features of ‘hybridity’ that play a crucial role in the construction of identity through the local deployment of diverse language resources (cf. Pennycook, 2010). In Bandung, Rostika (2009) surveyed language attitudes and usage among Sundanese speaking youth and found frequent use of Sundanese and Jakartan particles and grammatical forms when these young people were speaking Indonesian, which she linked to the production of relaxed informality. Such hybridity is also evident in the data examined here. I follow recently emerging approaches in socio-cultural linguistics which view ‘languages’ or ‘dialects’ not as discrete bounded entities objectively existing in the real world, but rather as politically and socio-culturally conditioned ideological constructs (Blommaert 2010; Heller, 2007; Jørgensen et al., 2011; Makoni and Pennycook, 2007). Such constructs as ‘Indonesian’ or ‘Sundanese’ nonetheless have real-world significance for speakers, in no small part because ideologies associated with them infuse individual linguistic resources with important semiotic resonances. Therefore, rather than talking about an analysis of ‘Indonesian’, I agree that it is, following Blommaert and Rampton, “far more productive *analytically* to focus on the very variable ways in which individual linguistic features with identifiable social and cultural associations get clustered together whenever people communicate” (2011: 5, emphasis in original).

Person referring terms are an important linguistic resource, and like Indonesian speakers across the country, young people in Bandung access a range of pronouns, kinship terms and names for referring to self and other. In what follows, I first outline resources for person reference used by young Indonesian speakers in Bandung and explore the ideology of person reference as expressed by young language users themselves. I then look at the use of person reference during spontaneous conversational interaction to show how young people deploy these resources for purposes of social positioning. Bandung’s position as a regional hub sitting in the near periphery of the national capital is crucial in shaping how young people choose to accomplish person reference.

---

as Novi Djenar, Howie Manns and Maya Costa-Pinto for their input in the development of this paper.

## 2. Resources and attitudes

Indonesian speakers have access to multiple resources for person reference (Ewing, 2005; Sneddon et al., 2010). Like many languages of Southeast Asia, it has an open system of self- and addressee-reference (Enfield, 2007; Thomason and Everett, 2001), meaning that person referring resources are readily adopted from other languages and that non-pronominal forms such as proper names and kinship terms are commonly used for self- and addressee-reference. Additionally, ellipsis is by far the most common strategy in Indonesian for tracking self and addressee in conversation, as it is in closely related languages (e.g. Ewing 2014 on ellipsis in Javanese); ellipsis is however beyond the scope of the current study. The existence of multiple pronominal forms has long been noted, but as Djenar (2014) points out, earlier accounts claimed that choice of terms was dependent on statically conceived demographic characteristics such as age, sex or first language. More recently, researchers have begun to recognise the fluidity with which speakers deploy person reference. Sneddon (2006), writing about Jakartan Indonesian, notes the speakers with similar backgrounds, and even a single speaker in a single speech event, will use widely different pronouns in a seemingly “random” manner. However, when examined more closely, motivations for pronominal choices begin to appear. Englebretson (2007) analyses pronouns as markers of stance, noting for Indonesian speakers in Yogyakarta, pronoun choice “is dynamic, takes place at the local level of discourse, and is used in stancetaking to index the speaker’s construction and expression of identities” (2007: 78). Manns (2011) reaches similar conclusions for Indonesian speakers in Malang. Djenar (2014) uses Manning’s (2001) notion of perduring social relations to examine youth fiction, demonstrating that situationally motivated shifts in pronoun usage also draw on perduring meanings linked to both social and spatial deixis, such as the centre-periphery contrast between Jakarta and the regions. The interplay between perduring social-semiotic resonances of pronouns and the locally contingent work of stance and identity construction through interaction is also a theme emerging from the Bandung data.

The data for the present study are from a corpus comprising recordings and transcripts of naturally occurring conversations among young Indonesian adults (aged 18-25 years) made in Bandung in early 2014. Eight recordings have been used for this study, comprising three hours of talk. The conversations involve from two to nine speakers and include all-female and mixed female-male groups. At the same time I conducted four focus groups with university students also aged 18-25, about equally distributed between men and women. The discussions ranged around topics of youth, youth identity and language perceptions.

The linguistic resources for self- and addressee-reference used by young people in the corpus include pronouns associated with formal and familiar registers of standard Indonesian, those associated with colloquial Jakartan Indonesian and Sundanese pronouns, including familiar, coarse and polite forms. Personal names are also used for first and second person reference. In the case of second person reference, personal names are sometimes combined with a kinship-based title, or occasionally, just the kinship term is used without name. Table 1 provides an overview of first person reference use in the corpus, indicating raw frequency and percentage for different reference types. Table 2 provides this information for second person reference types. Note that the characterisations under “Associated Social Semiotics” in the tables are meant to be heuristic, to remind the reader which is which. The social meanings and intertextual resonances of the different reference types are much more complex than a simple label can express. The following summary of focus group discussions and explication of examples from the conversational data aim to illustrate this complexity.

Reference type	Associated Social Semiotics	N	%
<i>aku</i>	Indonesian, familiar (romantic)	231	59.8
<i>gua / gue</i>	Jakartan, familiar (coarse)	84	21.8
<i>saya</i>	Indonesian, formal	29	7.5
<i>urang</i>	Sundanese, familiar	14	3.6
<i>aing</i>	Sundanese, coarse	13	3.4
NAME	Familiar	11	2.8
<i>abdi</i>	Sundanese, polite	2	0.5
TITLE	Familiar	2	0.5
<b>Total</b>		<b>386</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Table 1. Frequency of 1<sup>st</sup> person reference types in corpus**

Reference type	Associated Social Semiotics	N	%
<i>kamu</i>	Indonesian, familiar (romantic)	89	53.3
<i>lu / lo</i>	Jakartan, familiar (coarse)	28	16.8
NAME	Familiar	16	9.6
TITLE + NAME	familiar / respectful	15	9.0
<i>maneh</i>	Sundanese, familiar	8	4.8
<i>sia</i>	Sundanese, coarse	6	3.6
TITLE	familiar / respectful	4	2.4
<i>anjeun</i>	Sundanese, polite	1	0.6
<b>Total</b>		<b>167</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Table 2. Frequency of 2<sup>nd</sup> person reference types in corpus**

The focus group participants initially discussed youth language in general. They described their speech style as *biasa saja, nggak terlalu formal* ‘just normal, not too formal’

or *santai banget* ‘really relaxed’. They also pointed out that unlike (their perceptions of) what their parents’ generation did, today’s youth are more *spontan* ‘spontaneous’ and even *keceposan* ‘blurting out’ with their language. For them, this includes using informal language in contexts where formal language might be prescriptively expected. It also includes the notion of mixing languages. One participant said, “our speech is all mixed, sometimes Indonesian, sometimes Sundanese, sometimes even combined together” (*kita ngomongnya campur-campur, kadang bahasa Indonesia, kadang bahasa Sunda, kadang juga disatuin*).

The participants were also happy to discuss the social connotations of pronominal usage in great detail, indicating this is an aspect of language ideology at the forefront of their thinking. Participants consistently labelled usage in terms of matched first- and second-person pairs: *aku-kamu*, *gua-lu*, *urang-maneh* and so forth. They all reported that for young people in Bandung *aku-kamu* is the most commonly used pair and their interest and commentary was mainly directed to the use of more marked *gua-lu*. The consensus was that use of *gua-lu* is strongly associated with Jakarta and generally not appropriate in Bandung: using *gua-lu* is *angkuh* ‘haughty’ and *sombong* ‘arrogant’. Not surprisingly, participants originally from Jakarta said that in Jakarta they used *gua-lu* the most often. For them *aku-kamu* could be seen either as distancing (*kurang deket gitu*), or in specific contexts, as very intimate. The latter association is consistent with Djenaar’s (2014) finding that in novels, characters from Jakarta who become romantically involved often switch from *gua-lu* to *aku-kamu*. One female Jakartan participant said that because of this association with intimacy, even in Bandung she feels uncomfortable using *aku* with male interlocutors (*nggak nyaman kalau bilang aku ke cowok*).

For speakers from Bandung, people who use *gua-lu* are perceived as not wanting to integrate with their friends (*nggak menyatu*). It was pointed out several times that people need to adjust to the place where they are (*menyesuaikan tempatnya*). One Bandung person reported that when he used *aku* in Jakarta he was told it was *kaku* ‘stiff, awkward’ and he should use *gue*. Another who came to Bandung from Jakarta said he felt he could not use *gua-lu* but did not know the Sundanese pronouns, so he started using *aku-kamu*. Similar to speakers from Malang (Manns 2011), these Bandung speakers said if they did use *gua-lu*, it would be for humorous effect (*bercandaan*). It is clear that for speakers from Bandung – similar to findings in Englebreston (2006) for Yogyakarta and Manns (2011) for Malang – *gua-lu* retains a very strong association with Jakarta and often carries meanings of toughness, being outspoken or associated with (a possibly exaggerated or false) sophistication. Focus group participants’ assertion that *aku-kamu* is the most common, even the default,

pronominal pair used by young speakers in Bandung is born out by the frequency results in Table 1, where nearly 60% of first person references use *aku* and more than 50% of second person references use *kamu*. Interestingly, this contrasts markedly from perceptions of Bandung reported from Malang, where Bandung speakers are lumped together with Jakartans and assumed to use *gua-lu* (Manns, 2011: 137, 276). In the following section I examine how the ideologies around pronoun use discussed here play out in conversational interaction.

### 3. Person reference in conversation

I have chosen excerpts from three conversations in the corpus to illustrate a number key points. In “Blackout” we see the default use of *aku-kamu* contrasted with Sundanese pronouns used to index solidarity and personal perspective. “Chicken Foot Soup” illustrates the use of names for reference to self and addressee as well as formal Indonesian *saya* ‘1s’, options receiving only passing mention in the focus group discussions. Finally, “Cream Soup” looks at a particularly performative speaker who uses a wide range of person reference terms.

#### 3.1 Blackout

The conversation “Blackout” demonstrates the prevalent use of *aku-kamu* by Bandung speakers. The primary speakers, Salma and Sita, women in their early twenties, almost always use *aku-kamu* with each other. For Salma, 95% of her first person reference is *aku*, while for Sita it is 67%. Both women use *kamu* exclusively for second person reference. This default usage is illustrated in the first four lines of (1). In addition, the common use of ellipsis is illustrated in line 2 where the predicate *marah-marah* ‘get/be angry’ does not have an explicit subject, but the subject can be clearly understood from context to be second person.

In line 10, Sita uses the familiar Sundanese second person pronoun *maneh*. Use of a non-default pronoun can alert interlocutors that ‘something different’ is being done (Stivers et al. 2007). To understand what that ‘something different’ is, we can examine what social actions are being undertaken at this point in the interaction. Salma asks why Sita is mad at her (lines 1-2), thus setting up a low-level misalignment between the friends. According to Sita, Salma has been spending too much time with her male friend, Agoy, and so not hanging out with her other friends (lines 3-5). Salma tries to make amends by saying she will do something with Sita. Sita accepts Salma’s offer using the Sundanese *maneh* ‘2s’. This forms part of a process of realignment between the friends, and the resonance of locality and shared

ethnicity evoked by the use of Sundanese here is consistent with the social action being undertaken. This process of realignment is further amplified by the repeated, reciprocal use of colloquial *yuk* ‘HORT’ in lines 8-9 and 13-14, used to indicated shared agreement.

Example (1)<sup>2</sup>

- 1 Salma: *Sebenarnya kenapa gitu,*  
actually why like that
- 2 *marah-marah ke aku?*  
angry-REDUP to 1S  
‘So why is it (you)’re all mad at me?’
- 3 Sita: *Soal-nya,*  
problem-DEF
- 4 *kamu-nya nggak main terus.*  
2S- DEF NEG play continue
- 5 .. *Main-nya sama Kang Agoy aja terus.*  
play-DEF with older brother Agoy just continue  
‘The problem is you don’t hang out at all. (You)’re always just hanging out with Agoy.’
- 6 Salma: *Ya udah,*  
yes already
- 7 *hari ini main.*  
day this play  
‘Oh alright, (I)’ll hang out today.’
- 8 Sita: ... *Yuk?*  
okay  
‘Okay?’
- 9 Salma: .. *Yuk.*  
okay  
‘Okay.’
- 10 Sita: .. *Drama ari maneh.*  
drama if.SUN 2S.SUN  
‘You’ve got drama [club]?’

---

<sup>2</sup> See Appendix A for transcription and glossing conventions.

- 11 Salma: .. *Ya,*  
yes
- 12 *pulang drama.*  
return.home drama  
'Yes [we'll hang out after I] come back from drama [club].'
- 13 Sita: .. *Yuk.*  
okay  
Okay.'
- 14 Salma: .. *Yuk.*  
okay  
'Okay.'

Blackout 189-205

In (2), Sita uses the familiar Sundanese first person *urang*. The speakers are discussing the upcoming general election and how they will decide whom to vote for. This excerpt forms a single turn by Sita, which contains a dense clustering of three explicit first person references – an unusual occurrence given the frequency of ellipsis in Indonesian conversation. Here Sita explains she just goes for the candidate with the longest title. The first two pronominal tokens are default *aku*. The first of these is marked with the Sundanese contrastive topic particle *mah*, indicating she is talking about her actions in (presupposed) contrast with the actions of others. The second use of *aku* occurs when she mentions her action, the physical act of puncturing (*coblos*) the ballot paper to vote. When she expresses the affective motivation driving her choice – that she just will do whatever comes to mind at the moment of voting – she use a Sundanese phrase with the pronoun *urang*. This shift from public language – Indonesian – to private language – Sundanese – to express inner thoughts, feelings or reactions, is reminiscent of Errington's (1998) discussion of shifting between Indonesian and Javanese.

Example (2)

- 1 Sita: *Pokok-nya,*  
point-DEF
- 2 ***aku mah,***  
**1s part.SUN**
- 3 *yang paling panjang gelar-nya,*  
REL most long title-DEF

4            *aku coblos we,*  
1s    vote    just.SUN

5            .. *kumaha urang we.*  
          how.SUN 1s.SUN just.SUN

‘The thing is, as for me, I just choose the one who has the longest titles, just whatever I want.’

Blackout 332-337

### 3.2 Chicken Foot Soup

The following examples are from a conversation between five female friends, all students at the same university, who are having lunch in a food court. They are discussing, among other topics, what they want to order. In (3), both Hana and Ratih use *aku* for self reference. In this conversation, about 40% of self reference is done with *aku*, another 40% with first name and the remaining 20% with *saya*.

Example (3)

1    Hana: *Aku teh belum makan nasi=.*  
          1s    PART.SUN not.yet Eat    rice

2            *Jadi,*  
          so

3            .. *eh yang ga nasi,*  
          uh REL    NEG rice

4            *aku .. eliminasi.*  
          1s        elimination

‘I haven’t eaten rice yet. So I’ll eliminate anything without rice.’

5    Ratih: ... *Minum apa bro?*  
          drink    what bro

‘What are (you) going to drink bro?’

6    Aina: ... *Aku juga mau nasi ah,*  
          1s    also want rice PART

7            .. *Sop ceke.*  
          soup chicken.foot

‘Gosh I want rice to. Chicken foot soup.’

8    Ratih: ... *Boleh bro.*  
          can    bro

‘Ok bro.’

The use of name for first person reference is illustrated in (4).

Example (4)

Rini: **Rini** *teh* *suka* *kangkung* *Téh* *Hana*.  
**Rini** PART.SUN Like water.spinach older.sister.SUN Hana  
 ‘I like water spinach *Teh* Hani.’

Chicken Foot Soup 243

Particularly characteristic of this conversation is the use name, kin title or both for all cases of explicit addressee reference. The Sundanese title for older sister, *Teh* is used with name in almost 70% of cases of explicit addressee reference, just the title (usually the full form *Teteh*) in 10% of cases and just name in the remaining 20%. In general these women use *Teh* with name when addressing an older female friend and just the name when speaking to someone younger. This is illustrated in (5), where Rini is the youngest member of the group and (6) where Lela is the oldest.

Example (5)

Rini: **Téh** **Hana** *mah* *udah* *lulus* *yah?*  
**older.sister.SUN** **Hani** PART.SUN already pass Yeah  
 ‘You’ve already passed right?’

Chicken Foot Soup 51

Example (6)

Lela: **Aina** *yang* *kemarin* *makan* *apa?*  
**Aina** REL yesterday eat what  
 ‘What did you eat yesterday?’

Chicken Foot Soup 167

Finally, tokens of formal Indonesian *saya* ‘1s’ occur more often in this conversation than others in the corpus. Its use is usually stylised, when evoking someone else’s voice or exaggerating the formality of what is said for humorous effect. The latter is illustrated by (7). The speakers had been discussing an academic topic, which facilitated the use of more formal grammatical structures and lexicon. When Rini – who elsewhere uses name for self-reference, as in example (4) – brings the topic back to choosing what to order, she continues in this academic mode, using formal clause structure and formal, distancing *saya*. She uses a laughing voice at the beginning of her statement and finishes with exaggerated lengthening of the final syllable in *makan* ‘eat’, all marking a ludic stance.

Example (7)

Rini: <@ *Saya* belum menemukan apa @> yang mau *saya* maka=*n*.  
1S not.yet MEN-meet-APPL what REL want 1S eat

‘I have not yet discovered what it is I want to eat.’

Chicken Foot Soup 387

The speakers in this conversation can be considered more conservative than many others in the corpus. They come from a university sometimes stereotyped as having a ‘*kampungan*’ (less than sophisticated) reputation and they tend to be conservatively dressed. This may correspond with their use of Sundanese kinships terms and avoidance of *kamu* ‘2S’. It is also interesting that these women move towards more formal language for humour, while many of the other speakers in this corpus move towards coarseness for humour, as illustrated in the next section. It is through such constellations of person referring strategies that identity arises, embodied through interaction and supported by other semiotic markers.

### 3.3 Cream Soup

During “Cream Soup” three students at a technical collage discuss a marketing assignment in which they plan to sell cream soup. The discussion takes place in a hallway on campus and as many as six other students temporarily join the conversation. The male member of this trio, Bayu, uses the greatest variety of different reference terms of anyone in the corpus. While he is primarily an *aku-kamu* user, he uses *aku* in only 50% of self references. The remaining 50% include Jakartan *gua* and the Sundanese first person pronouns, *aing* (coarse), *urang* (neutral) and *abdi* (refined, only one token).

In the excerpt in (8), when Bayu uses *gua* ‘1s’, it is clearly for humorous effect. Alma corrects Bayu’s mistaken suggestion about how to cook macaroni showing slightly humorous stance with exaggerated lengthening on final syllables of intonation units and the use of the vocative *nak* ‘child’, not normally used between university friends. Bayu’s response raises the humour level with an exaggerated imitation of a Betawi (local Jakarta) accent when saying he has no culinary skills. The use of Jakartan *gua* is an integral part of this humour.

Example (8)

1 Alma: *Makroni téh direndem dulu=*,  
macaroni DEF.SUN DI-soak first

- 2            *baru*        *direbu=s*.  
only then    DI-boil
- 3            *Na=k*.  
child  
‘The macaroni should be soaked first and only then boiled, son.’
- 4    Bayu:    *Ma’ap*    *deh*,  
sorry        PART.JKT
- 5            ***gua***        *nggak*    *tahu=*,  
**1S.JKT**    NEG        Know
- 6            ***gua***        *bukan*    *tukang*    *peda=*.  
**1S.JKT**    NEG        peddler    salt fish  
‘I’m so sorry, I didn’t know, I’m not a salt fish peddler.’

Cream Soup 441-446

Examples (9a)-(9d) are from an extended excerpt provided in Appendix B. Bayu, Asmita and Alma are discussing their plans to sell cream soup. In (9a) Bayu calls out to a friend who is passing by, asking whether she would buy their soup if they go into business. Bayu primarily uses *aku-kamu* with the main interlocutors, but his call to Dian uses Jakartan *lu*. This evokes a strongly assertive stance, consistent with the Sundanese hortative *sok*, compressed grammatical structure and blunt questioning style. When Dian answers she can’t say because she doesn’t know whether the soup is any good, Bayu further pushes her in (9b), reminding her he has helped with her graphic design assignment, using Jakartan *gua*. At the point Dian responds (9c), she and Bayu are using almost entirely Sundanese resources. Indeed Dian uses coarse first person *aing* – something that was almost always associated with young men by focus group participants – saying she will be held responsible for the quality of Bayu’s work. Bayu ignores this, making a self-deprecating response to Alma, softened by beginning with the familiar (not coarse) Sundanese *urang* in an otherwise entirely Indonesian clause. By the time the discussion has returned to the project (9d), Bayu again uses *aku*. Throughout this example, the modulation between Indonesian and Sundanese incrementally builds and recedes as attention shifts between interlocutors, stances and topics.

Example (9a)

- 5    Bayu:    ..    *Dian*    ***gue***        *pangjualkeun*,  
          Dian    **1S.JKT**    be.in.business.SUN



Example (9d)

- 41 Asmita: .. *survai dulu?*  
survey First  
'Will (we) do a survey first?'
- 42 Bayu: *Aku mah emang udah.*  
**1s** PART.SUN indeed already  
'For me, that's it?'
- 43 Asmita: *Udah di-approve gitu,*  
already DI-approve.ENG like.that  
'Has it already been approved,'

Cream Soup 771-773

In example (10a) Bayu describes *bakso* 'meatball soup' kiosks in one area of Bandung, claiming Balong Gede is the best. When he asks Asmita if she has tried it, Bayu uses Jakartan *lu* '2s' combined with blunt question structure similar to that in (9a). At this point in the conversation Bayu controls the direction of talk and his use of *lu* adds to the performativity of his question. When Bayu uses *kamu* in his next line, the shift corresponds with a shift from a personal reading of second person reference to a generic reading as he explains how to find Balong Gede. This continues for several lines and includes three generic instances of *kamu*. As Bayu homes in on Balong Gede, his friends realise he is describing a kiosk known to sell pork, example (10b). These young people are Muslim and the friends begin to laugh at Bayu's ignorance. Bayu demands to know how they know it is pork, using *kamu* – no longer with a generic reading but as direct personal reference. Having been confronted with the possibility that he had eaten pork (and liked it), Bayu is on the defensive. His question in line 37 no longer has the bravado of his early question in line 4. In this context he falls back on his default addressee reference term *kamu*. His dismay at the thought he might have eaten pork, and his attempt to deny this, mean he can no longer muster to what it takes for the stylising deployment of *lu*.

Example (10a)

- 1 Bayu: .. *Yang paling enak tuh Balong Gede.*  
REL most delicious that Balong Gede
- 2 ... *Lu udah pernah nyobain belum?*  
**2.JKT** already ever N-try-APPL not.yet  
'The best is Balong Gede. Have you ever tried (it) yet or not?'

- 3 Alma: *Apa?*  
 what  
 ‘What?’
- 4 Bayu: .. *Jadi kalau misalnya kamu ke alun-alun=.*  
 so if example.DEF 2s to city.square  
 ‘So if for example you go to the city square.’

Cream Soup 1177-1180

Example (10b)

- 32 Alma: *Itu kan babi Bayu.*  
 that part pork Bayu  
 ‘That’s pork Bayu [they serve pork bakso].’
- 33 Asmita: ... <@ *Bayu tuh,*  
 Bayu That
- 34 *babi= [makanannya @>.*  
 pork food-DEF  
 ‘Bayu eats pork.’ (launging)
- 35 @@@]
- 36 Alma: [@@@]
- 37 Bayu: [[*Tahu dari Mana kamu*]]?  
 know from Where 2s  
 Where do you know that from? [that Balong Gede *bakso* is pork].’
- 38 Alma: [[@@@]]
- 39 Asmita: [[@]]
- 40 <@ *Iya beneran @>.*  
 yes true  
 ‘It’s true.’ (laughing)
- 41 Bayu: *Nggak=.*  
 no  
 ‘No.’

Cream Soup 1209-1217

In Bayu’s deployment of *lu* and *kamu* we can see how indexical significance arise from the localised moments of interaction and how the quickly changing dynamics of

conversation can mean equally quickly changing semiotic resonances of person reference, as he falls back on his default resources when put on the defensive. This can be read as reinforcing his core non-Jakartan – that is Bandung – identity, despite his frequent use of language associated with the capital. In this way we see the meaning of the pronouns arising in part from the semiotic resonance of their perceived provenance in Jakarta, but equally as arising out of their moment-by-moment deployment by interlocutors.

#### 4. Conclusion

These examples have illustrated how young people in Bandung use Indonesian, Jakartan and Sundanese resources for self- and addressee-reference. As demonstrated by the ideologies expressed by speakers about pronominal usage, the perduring means associated with these terms reflect the speakers' location in Bandung, a regional hub sitting in the (near) periphery of the national hub, Jakarta. These meanings in turn inform the deployment of person reference in conversation, where their immediate meaning and contribution to the construction of stance flexibly emerge from the shifting social needs of face-to-face interaction.

#### Appendix A: Transcription and glossing conventions

Transcription conventions (following Du Bois et al. 1993)

Asmita:	speaker attribution
<i>line break</i>	separate line used for each complete or truncated intonation unit
.	final pitch contour
,	continuing pitch contour
?	appeal pitch contour
..	short pause
...	long pause
=	lengthening of preceding segment
[ ]	speaker overlap
@	pulse of laughter
<@ @>	laughing voice quality

Glossing conventions

1S	first person singular
2S	second person singular
APPL	applicative suffix
DEF	definite enclitic
DI	<i>di-</i> P-trigger verbal prefix
EMPH	emphatic
ENG	English

GAUL	<i>Gaul</i> -style slang
HES	hesitation
HORT	hortative
IMP	imperative
IND	Indonesian
JKT	Jakartan Indonesian
MEN	<i>meN</i> - verbal prefix
N	nasal verbal prefix
NEG	negative
PART	discourse particle
REDUP	reduplication
REL	relative clause marker
SI	personal article
SUN	Sundanese
SURP	surprise particle

### Appendix B: Full version of example (9)

- 1 Asmita: *Eh tapi gimana yah?*  
HES but how yeah
- 2 ..(1.3) *Laku moal?*  
marketable NEG.SUN  
'Uh but how will (it) be huh? Will (it) sell or not?'
- 3 Bayu: *Laku lah [kayaknya mah].*  
marketable EMPH seems.like PART.SUN  
'Seems like (it) will sell for sure.'
- 4 Asmita: [*target pasar*].  
target.ENG market  
'the target market.'
- 5 Bayu: .. *Dian gue pangjualkeun,*  
Dian 1S.JKT be.in.business.SUN
- 6 *sok lu makan kagak?*  
HORT.SUN 2S.JKT eat NEG  
'Dian if I go into business, come on will you eat some or not?'
- 7 Dian: ... *Ya nggak tahu.*  
yeah NEG know  
'Yeah (I) don't know.'

- 8 Asmita: [*Kok nggak tahu*].  
SURP NEG know  
'How can (you) not know.'
- 9 Dian: [*enak ngga=k*].  
tasty NEG
- 10 .. *enak ngga=k*.  
tasty NEG  
'Is (it) any good or not? Is (it) any good or not?'
- 11 Bayu: *Eh*,  
uh
- 12 *gua ngebantuin Gamdes lho ni=h*.  
1S.JKT N-help-APPL.JKT graphic design PART this
- 13 ... *Beli lah*.  
buy IMP  
'Uh I'm helping with the Graphic Design [assignment] right. Buy some.'
- 14 Alma: .. <@ *Ngancam* @>.  
N-threaten  
'(He)'s threatening (you).'
- 15 Asmita: @@
- 16 Dian: *Gitulah*.  
like.that-EMPH
- 17 .. *Gitulah*.  
like.that-EMPH  
'That's how it is. That's how it is.'
- 18 Bayu: *Eh bagus nih Gamdesna yah*.  
HES good this graphic.design-DEF.SUN yeah
- 19 .. *mun hade ditanyakeun moal?*  
if.SUN good.SUN DI-ask.SUN neg.SUN
- 20 *Bae nya*.  
doesn't.matter.SUN yeah.SUN  
'Uh the Graphic Design is good you know. If it's good will (they) ask about (it) or not?'

- 21 Dian: .. *Ulah* *alus-alus* *teuing*.  
 NEG.HORT.SUN good.SUN-REDUP very.SUN  
 ‘Don’t [make it] too good.’
- 22 Alma: *Emang bagus gitu?*  
 indeed good like.that  
 Is (the drawing) actually good?
- 23 Dian: *Ké aing di= .. titah*  
 later.SUN 1s.SUN DI.SUN/IND order.SUN  
  
*mempertanggung-[jawabkeun kan],*  
 MEN-responsible-APPL.SUN PART  
 ‘I’m going to have to be responsible [for it] you know.’
- 24 Bayu: [*ulah gitu Alma mah*].  
 NEG.HORT.SUN like that Alma PART.SUN  
 ‘Don’t be like that Alma.’
- 25 X: .. *bingung*.  
 confused  
 ‘Confused.’
- 26 Bayu: ... *Nggak deng*.  
 NEG PART.GAUL  
 ‘No it’s not.’
- 27 *Urang .. udah nggak jago gambar*.  
 1s.SUN already NEG champion.SUN/IND draw.SUN/IND  
 ‘I’m not any good at drawing.’
- 28 .. *Urang geus teu bisa gambar*.  
 1s.SUN already.SUN NEG.SUN can.SUN/IND draw.SUN/IND  
 ‘I’m not any good at drawing.’
- 29 *Tara*.  
 never.SUN
- 30 *Tara ngagambar*.  
 never.SUN N.SUN-draw.SUN/IND  
 (I)’ve never, never drawn.
- 31 Alma: ... XXX

- 32 Bayu: ... <@ *Batur mah gampang .. euh.*  
 other.people.SUN PART.SUN easy.SUN/IND PART.SUN  
 ‘It’s easy for other people.’
- 33 *Tinggal hitung-hitungan doang @>*  
 remain figure.out-REDUP just.JKT  
 ‘All there is [for them] is to just figure it out.’
- 34 ... (04.7)
- 35 (SINGING)
- 36 Asmita: *Jadi gimana?*  
 so how
- 37 ... *udah itu aja?*  
 already that just
- 38 ... *Kapan?*  
 when
- 39 .. *belanja?*  
 shop
- 40 ... *kapan survai?*  
 when survey
- 41 .. *survai dulu?*  
 survey first  
 ‘So where are (we) at? Is that it? When will (we) shop, when will (we) do a survey? Will (we) do a survey first?’
- 42 Bayu: *Aku mah emang udah.*  
 1s part.SUN indeed already  
 ‘For me, that’s it.’
- 43 Asmita: *Udah di-approve gitu,*  
 already DI-approve.ENG like.that
- 44 *sama si bapaknya,*  
 by SI mister-DEF
- 45 *memang harus .. creamsoup?*  
 indeed must cream soup.ENG  
 ‘Has it already been approved by our professor that it has to be cream soup?’

## References

- BeritaSATU TV. (2013). Dialog: Bahasa Indonesia Vs Bahasa Gaul. *BeritaSATU TV Official Youtube Channel*. <<https://youtu.be/IHgro-d4t0E>>.
- Blommaert, J. (2010). *The Sociology of Globalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Blommaert, J. and Rampton, B. (2011). Language and Superdiversity. *Diversities* 13(2), 1-21.
- Bucholtz, M. (2002). Youth and cultural practice. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 31, 525-552.
- Djenar, D.N. (2006). Patterns and variation of address terms in colloquial Indonesian. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics* 29(2), 22.1-22.16.
- Djenar, D.N. (2014). Pronouns and socio-spatial ordering in informal Indonesian. Monash Linguistics Seminar, 26 August 2014.
- Djenar, D.N. and Ewing, M.C. (2015). Language varieties and youthful involvement in Indonesian fiction. *Language and Literature* 24(2), 108-128.
- Du Bois, J.W., Schuetze-Coburn, S., Paolino, D., Cumming, S. (1993). Outline of discourse transcription. In: Edwards, J.A., Lampert, M.D. (Eds.), *Talking Data: Transcription and Coding Methods for Language Research* (pp. 45-89). Lawrence Erlbaum, Hillsdale, NJ.
- Enfield, N.J. (2007). Meanings of the unmarked: How ‘default’ person reference does more than just refer. In: N.J. Enfield & T. Stivers (Eds.), *Person reference in interaction: Linguistic, cultural and social perspectives* (pp.97-120). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Englebretson, R. (2007). Grammatical resources for social purposes: Some aspects of stancetaking in colloquial Indonesian conversation. In R. Englebretson (Ed.), *Stancetaking in discourse: Subjectivity, evaluation, interaction* (pp. 69-110). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Errington, J.J. (1998). *Shifting languages: interaction and identity in Javanese Indonesia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ewing, M.C. (2014). Motivations for first and second person subject expression and ellipsis in Javanese conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 63, 48-62.
- Ewing, M.C. 2005. Colloquial Indonesian. In K.A. Adelaar and N.P. Himmelmann (Eds), *The Austronesian Languages of Asia and Madagascar* (pp. 227–258). London: Routledge.
- Foulcher K., Moriyama M. and Budiman, M. (2012). *Words in motion: language and discourse in post-new order Indonesia*. Singapore: NUS Press.
- Heller, M. (2007). Bilingualism as ideology and practice. In M. Heller (Ed.) *Bilingualism: A Social Approach* (pp. 1–22). London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Januar, A. (2014). Ketika Kaum Alay Merusak Bahasa Indonesia. *Okezone 19 Maret 2014*. <<http://news.okezone.com/read/2014/03/19/337/957255/ketika-kaum-alay-merusak-bahasa-indonesia/large>>.
- Jørgensen, J.N., Karrebæk M.S., et al. (2011). Polylinguaging in Superdiversity. *Diversities* 13(2), 23–37.
- Maier, H.M.J. (1993). From heteroglossia to polyglossia: The creation of Malay and Dutch in the Indies. *Indonesia* 56, 37-65.
- Makoni, S. and Pennycook, A. (2007). Disinventing and reconstituting languages. In S. Makoni and A. Pennycook (Eds), *Disinventing and Reconstituting Languages* (pp. 1–41). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Manning, P.H. (2001). Social deixis. *Anthropological Linguistics* 43(1), 54-100.

- Manns, H. (2011). *Stance, Style and Identity in Java*. PhD Thesis: Monash University.
- Parker, L. and Nilan, P. (2013). *Adolescents in Contemporary Indonesia*. London: Routledge.
- Pennycook, A. (2010). *Language as a Local Practice*. London: Routledge.
- Rostika, E. (2009). *Sikap Bahasa dan Perilaku Berbahasa Mahasiswa Suku Sunda di Kota Bandung: Satu Kajian Sosiopragmatik*. MA Thesis: Padjadjaran University.
- Smith-Hefner, N. (2007). Youth language, *Gaul* sociability, and new Indonesian middle class. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 17(2): 184-203.
- Sneddon, J.N. (2006). *Colloquial Jakartan Indonesian*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Sneddon, J.N., Adelaar, A., Djenar D.N. & Ewing, M.C. (2010). *Indonesian: A Comprehensive Grammar*, 2nd ed. New York: Routledge.
- Stivers, T., Enfield, N.J. and Levinson, S.C. (2007). Person reference in interaction. In N.J. Enfield and T. Stivers (Eds.), *Person reference in interaction: linguistic, cultural and social perspectives* (pp. 1-20). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tamtomo, K. (2012). Multilingual youth, literacy practices, and globalization in an Indonesian city: a preliminary exploration. *Tilburg Papers in Culture Studies* 41.
- Tasai, S.A. (2006). Teenlit, masalah baru pernovelan Indonesia. <[http://www.republika.co.id/cetak\\_berita.asp?id=239147&kat\\_id=364 &edisi=Cetak](http://www.republika.co.id/cetak_berita.asp?id=239147&kat_id=364 &edisi=Cetak)>.
- Thomason, S.G. and Everett, D.L. (2001). Pronoun borrowing. *Berkeley Linguistics Society* 27, 301-315.