

Tilburg Papers in Culture Studies

Paper 205

Transnationalism, Globalisation, and Superdiversity

by

Zane Goebel[®] (University of Queensland)

z.goebel@uq.edu.au

April 2018



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

Transnationalism, Globalisation, and Superdiversity

Zane Goebel, University of Queensland

INTRODUCTION

Transnationalism, globalization, and superdiversity can all be viewed as ideas, processes and embodied practices. Using tools for analysing discursive semiosis (Agha, 2007) and thinking about chronotopes and their relationship to identity (Blommaert, 2016; Blommaert & De Fina, 2017; Goebel, 2017b; Goebel & Manns, 2018), this chapter shows how we can get an understanding of the phenomena these terms describe. At the same time, I examine how discursive processes create, challenge, and erase boundaries for those implicated in the use of these three terms. My use of discursive analysis highlights some of the limitations of these ideas, especially in relation to the concept of identity that is common to all of these notions. My empirical focus will be multiple data sets, including transcripts of public addresses, interviews, focus group talk, policy documents, newspaper stories, and blogs. I start by looking at how a group of transnational Indonesians discursively create four different types of identities over the course of a number of communicative events. I then trace the discursive connections between different communicative events about the idea of good governance, while highlighting the tensions between change and stability in the semiotic resources being used to construct these ideas. Building on my analysis of this material, I point to how discursive simplification and diversification co-exists in many of the texts that I examine. The take home from this chapter as a whole is that one recurring problematic for studies focusing on transnationalism, globalisation, and superdiversity relates to the notion of identity, which I suggest can be overcome if we see identity as scale-specific, connected, and constantly emergent.

TRANSNATIONALISM, GLOBALIZATION, AND SUPERDIVERSITY

In line with anthropologists, sociolinguists, economists, historians, and social theorists, we can define transnationalism and globalization as the movement or flow of people, goods, services, and ideas between nation-states or countries as well as the complex connections between all of these (Appadurai, 1996; Bauman, 2001; Blommaert, 2010; Brettell, 2003; Castells, 1996; Giddens, 1999; Harvey, 2005; Hobsbawm, 1992; Marcus, 1995; Stiglitz, 2006; Tsuda, 2003; Wallerstein, 2004). For example, tourists, migrants, students, and refugees are all mobile people moving from one country to the next. This type of human mobility has typically been described as transnationalism, and part of a bigger phenomenon called globalization. Transnationalism and globalization can also be defined as connections between one slice of social practice within one timespace and another. For example, a bitcoin trade, a wire transfer of money, a labour hire agency connecting a person with an employer through a myriad of electronically mediated texts and phone calls, or a Skype call between a migrant worker and their family back home.

While we can think of globalization and transnationalism as a phenomenon that shrinks the world, ably facilitated by infrastructures that enable space-time compression (Harvey, 1989), such as increasingly rapid transportation or the ability to have face-to-face conversations over great distances, some have pointed out that globalization can also be seen in expansionist terms too (Clifford, 1997; Heller, Bell, Daveluy, McLaughlin, & Noel, 2015; Tsing, 2005). Indeed, it seems better to characterize globalization as a process that moves between compression and expansion on the one hand and simplification and diversification on the other. For example, the movement of people, capital, and equipment that are part of mining operations, typically take people, goods, and ideas to new territories or frontiers in similar ways to early colonial endeavours (Clifford, 1997; Heller et al., 2015; Tsing, 2005; Wallerstein, 2004). These global flows are expanding rather than compressing space, while the role of infrastructures for creating connection and compressing time and space remain in place. At the same time, those trying to understand, manage, and extract profit and taxes from these new frontiers typically try to simplify

it through new surveillance techniques, including mapping, town planning, census, laws, and so on (Scott, 1998). As Scott (1998) points out, the outcome of this is a narrow view of what is normative, and who fits these categories or more precisely diversity is erased within the social, economic, political, linguistic, cultural, and natural environments as are the connections between these domains. As this expansion and simplification occurs, other processes elsewhere are in play.

Appadurai (1996) has observed that representations and mass-mediated stories about migrant experiences in general motivate others to migrate. The resultant migrant hubs and frontier outposts that this movement creates attracts other people, ideas, and capital, including banks, education providers, health and communication infrastructure providers, and so on (Clifford, 1997; Heller et al., 2015; Tsing, 2005), which in turn help facilitate a new wave of space-time compression. Scott (1998: 84) notes that eventually all of these processes, for better or worse, are influenced by the state and its governance apparatus which contribute to further waves of simplification and normativization.

As pointed out by Blommaert (2010), the creation of such normativities inevitably create inequalities, especially for anyone who has not been socialized into a particular system. For example, the type of diversification that has been engendered by economic and forced migration and ably assisted by people smugglers, faster transportation, and an internet society has meant that many do not neatly fit into state understandings of personhood (Blommaert, 2001; Jacquemet, 2011, 2015; Karrebæk, 2016; Maryns, 2006). These problems of fitting people into categories has produced new descriptors both for academics and for administrators. Of particular interest here, is the descriptor superdiversity. We can view the term superdiversity as referring to the experiential outcome of transnationalism and globalization, both from the perspective of those who are mobile and those who encounter those who are mobile.

The idea of superdiversity received uptake via the publication of Vertovec's (2007b) paper "Super-diversity and its implications". In this paper, superdiversity referred to the diversification

of diversity in European contexts, especially the UK. In this paper, this diversification was experienced, commented upon, and bureaucratized (in policy) as a new and potentially troublesome phenomena. Vertovec's (2007b) discussion of superdiversity and his discussion of how we thought about transnationalism and identity (Vertovec, 2007a), also pointed to the need to understand the everyday mundane practices that contributed to or detracted from multiculturalism under conditions of superdiversity. For example, the idea of transnationalism often constructed borders between migrants and their hosts while presupposing singular identities. This was most typically done by discursively positioning migrants as members of a homogenous national group moving to another nation populated by another homogenous group. We can see this discursive work in action in anthropological accounts, such Tsuda's (2003) account of mobility between Brazil and Japan:

- 1 A complete and comprehensive ethnography of transnational processes requires
- 2 multisited fieldwork (Marcus 1995; cf. Clifford 1992) in the various countries involved.
- 3 In the case of transnational migrants, fieldwork must ideally be conducted in both the
- 4 sending and the receiving country in order to understand the influence of migration on
- 5 their ethnicity and identity and analyse the transnational linkages between the two
- 6 countries that frame their experiences. Moreover it is impossible to fully understand
- 7 the ethnic status and identity of migrants in the host society without first understanding
- 8 their prior status and identity in their home country, since their sociocultural
- 9 experiences back home inevitably condition how they interpret and react to their ethnic
- 10 experiences abroad... (Tsuda, 2003: 55)

While identity is problematized in the book as a whole, the above quote discursively constructs people as only having one identity. This is done via the use of the use of singular versions of "ethnicity" (lines 5, 7, and 9) and "identity" (lines 5, 7-8), rather than their plural counterparts,

“ethnicities” and “identities”. While we also see that identity changes through movement between host country and home country (lines 7-8), once in the host country identity is also discursively constructed as fixed, rather than situation dependent (lines 6-10). In this case, Tsuda’s group of Japanese-Brazilian migrants became more Brazilian than Brazilians while in Japan through the running of parades that celebrated Brazilian-ness, and so on.

With a long history of engaging with issues of human contact, social cohesion, and identity (Antaki & Widdicombe, 1998; Auer, 1998; Blommaert, 2001; Eastman, 1992; Gumperz, 1982; Le Page & Tabouret-Keller, 1985; Milroy & Muysken, 1995; Rampton, 1995; Scollon & Scollon, 1981; Tannen, 1984; Wortham, 2006), sociolinguists, discourse analysts, and linguistic anthropologists have developed the idea of superdiversity in multiple ways (Arnaut, Blommaert, Rampton, & Spotti, 2015; Arnaut, Karrebæk, Spotti, & Blommaert, 2016; Blommaert, 2013; Blommaert & Varis, 2015; De Fina, Ikiszoglu, & Wegner, 2017; Duarte & Gogolin, 2013; Faudree & Schulthies, 2015; Goebel, 2015c).

Some use superdiversity as a descriptor for human contact in contemporary urban spaces across the globe (Jacquemet, 2011; Jørgensen, 2012). In other cases, superdiversity has been interpreted as an exemplar of academic faddism and branding (Pavlenko, 2017), an a-scalar perspective (Reyes, 2014), or over emphasizing the role of migration in creating the types of complexity covered by the term (Goebel, 2015c). More importantly, however, the idea of superdiversity has motivated the emergence of a new paradigm. This paradigm shift challenges old concepts, such as the notion of language, community, ethnicity, multiculturalism, multilingualism, and so on, by bringing together many areas of sociolinguistic, social science, and humanities research. In doing so, this work has sought to engender new ways of talking about and reconceptualizing human contact and connection (Arnaut et al., 2015; Arnaut et al., 2016; Blommaert, 2015b; Goebel, Under review).

For example, drawing on a critique of work in the area of codeswitching (Alvarez-Cáccamo, 1998; Auer, 1995; Gafaranga & Torras, 2002; Meeuwis & Blommaert, 1994; Swigart,

1992), new terms have been coined to talk about everyday language practices. These terms include polylinguaging (Jørgensen, Karrebæk, Madsen, & Møller, 2011; Karrebæk, 2016; Møller, 2016); translanguaging (Garcia & Wei, 2014; Jaspers, 2018); heteroglossia (Blackledge & Creese, 2014; Rampton, 2011); and metrolingualism (Pennycook & Otsuji, 2015). These terms were coined to underscore that we can't assume that the semiotic resources used in interaction can be associated in any straight-forward way with a set of speakers often referred to as a community. Instead of interpreting language-community relationships primarily from the perspective of a nation-state, in this entry language, community, and identity are all seen as discursively produced social constructs that are produced in different timespaces or scales and interconnected through chains of imitations and reflexive commentaries about the value of particular social practices (Agha, 2007; Blommaert, 2015a; Du Bois, 2007; Faudree & Schulthies, 2015; Gal, 2012; Goebel, 2015c, 2017b, Under review; Goebel & Manns, 2018; Lempert, 2014, 2016; Moore, 2011; Silverstein, 2015). In this view – and in line with Scott's (1998: 310) ideas that simplification always engenders diversification work – each discursive event can also be treated as an instance of diversification. In the following section, I provide examples of these processes as a way of both explaining and complicating ideas associated with transnationalism, globalization, and superdiversity.

SOCIAL IDENTIFICATION AND TRANSNATIONALISM

This section takes a discursive perspective to show how identities are negotiated, constructed and emergent from one situation to the next, as well as how they can also solidify over the course of multiple interactions in settings inhabited by the same participant constellation. By taking a discursive view, I complicate ideas about identity as singular. In doing so, I hope to show how focusing on discursive practices can provide a useful corrective to the identity erasure that comes with lumping together a group of migrants as a citizen of this country or that country. This is not to say that lumping is bad – and in the next sentence I will do exactly this – but just to say that

examining processes that form and split or distinguish a group is also important. My empirical focus will be the talk of a group of Indonesians who were living, working, and studying in Japan. In Goebel (2012, 2015c) I have discussed the larger project from which I will draw my data, and so here I will just focus on some of the data and analysis presented in these more detailed studies.

These Indonesians all voluntarily responded to an advertisement seeking participants for a study concerned with how people understood representations of people and events in Indonesian soap operas and films. This group was one of five groups who were invited to attend four viewing and interview sessions. Typically, these groups consisted of age-mates, although many like the group discussed here were relative strangers. To reduce imposition and travel costs, these sessions were held each Saturday afternoon when they coincided with the weekly Indonesian Saturday school that taught Indonesian, Mathematics, English, and Social Studies to many of these participants' children. The viewing and interview sessions started with some informal chatting to participants about their backgrounds and about my research project. Following this, an Indonesian serial or film was screened and directly afterwards I interviewed participants.

While all five participants had been living in Japan for around ten months, only two of the four women – Nina and Fatimah – could be said to have a history of frequent and sustained interaction while in Japan (all names are pseudonyms). Indeed, the first viewing session was the first time Farid (the only male), had met these women. Nuraeni and Endang had met on only a couple of occasions during functions that were organized by the Indonesian student association. Most participants had a wide range of semiotic repertoires associated with named languages, including English, French, Japanese, Indonesian (Indonesia's national language), one or more of Indonesia's regional languages, such as Javanese and Sundanese, and the ability to recognize some of these languages. This ability was a product of processes of enregisterment described in detail in Goebel (2015c).

Each participant used fragments of these repertoires to socially identify themselves and others. They also used interactional strategies of repetition as a way of aligning with and showing

social sameness with others in the group. As we will see, some identities were short-lived, others ratified over a couple of conversational turns, and yet others across the course of the viewing and interview session. The three points to keep in mind here are: 1) being an Indonesian living in Japan was not the only identity that was made relevant and/or ratified through these people's discursive work; 2) this discursive work was connected with identities from other scales through imitations of semiotic fragments from other scales and through evaluative commentaries of these recontextualizations; and 3) while we get glimpses of how seeing and thinking like a state impacts on social identification (in this case Sundanese-ness), typically the uptake of these identities produces new identities (i.e. diversifies the range of people who might be thought of as belonging to this group or that group).

In presenting a temporal view of the social identification processes at work across two speech situations, here I will start with the first viewing and interview session. During this session, I played an episode titled *Cipoa* "Con artist". It was part of a series called *Noné* (Missy), broadcast in 1995 by the television station, *TPI*. In contrast to the government owned and run station, *TPI* was one of the five commercial stations (*Indosiar*, *SCTV*, *RCTI* and *ANTV*) that came online after television was deregulated in Indonesia in 1990 (Kitley, 2000). This serial is notable because of some characters' frequent alternation between semiotic fragments stereotypically associated with Indonesian and semiotic fragments stereotypically associated regional languages, – in this case Sundanese words and Sundanese-like pronunciation of some Indonesian forms – and because of the presence of other signs that anchor the story geographically to a stereotypically Sundanese speaking region.

At this session, all five participants were present. In the first two minutes of the teledrama an unseen character provided a short monologue that was primarily in the national language, Indonesian, but also contained a word that was pronounced using a stylized accent stereotypically associated with a particular ethnicity, in this case Sundanese. Participants recognized one of the

actors and provided her name. Shortly thereafter the serial title “Cipoa” appears on the screen and the following talk ensues¹.

Extract 1 Community as mutual alignment and displayed through recognition

Endang

1 cipor = Cipor.

Nuraeni

2 = cipoa = Cipoa.

Endang

3 = cipor = Cipor.

Fatimah

4 = cipo (0.5) ah Cipo, ah,

5 (0.5) eh bukan ya . eh, no right?

Endang

6 ci . cipor gitu (0.5) sungai por gitu = Ci, like Cipor, like the river Por.

Nina

7 =

8 cipoa apa ci por . artinya apa . Is it cipoa or cipor, what’s the meaning?

Endang

9 ci . por = Cipor.

Fatimah

10 = ci = Ci.

Nuraeni

11 = sungai por = The river Por.

Nina

12 = artinya Sister ((Endang)) what does it mean?

13 apa mbak =

Fatimah

14 = sungai por gitu = Like the river Por.

Endang

15 = iya . Yeah,

16 kali (laughs) (1.0) a river.

Fatimah

17 kayak cirebon gitu (laughs) cipoa = Like Cirebon yeah? Cipoa.

Nina

18 =

19 kayak nama tempat = Like a place name?

In the above transcript we see that participants are engaged in mutual alignment via repetitions of an unfamiliar word, *cipoa* (lines 1-5) and then what this term might mean (lines 6-19). There are two things of interest in this talk. First, we get a little bit of an insight into the extent to which participants who are not from areas stereotypically associated with Sundanese-ness and speakers of Sundanese can nevertheless display some familiarity with semiotic fragments that potentially index Sundanese-ness. In my conversations with participants prior to this session, only Nuraeni claimed an ability in Sundanese, which is a semiotic register where the prefix “ci” is found in place names.

Second, we also see that it is actually a participant from a non-Sundanese background (Endang) who starts the lesson for Nina about the meaning of this prefix (line 6), rather than Nuraeni. In terms of the discursive construction of community, we are seeing the potential emergence of a local one that involves a specific participant constellation engaged in mutual alignment, who are also part of a community who can recognize and display knowledge of signs

associated with a particular ethnic community (on lines 9 and 14-17). Here, Endang, Fatimah, and Nuraeni are demonstrating their knowledge of what the prefix *ci* means, in this case “river”. As the actors’ names appear on the screen, Nuraeni notes that one of the actors, Nike Ardila, is from the same neighborhood as she, namely Bandung (the capital city of West Java and the stereotypical Sundanese speaking heartland), as can be seen in Extract 2.

Extract 2 Self-identification through reference to place

- | | | |
|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| 1 | (looks at Fatimah, smiles and touches chest | Heh, the same, the same neighborhood |
| 2 | rapidly) eh satu . satu kampung . satu | (as me), the same neighborhood (as |
| 3 | kampung [makanya dikenali . | me), that is why I recognize ((her)). |

Endang

- | | | |
|---|----------|----------|
| 4 | [oh ya] | Oh yeah. |
|---|----------|----------|

Nuraeni

- | | | |
|---|--|----------------------------|
| 5 | bandung . bandung . he he he [he (breaths | Bandung, Bandung (laughs). |
| 6 | in) . | |

Endang

- | | | |
|---|----------|---------------|
| 7 | [ciamis | Ciamis right? |
| 8 | bukan] = | |

Nuraeni

- | | | |
|---|----------------------|-----------------------|
| 9 | = cipoa kan he he he | Cipoa right? (laughs) |
|---|----------------------|-----------------------|

The import of Extract 2 is that through identifying her place of origin as Bandung (lines 2-3 and 5), Nuraeni also implicitly identifies herself as a Sundanese speaker. I say implicitly because of the long-term processes of enregisterment that have constructed ethnic communities by discursively linking linguistic form to territory and group in Indonesia (Goebel, 2015c). By identifying herself as hailing from a particular territory, she is also projecting membership in a

particular ethnic community, in this case a Sundanese one. In a sense, Nuranei's talk has moved her from a member of a community with knowledge about linguistic signs associated with ethnic communities (Extract 1, line 11) to a person associated with the specific ethnic community that has become the object of mutual alignment. Nuraeni's self-identification as a Sundanese speaker continues in Extract 3 and becomes more explicit after a conversation between the main character of the teledrama (Dewi) and the taxi driver. In this televised talk there are many semiotic resources that are stereotypically associated with Sundanese-ness. When an advertisement break occurs, Nina asks about the meaning of a word used (Extract 3).

Extract 3 Solidifying ethnic identities

Nina

1 apa . What?

Farid

2 **sabaraha** = How much?

Nuraeni

3 = (turns toward Farid and Nina)

4 **sabaraha** tu . berapa (while still looking **Sabaraha** ((means)) "how much".

5 at Farid and Nina points and smiles) ha (laughs) understand, ((you both)) don't

6 ha ngerti . nggak ngerti ya [ha ha] understand do you? (laughs)

Farid

7 [(shakes head No.

8 from side to side)

In Extract 3 Nuraeni not only offers the Indonesian equivalent *berapa* (line 4) of the word in question (*sabaraha*), but then goes on to jokingly pointing to Nina and Farid while saying "you don't understand do you" (lines 4-6). These two acts further identify Nuraeni as a speaker of the

medium (in this case Sundanese). At the same time, she also positions Farid and Nina as having no competence in this medium through her comment about whether they understand it and their response (lines 5-8). Put in terms of community, here Nuraeni is simultaneously indexing her membership in a particular community who are knowledgeable about these semiotic resources, while also suggesting that Farid and Nina mustn't be part of that community. With reference to enregistered associations between ethnic communities and ethnic languages, we can also suggest that Nuraeni is inferring that both Nina and Farid have different ethnic identities to the one being represented in the serial.

Note also that while this medium has not yet been explicitly named by any as Sundanese, the preceding represented signs – such as the text on a taxi door “Bandung taxi company”, the car number plate starting with a “D” (used for motor vehicles in Bandung), and architecture – may have provided many participants with clues as to just which ethnic language was being spoken. This is so because of the proclivity for Indonesian school curriculum to contain this type of nation-building information (Goebel, 2007, 2008). The medium being represented in this serial does not go unidentified for much longer, however, when some five minutes later Nuraeni identifies the medium as Sundanese, as in Extract 4. This talk occurs after an elderly woman appears for the third time and again talks with Dewi, this time using many tokens stereotypically associated with Indonesian, together with an heavily accented performance of Indonesian.

Extract 4 Identifying and evaluating LOTI usage

Farid

1 (while laughing) [+translation please+ Translation please⁵.

2 (laughs)]

Nina

3 [(laughs) ya aku juga Yeah, I also
4 nggak ngerti (laughs) don't understand.

Nuraeni

5 [aduh Wow
6 resep iyeuh . bahasa sundana **this Sundanese is good**
7 (while pointing to self with hand while (which is my language).
8 also gazing at Nina and continuing to
9 laugh) =

Endang

10 = (while gazing toward others
11 and smiling) sunda téa = **It's Sundanese?**

Nuraeni

12 = sunda Sundanese.

On line 1 we can see that the old woman's monologue has led Farid to loudly ask for a translation, while also laughing. (The increase in volume is indicated by "+", while laughter while talking is indicated with an underline.) Nina appears to align with Farid's implicit claim of not understanding through her explicit note of "not understanding also" (lines 3-4). In doing so, we see the continued construction of a local community that involves particular participant constellations that at the very least agree on the topic for discussion. While Nuraeni offers no translation and laughs herself, she does evaluate the language used "as good Sundanese" (lines 5-6). These utterances achieve a number of things. First, Farid and Nina continue to build on their emerging identities as not members of Nuraeni's ethnic community, which has now been named. Nuraeni's evaluative commentary makes explicit for the first time her identity as a speaker of the medium being represented in the television serial, while also naming the medium being spoken.

The way Nuraeni authenticates this representation is also important in that it builds upon her earlier claims of being a Sundanese and by extension a Sundanese speaker. For example, while her earlier talk was in Indonesian, now she uses linguistic signs associated with Sundanese (*resep*, *iyeh* and the suffix *na*) while pointing to herself. In this case, we are seeing Nuraeni performing Sundaneseness, while simultaneously evaluating other's usage of signs associated with Sundaneseness: all of which help explicitly identify her as a Sundanese speaker and member of an ethnic community that the others do not belong.

In asking "Why this now?" I need to start by sketching some fundamental tensions. First, prior to and during my fieldwork in Japan, Indonesia had been going through fiscal and political decentralization. Among other things, this process started to re-politicize ethnicity, which had been depoliticized over the course of the thirty-two year regime referred to as the New Order (1966-1998). While Indonesian usage and demonstrating knowledge of fragments of semiotic registers associated with other communities can index unity, showing membership in another community through using another semiotic register (in this case one associated with Sundaneseness) also appears increasingly important (Goebel, 2018; Goebel, Cole, & Manns, 2016; Moriyama, 2012; Quinn, 2012).

This tension seems to be part of Nuraeni's talk, especially if we look back to the prior talk in Extract 1 where it seemed that everybody could make claims to having competence to recognize a certain medium and later in Extract 3 when Nuraeni made claims about understanding the medium spoken through her offering of a translation. Here it seems Nuraeni is backing up her claims of competence and authenticity through her performance of the represented medium. A second tension, however, is that difference – here and in other interactions I recorded as part of my Japan project – was typically quickly downplayed as it was even more important to index one's membership in the community of students who relied upon other Indonesians for financial and physical support during their stay in Japan (Goebel, 2015a).

It is also important to note here that Nuraeni's identity work sits in contrast to Endang's, who builds on her earlier claims (Extract 1) that she is familiar with this medium through her performance of one linguistic sign *téa* (line 11) that is stereotypically associated with Sundanese-ness. In terms of community, we are seeing Endang showing not only membership in a community who has knowledge of forms associated with a particular ethnic community, but also membership in another community, namely those who can use this knowledge to engage in in what has been described as crossing (Rampton, 1995): defined here as the use of semiotic resources not stereotypically associated with the current user. In the interview that followed this viewing session and in the subsequent viewing and interview sessions, this participant constellation continued to construct the four types of communities that have emerged here.

Elsewhere I have discussed these in detail (Goebel, 2012, 2015a, 2015b) and so here I will just summarize the continued discursive work that helped to solidify the four emergent communities noted above. In the viewing session itself, all participants began to evaluate the authenticity of the characters as models of Sundanese-ness in the serial *Si Kabayan* that I screened during this second session. These evaluative commentaries helped to continue building a community who had the ability to recognize signs associated with different ethnic communities. We can see this discursive work as also helping to solidify another type of emerging community. For example, alignment with each others' evaluative commentaries, including frequent imitation of others' talk represented an emergent community or participant constellation that was based on sociability around authenticities. At the same time, this sociability was also implicitly mediated by the need for participants to continue to be seen as sociable amongst a broader community of Indonesians living, working and studying in Japan.

In sum, attention to the talk, participants' life worlds, ideologies about ethnic identity in Indonesia, and the connection between them shows us, that rather than being singular, identity and community are multiple, and that these notions are situation dependent, emergent, and connected to semiotic fragments that are associated with identities and communities that are often

constructed elsewhere in another timespace or scale. In more recent work, identity and its scalar nature are characterized as chronotopes and chronotopic configurations that are always emergent and connected to other chronotopes (Blommaert, 2016, 2018; Blommaert & De Fina, 2017; Goebel, 2017b; Goebel & Manns, 2018). In the following section, I pursue this line of thought through the development of ideas in some of my other more recent work (Goebel, 2017b; Goebel & Manns, 2018).

CHRONOTOPES, GOOD GOVERNANCE, AND GLOBALISATION

As a replacement for the descriptors identity and community, chronotope can be defined as semiotic configurations that discursively emerge within a particular communicative event. Within this event, there will be a particular participant constellation, specific social practices, semiotic fragments from another scale, uptake, and commentaries about the social value of these fragments. Drawing upon ideas about participation frameworks, stance and semiosis (Agha, 2007; Du Bois, 2007; Goffman, 1981), this section provides examples of chronotopes and ways to examine how they are discursively constructed. I will focus on how a word, “efficiency”, becomes part of chronotopes of good governance and the figures of personhood that practice good governance. More specifically, I will trace the word “efficiency” from one origin, in this case discourses of good governance emanating from the IMF and follow its uptake across multiple contexts including the central Indonesia public service and local newspapers.

On the 21 January 1998, the Managing Director of the International Monetary Fund, Michel Camdessus, gave an address “The IMF and Good Governance” to Transparency International, in Paris (Camdessus, 1998). This address linked transparency and good governance (GG) to economic success and the increasing imperative of the IMF to play a role in encouraging GG as a way of ensuring donor countries got lasting value from the funds they provided. Part of his argument about creating an environment for prosperity for fund-receiving countries was recontextualized from an earlier annual meeting of the IMF in September 1996 that adopted a

Declaration on Partnership for Sustainable Growth. This declaration included the following: "promoting good governance in all its aspects, including ensuring the rule of law, improving the efficiency and accountability of the public sector, and tackling corruption" (Camdessus, 1998: no page numbers). Of note here, is how GG links efficiency, accountability, tackling corruption and the public sector. In terms of Goffman's (1981) and Du Bois' (2007) ideas around participation frameworks, there are those attending the address (the ratified participants), the institution addressed (Transparency international), and the countries evaluated as in need of good governance, including Korea, Thailand, and Indonesia (unratified participants), an animator (Camdessus), an author and principle (the IMF), and the stance object "good governance".

By 2001 these ideas had also received uptake by the World Bank and had been written into Indonesia-specific reports about the need for new poverty reduction efforts that involved attention to issues of good governance (World Bank private sector development unit East Asia and Pacific region, 2001). This report imitated much of the content of earlier IMF statements, although the participation framework and stance objects had changed. There was the author (those who authored the report; in this case consultants employed by the World Bank), the principle (the World Bank), the objects of the report (Indonesia, Good Governance, Poverty, Indonesian Civil Servants, Indonesian law, corruption), and the audience (World Bank, its funders, the Indonesian government).

In this report it was noted that in order for Indonesia to become a modern market economy, there was: a need to fight corruption in the public administration; the need for the state to withdraw from ownership of public utilities, while strengthening its oversight role (p. i); as well as a need for good governance in the legal system (p. 30). In other places in the report, the public service was seen as being of poor quality and efficiency (pp. 16-17). In imitating several signs of the IMF's discursive construction of good governance, this new semiotic configuration had not only become linked to more specific areas of Indonesian life, including those responsible for

public utilities and the law, but it has also moved its audience from Indonesia in general to Indonesian public servants and their practices in particular.

This emergent semiotic configuration of the practices of those engaging in good governance received further uptake within the Indonesian government in the early 2000s, although some of its meaning also changed as part of its uptake, as can be seen in the below policy document issued by the Minister for Administrative Reform in 2002.

Extract 5 Uptake and state simplification of signs of good governance

1	...dalam rangka menumbuh-	Within the framework of developing
2	kembangkan etos kerja aparatur,	civil servants work ethic, moral
3	tanggung jawab moral dan guna	responsibilities and to increase the
4	meningkatkan produktivitas serta	productivity and service
5	kinerja pelayanan aparatur kepada	outcomes/efficiency of civil servants
6	masyarakat, dipandang perlu	dealing with the public, it is seen as
7	mengembangkan nilai-nilai dasar	necessary to develop basic principles of
8	Budaya Kerja Aparatur Negara secara	work culture [for] civil servants in an
9	intensif dan menyeluruh pada jajaran	intensive and encompassing way
10	aparatur penyelenggara negara.	amongst the ranks of the nations' civil servants.

(Menteri Pendayagunaan Aparatur Negara, 2002: 1)

While the above memo does not explicitly note good governance, it does imitate and metapragmatically comment upon a whole host of participants and practices that have been linked to the idea of good governance at other scales (e.g. the IMF address and the World Bank Report). It does this by discursively and reflexively valuing and reconfiguring the participation

framework and stance objects. For example, the audience and one of the stance objects continues to be whole Indonesian civil service (lines 2 and 8), “productivity”; and “service outcomes/efficiency” (lines 4-6), while new stance object include “work ethic” (lines 1-2) and “moral responsibilities” (line 3). The metapragmatic commentary about the need to develop “basic” principles of a work culture rather than say “intermediate” or “advanced” principles (lines 7-8) is a value statement that further reconfigures the idea of good governance by linking it to ideas of deficit. While this discursive work produces an emergent diversification of the meaning of good governance, the object (the whole civil service), along with a limited number of examples of efficient practices tends to simplify and generalize the practices of all civil servants.

In addition to receiving uptake in administrative circles in Indonesia, ideas about good governance also received uptake on a large scale in the mass media, including local provincial newspapers (Goebel, 2017b). By mid-2003, for example, the primary concern of these stories revolved around the lack of good public services, accountability of public servants, their need to be politically neutral, and their propensity to be involved in corruption and collusion. In looking at these stories, I started to notice regular instances of imitation and simplification or more precisely iconization; that is, a generalizing phenomenon where there is a lack of deictic anchoring about who and where and/or the use of universal and particular selective deictics (Goebel, 2017b). Elsewhere, I have defined the co-occurrence of these two features with instances of quotations and instances of authorization by powerful figures as “interdiscursive hubs” (Goebel, 2017b). If chronotopes can be thought of at all as finished products, then such hubs are scale-specific ones that provide the semiotic material for subsequent imitation.

As with the enregisterment of the semiotic constellation associated with *pembangunan* “development” in the 1980-1995 period (Heryanto, 1995), these stories can also be seen as imitating semiotic fragments from discourses of development, but with a revised focus on the idea of good governance. Across the course of seven months and a hundred or so front-page stories in an online regional paper, *Suara Merdeka*, ideas of development and good governance

became linked to each other, both within and across stories helping to continually reconfigure an emergent chronotope of good governance and the personas that inhabited this semiotic configuration. Below I have chosen just one of these stories that was published on the 6th June, 2003 because it has a number of features that demonstrate what I mean by interdiscursive hub.

Extract 6 Evaluating the efficiency of civil servants

1	Lebih dari 13.000 pegawai negeri sipil (PNS)	More than thirteen thousand civil servants
2	di lingkungan Pemerintah Kabupaten	(PNS) from within the regional government
3	(Pemkab) Karanganyar akan	(Pemkab) of Karanganyar will be tidied
4	ditertibkan....."Kalau tidak orang daerah asli	up...."If you are not a local or a friend, [then]
5	atau kerabat dekatnya, PNS tidak bisa naik	a civil servant can never be promoted causing
6	jabatan pada jenjang yang lebih tinggi,	[them] to be boxed in. Because of this, this is
7	sehingga terjadi pengkotak-kotakan. Oleh	a matter that needs to be tidied up" he said
8	karenanya, hal itu perlu dibenahi,"	firmly. "By having a deep understanding of
9	tandasnya...."Para pejabat untuk benar-benar	their respective roles and functions, senior
10	memahami peran dan fungsinya masing-	civil servants work responsibilities can be
11	masing sehingga beban tugas yang menjadi	successfully carried out.
12	tanggung jawabnya akan berhasil dengan	
13	baik.... Pengembangan sistem dengan	"The development of a system of rewards and
14	memberikan penghargaan dan hukuman bagi	punishments for staff who do well and
15	staf yang berprestasi dan bermasalah atau	perform poorly or are regularly absent
16	mangkir juga perlu untuk meningkatkan	without leave also need to increase their
17	motifasi kerja," tandasnya. "Kami akan	motivation to work", he said firmly.
18	membuat evaluasi terhadap kinerja para	"We are going to evaluate the efficiency of
19	pejabat dan staf masing unit kerja guna	senior civil servants and their staff in their
20	mengetahui seberapa jauh tanggung jawab	respective departments so that we understand
21		

- 22 mereka dalam melaksanakan tugasnya," how responsible they are in undertaking their
tandas dia duties", he firmly said.

(Source: G8-78, 2003)

The number of bureaucrats (13000) on line 1 helps to generalize the claims that follow about the characteristics of civil servants (*pegawai negeri sipil* or *PNS* for short). The deictic anchoring to a place, Karanganyar, coupled with the continued use of *PNS*, and the use of *para* "a classifier for human groups", and staf "staff" without the use of particular selective deictics helps to imply "all" *PNS*, *pejabat* (senior civil servants), and staff, working in Karanganyar regency, rather than just some. The story is also characterized by quotations (lines 4-9, 9-18, and 19-23) made by a relatively powerful figure, the area head of human resources. The citation of a powerful figure, was common in many of the stories, and more generally seems to add authority to the text. While some of the content imitates discourses of good governance that we have examined earlier, there is also a change in participation framework. The animator and author is the reporter, and the audience is now the imagined and real readership. There are a number of principles including the head of human resources, and the complex web of people and texts that sponsor good governance. The stance objects are those who engage in or not in practices of good governance, and the measures used to evaluate and encourage good governance.

The quotations also often function as metapragmatic evaluative commentaries about the characteristics of this group of civil servants. For example, we find out on lines 4-8, that for this group, it seems difficult to get promoted without some sort of nepotism (either being a local or a friend of the person doing the promoting). Of interest here too is the emerging definition of *kinerja* "efficiency" (line 20), which is linked to the need for civil servants and senior civil servants to understand their responsibilities (lines 9-13), presupposing that they currently do not. Here *kinerja* acts as a potential semiotic connection to emergent chronotopes of good governance from other scales. For example, civil servants characteristic of not understanding their role is

linked on lines 14-24 with other ideas about civil servants as being good at their job (*berprestasi*), problematic (*bermasalah*), a group who is regularly absent without leave (*mangkir*), a group who are required to increase their motivation to work (line 18), and a group whose efficiency needs to be evaluated via the extent that they take on their responsibilities (lines 20-23).

In subsequent months through to February 2004 semiotic partials of these chronotopes of good governance were imitated. While there were some positive characteristics mentioned in some stories during this six-month period, typically most of the characteristics that were imitated and laminated onto these multiple emergent chronotopes of good governance and the efficient personas that inhabited them were negative and engendered through explicit commentaries about deviant behavior. While changes in meaning of efficiency and good governance occurred across Camdessus' address, World Bank reports, Indonesian government policy documents and newspaper stories, some elements remained the same including those responsible for enacting good governance (Indonesian civil servants) and the activity types that were signs of good or bad governance. In part, this relative stability in these chronotopes was a result of the one-to-many participation framework of mass-mediated texts which make it more difficult to contest ongoing mean-making processes (Agha, 2007). In essence, we are getting a closer look at the simplification processes discussed by Scott (1998). If we move to smaller participation frameworks that involve involves face-to-face interaction, then there seems to be much more scope for diversification of meaning, another point made by Scott (1998: 310), a point I take up below.

DISCURSIVE DIVERSIFICATION

Discursive diversification refers to the way discourse contributes to the diversification of the social world at a particular scale. The focus on diversification aligns with contemporary critiques of the idea of superdiversity because it implies that something is more diverse than before without offering a picture of what this "before" looked like (Pavlenko, 2017). If nothing else, the

previous section – along with a reflection on the work on imitation cited in the beginning – shows us that while identifying the origin of anything is very difficult, if we follow discursive chains we can identify a type of “before diversification” through an examination of how discursive work in one-to-many participation frameworks helps to create a sense of stability through simplification and generalization of social life. In what follows, I want to show how uptake in different participation frameworks can contribute to diversification. My empirical focus will continue to follow the term *kinerja*, this time into conversations held in an Indonesian government office, as well as looking at another instances of discursive diversification as it relates to a separatist movement in Indonesia.

The interviews I look at were gathered during five months of fieldwork in a provincial level government department in Semarang, between September 2003 and February 2004. My observations from early September onwards guided the types of questions I asked in these interviews. Even so, typically my questioning was primarily unstructured and done on the fly as answers often created more questions, which I would ask as an interview proceeded. Interviews were typically carried out in the afternoon and often involved two or three interviewees at a time. On many occasions, those being interviewed would need to take a phone call or leave the interview temporarily, and on just as many occasions, those who happened to be near the interview event would join in.

In many interviews *kinerja* became a topic, but its meaning and how it was linked to good governance were changed *in situ*. Elsewhere I have looked at the use of the word *kinerja* in some of these interviews (Goebel, 2015b, 2016b; Goebel & Manns, 2018), and so here I will just provide one extract from Goebel and Manns (2018) to further illustrate what I mean by discursive diversification. I recorded this interview with Pak Agus and Pak Mugi, both male career civil servants, during the afternoon of the 15th of October 2003. This bit of talk occurs thirty minutes into the interview and after we had been talking about visiting etiquette and directness in encounter. The talk in excerpt 7 starts after I ask whether it is time to wrap up the interview

because others in the office are starting to go home. In contrast to extracts 1-4, I will only present basic interview transcripts.

Extract 7 Efficiency and the role of communication

Pak Agus

- | | | |
|---|---|--|
| 1 | Ini kan paling ada pekerjaan yang belum | The [friends here now] right, at the most |
| 2 | selesai, selesaikan. Temen temen itu kan | have work that isn't yet finished. [So they] |
| 3 | ada pekerjaan belum selesai. Jadi | finish it. These friends right, have work |
| 4 | istilahnya kalau budaya kerja di PNS ini, | that isn't yet finished. So the term if [we |
| 5 | memang, artinya kurang anu pak, kurang | are talking about] work culture is less than, |
| 6 | ah kurang, kurang bisa, kurang bisa apa | what is it, Pak, not enough, not enough, not |
| 7 | namanya, di, diapanamanya istilahnya | able to be what is it called, to be what is it |
| 8 | dipaksakan gitu | called the term, to be forced, you know. |

Zane

- | | | |
|---|-------------|-----------|
| 9 | Heeh, heeh. | Yes, yes. |
|---|-------------|-----------|

Pak Agus

- | | | |
|----|--|--|
| 10 | artinya memang, ketergantungan ini pada, | That means that indeed it depends on, on |
| 11 | pada pekerjaan dan volume pekerjaan. | the work and the volume of work. |

Zane

- | | | |
|----|-------------|-----------|
| 12 | Heeh, heeh. | Yes, yes. |
|----|-------------|-----------|

Pak Agus

13 Sehingga, ini juga akan mempengaruhi With the result that this also will influence
14 tadi. Cuma yang yang, sebetulnya yang [what we talked about] earlier. But that
15 perlu di, diperbaiki itu adalah, untuk which, that which needs to be, be fixed is
16 kinerja, itu adalah satu tadi komunikasi efficiency, one thing from before is
17 ya, komunikasi penting communication yes, communication is
important.

Zane

18 Heem. Yes.

Pak Agus

19 yang menyangkut bahasa tadi. That which involves [the type of] language
use [we talked about] earlier.

Zane

20 Hmm. Right.

Pak Agus

21 Artinya komunikasi itu informasi, dari This means the communication is
22 atas bawah itu, imbang berimbang. information from above and below,
23 Kemudian juga yang harus diperbaiki balanced, balanced. Then what also needs
24 adalah pendapatan. fixing is income.

The import of excerpt 7 is that we see how a change in participation framework, setting, activity type (face-to-face talk rather than mass-mediated discussions of good governance), diversifies the meaning of *kinerja* “efficiency” and good governance. More specifically, there are three career civil servants as ratified participants, a number of other unrated civil servants who can become ratified participants, a foreign researcher (me), and an unseen audience to the recording and eventual written documents about the interview. In contrast to the newspaper story,

kinerja and how to improve it are linked with apparent unequal workloads (1-11), the inability to force workers (lines 5-8), communication (lines 15-17), the need for using language in specific ways (line 19), two-way communication (lines 21-22), and income levels (lines 23-24).

In terms of connection – one focus of studies of globalization – what we see in this setting and among this participant constellation is the imitation of the idea of efficiency noted in the types of discourses of good governance found in extracts 5-6. The old part of this imitation is the idea of work output and the new one is its link to specific conditions, practices, and participant constellation. In this case, work output is the connection to other chronotopes, while the evaluative commentary about communication and remuneration become part of a reconfigured and emergent chronotope. This emergent chronotope of good governance is inhabited by figures of personhood whose efficiency is restricted by poor communication practices within the workplace and low remuneration. In other words, and in contrast to the slack civil servant, what is being created here is the persona of the hard-working and underpaid civil servant who can become more efficient through better means of communication and better remuneration.

While thus far my examples of discursive diversification have focused on interviews, though this type of analysis is productive when applied to other genres, such as televised soaps and advertisements, as I have done elsewhere (Goebel, 2015c, 2016a, 2016c). Indeed, this type of analysis could have been applied to excerpts 1 to 4 too, especially in relation to the unknown word *cipoa*. Even so, a close analysis of those extracts would reveal that simplification also occurs in other areas of the communicative event, as I have pointed out in relation to neighbourhood talk (Goebel, 2017a). While often this dual process is quite subtle with recognition being dependent upon interpretation of data from multiple sources (Goebel, 2015c, 2016a, 2016c), sometimes it is more explicit and more easily identified, as in my final extract below, which is drawn from Goebel (In press).

This extract is drawn from a relatively small database of online newspaper reports and blogs that an Indonesian research assistant and I started to gather in 2014. We initially started by

focusing on a combination of a few Indonesian keywords, including *pemekaran* “reterritorialization”, *provinsi* “province” and Cirebon. These keywords had come from my reading of two blogs (Setiawan, 2012; Sutrisman, 2013) about the city and district of Cirebon, which is located on the North coast of West Java. Quantitatively, this material is very small with only around fifty entries from 2008 to 2015. This small number of stories and social media commentaries is an indication of the limited imitation of arguments around reterritorialization, and indeed ultimately, the proposed reterritorialization received no wider uptake by those who could make it a reality. Even so, this material provides an insight into the mechanisms that engendered the massive diversification that occurred in post-authoritarian Indonesia (Goebel, 2015c; Goebel et al., 2016), while also showing how diversification and simplification discursively co-exist.

For example, in the period 2008 to 2010, there were two main groups that sought different types of reterritorialization. One group sought to form a breakaway province out of five existing regencies, namely Cirebon city, and the regencies of Cirebon, Indramayu, Majalengka and Kuningan. This group used reasons such as, historical continuity with older kingdoms, cultural and linguistic sameness, regional development, and better service to the public. Another group, sought to split the existing regency of Cirebon in two as a way of encouraging development and better service to the public. Extract 8 is an example of the former and is from a blog published on the 11th of August 2009 and authored by Eko Risanto.

Extract 8: Blogging about reterritorialization

- | | | |
|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| 1 | Masyarakat pantai utara Jawa Barat yang | The Northern coastal community of |
| 2 | terdiri dari Cirebon, Indramayu, | West Java, which consists of Cirebon, |
| 3 | Majalengka dan Kuningan | Indramayu, Majalengka and Kuningan |
| 4 | (Ciayumajakuning), mendeklarasikan | (Ciayumajakuning), have declared the |

5 berdirinya Propinsi Cirebon. Mereka formation of the Cirebon Province. They
6 ingin mandiri dan berpisah dari induknya seek autonomy and separation from the
7 Provinsi Jawa Barat..... home Province of West Java....
8 “Hal ini seolah-olah semua fungsi ingin “This practice is as if all functions are
9 diambil pusat dan daerah lain seperti desired by the center, and other areas
10 Cirebon tidak diberi porsi,” tutur like Cirebon aren’t given a share,” said
11 Pangeran Arief....Demikian juga masalah Prince Arief....It is also the same with
12 budaya. Budaya Sunda termasuk bahasa culture. Sundanese culture including
13 Sunda mendapat tempat khusus, sebelum Sundanese language have been given a
14 akhirnya budayawan Cirebon mendesak special place, in the end Cirebon cultural
15 adanya pengakuan bahasa Cirebon specialists pushed for recognition of
16 sebagai bahasa daerah Jawa Barat yang Cirebon language as a regional language
17 kemudian berujung pada munculnya of West Java and then struggled until the
18 Perda Bahasa Daerah. appearance of a Local Government
Regulation about Regional Languages.

(Risanto, 2009)

Lines 1-7 provide examples of discursive simplification and diversification. On the one hand, five regencies are hoped to be turned into one (i.e. simplified), while this simplification creates diversity in terms of more provinces via the imagined construction of a new one, Cirebon, from the five regencies. In the second paragraph (lines 8-18) we see both discursive simplification and diversification too. In terms of simplification, the imitation of an old construct equating territory with language, culture, territory and group simplifies the linguistic variation one finds in these areas to just two languages: Sundanese and Cirebon language. At the same time, this discursive work diversifies older ideas about linguistic diversity in the region where only Sundanese was recognized and institutionally supported or enfranchised (Goebel, 2015c, In

press; Goebel, Jukes, & Morin, 2017). Now, Cirebon language is recognized and institutionally authorized on lines 14-18.

CONCLUSION

This paper introduced ideas of transnationalism, globalization, and superdiversity. In doing so, I used tools from contemporary linguistic anthropology to provide a discursive lens that enabled critical engagement with these ideas and the vocabulary sets that inevitably come with them. I pointed out that transnationalism and globalization were processes associated with connection, mobility, compression and expansion, and simplification and diversification, while superdiversity was initially conceptualized as one outcome of these processes. In using discursive analysis to critique these three ideas, I pointed out that while scholarship on transnationalism tried to complicate identities, this work often continued to simplify or essentialize identity. I addressed this issue by looking at how a group of Indonesians living, working, and studying in Japan discursively created four different types of identities over the course of a number of communicative events.

In taking a discursive view of globalization, I then examined how we could trace connections between different communicative events, while highlighting the tensions between change and stability in the semiotic resources that were used to discursively construct the notion of good governance. As my analysis progressed, I also pointed to how discursive simplification and diversification could co-exist in one timespace. In terms of a “take-home” from these analyses, I pointed out that while anthropological scholarship on superdiversity had problematized notions of identity coming out of work on transnationalism (Vertovec, 2007a, 2007b), it is recent linguistic anthropological work on chronotopes and chronotopic identities that seems to have provided ways forward for thinking about identity and how it is or is not discursively constructed and linked to other constructs, such as language, community, and territory. In particular, this work suggests that identity is scale-specific, connected, and constantly emergent.

NOTES

1. I use a period to indicate a perceivable silence. Numbers in brackets indicate silences from three tenths of a second and more. A “[“ indicates the start of overlapping talk, while] indicates the end of overlapping talk. I use a “=” to indicate latching’ and “+” surrounding talking indicates a raise in volume relative to prior and subsequent talk. I also use a series of colons to represents a sound stretch, and in my glosses words surround by “(())” indicate implied talk. Bold font represents a regional language, in this case Sundanese. I should also note that while I do pay attention to the multimodal aspects of this interaction, this is not the primary focus of my analysis. Thus, in the transcripts I merely put a description of some of the other signs used within brackets “()”, rather than also transcribing these meaning making signs.

REFERENCES

- Agha, A. (2007). *Language and social relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Alvarez-Cáccamo, C. (1998). From 'switching code' to code-switching. In P. Auer (Ed.), *Code-switching in conversation: Language, interaction and identity* (pp. 29-48). New York: Routledge.
- Antaki, C., & Widdicombe, S. (Eds.). (1998). *Identities in talk*. London: Sage Publications.
- Appadurai, A. (1996). *Modernity at large: Cultural dimensions of globalization*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Arnaut, K., Blommaert, J., Rampton, B., & Spotti, M. (Eds.). (2015). *Language and Superdiversity*. New York: Routledge.
- Arnaut, K., Karrebæk, M., Spotti, M., & Blommaert, J. (Eds.). (2016). *Engaging superdiversity: recombining spaces, times and language practices*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

- Auer, P. (1995). The pragmatics of code-switching: a sequential approach. In L. Milroy & P. Muysken (Eds.), *One speaker, two languages: cross-disciplinary perspectives on code-switching* (pp. 115-135). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Auer, P. (Ed.) (1998). *Code-Switching in Conversation: Language, Interaction and Identity*. New York: Routledge.
- Bauman, Z. (2001). *Community: seeking safety in an insecure world*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Blackledge, A., & Creese, A. (2014). Heteroglossia as Practice and Pedagogy. In A. Blackledge & A. Creese (Eds.), *Heteroglossia as Practice and Pedagogy* (pp. 1-20). New York: Springer.
- Blommaert, J. (2001). Investigating narrative inequality: African asylum seekers' stories in Belgium. *Discourse & Society*, 12, 413-449.
- Blommaert, J. (2010). *The sociolinguistics of globalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Blommaert, J. (2013). *Ethnography, superdiversity and linguistic landscapes: chronicles of complexity*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Blommaert, J. (2015a). Chronotopes, scales, and complexity in the study of language in society. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 44, 105-116.
- Blommaert, J. (2015b). Commentary: Superdiversity old and new. *Language & Communication*, 44, 82-88.
- Blommaert, J. (2016). Chronotopes, scales and complexity in the study of language in society. In K. Arnaut, M. Karrebæk, M. Spotti, & J. Blommaert (Eds.), *Engaging superdiversity: recombining spaces, times and language practices* (pp. 47-62). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Blommaert, J. (2018). Chronotopes, synchronization and formats. *CTRL+ALT+DEM*, 18-03-2018.
- Blommaert, J., & De Fina, A. (2017). Chronotopic identities: on the timespace organization of who we are. In A. De Fina, D. Ikisozglu, & J. Wegner (Eds.), *Diversity and superdiversity: sociocultural linguistic perspectives* (pp. 1-15). Washington: Georgetown University Press.

- Blommaert, J., & Varis, P. (2015). The importance of unimportant language (Special issue). *Multilingual Margins*, 2(1), 1-4.
- Brettell, C. (2003). *Anthropology and migration: Essays on transnationalism, ethnicity, and identity*. Walnut Creek, Calif.: Altamira Press.
- Camdessus, M. (1998). *The IMF and Good Governance*. Paper presented at the Address to Transparency International, Paris, France, 21 January. Accessed at <https://www.imf.org/external/np/speeches/1998/012198.htm> on 12 August 2015.
- Castells, M. (1996). *The rise of the network society*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Publishers.
- Clifford, J. (1997). *Routes: travel and translation in the late twentieth century*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.
- De Fina, A., Ikiszoglu, D., & Wegner, J. (Eds.). (2017). *Diversity and super-diversity: sociocultural linguistic perspectives*. Washington: Georgetown University Press.
- Du Bois, J. (2007). The stance triangle. In R. Englebretson (Ed.), *Stancetaking in discourse: Subjectivity, evaluation, interaction* (pp. 139-182). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Duarte, J., & Gogolin, I. (Eds.). (2013). *Linguistic superdiversity in urban areas : research approaches*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Eastman, C. (Ed.) (1992). *Codeswitching*. Clevedon, Avon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Faudree, P., & Schulthies, B. (2015). Introduction: “diversity talk” and its others. *Language & Communication*, 44, 1-6.
- G8-78. (2003, 16 June). Tiga belas ribu lebih PNS di Karanganyar ditertibkan. *Suara Merdeka*. Retrieved from <http://suaramerdeka.com/harian/0306/16/slo17.htm> on 24 September 2013.
- Gafaranga, J., & Torras, M.-C. (2002). Interactional otherness: towards a redefinition of codeswitching. *The International Journal of Bilingualism*, 6(1), 1-22.

- Gal, S. (2012). Sociolinguistic regimes and the management of "diversity". In M. Heller & A. Duchene (Eds.), *Language in late capitalism: pride and profit* (pp. 22-42). Hoboken: Routledge.
- Garcia, O., & Wei, L. (2014). *Translanguaging: language, bilingualism and education*. UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Giddens, A. (1999). *Runaway world: How globalisation is reshaping our lives*. London: Profile.
- Goebel, Z. (2007). Enregisterment and appropriation in Javanese-Indonesian bilingual talk. *Language in Society*, 36(4), 511-531.
- Goebel, Z. (2008). Enregistering, authorizing and denaturalizing identity in Indonesia. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 18(1), 46-61.
- Goebel, Z. (2012). Enregisterment, communities, and authenticity: Watching Indonesian teledramas. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 22(2), 1-20.
- Goebel, Z. (2015a). Common ground and conviviality: Indonesians doing togetherness in Japan. *Multilingual Margins*, 2(1), 46-66.
- Goebel, Z. (2015b). *From backstage to frontstage in interviews: I'm a good boss and nothing like what you have heard about Indonesian civil servants*. Paper presented at the Paper presented as part of the panel "The Presentation of Self in Workaday Life" convened at the Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association, November 18-22., Denver, USA.
- Goebel, Z. (2015c). *Language and superdiversity: Indonesians knowledging at home and abroad*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Goebel, Z. (2016a). Modelling unitary and fragmented language ideologies on Indonesian television. In Z. Goebel, D. Cole, & H. Manns (Eds.), *Margins, hubs, and peripheries in a decentralizing Indonesia* (pp. 148-158). Tilburg Papers in Culture Studies, special issue number 162.
- Goebel, Z. (2016b). Represented speech: Private lives in public talk in the Indonesian bureaucracy. *Pragmatics*, 26(1), 51-67.

- Goebel, Z. (2016c). Superdiversity from within: The case of ethnicity in Indonesia. In K. Arnaut, M. Karrebæk, M. Spotti, & J. Blommaert (Eds.), *Engaging superdiversity: recombining spaces, times and language practices* (pp. 251-276). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Goebel, Z. (2017a). From neighborhood talk to talking for the neighborhood. In M. Tomlinson & J. Millie (Eds.), *Imagining the monologic* (pp. 121-140). New York: Oxford University Press (Oxford Studies in the Anthropology of Language).
- Goebel, Z. (2017b). Imitation, interdiscursive hubs, and chronotopic configuration. *Language & Communication*, 53, 1-10.
- Goebel, Z. (2018). Language diversity and language change in Indonesia. In R. W. Hefner (Ed.), *Routledge Handbook of Contemporary Indonesia* (pp. 378-389). New York: Routledge.
- Goebel, Z. (In press). Reconfiguring the nation: re-territorialisation and the changing social value of ethnic languages in Indonesia. In S. Kroon & J. Swanenberg (Eds.), *Language and culture on the margins: global/local interactions*. New York: Routledge.
- Goebel, Z. (Under review). Contact Discourse. *Language in Society*.
- Goebel, Z., Cole, D., & Manns, H. (Eds.). (2016). *Margins, hubs, and peripheries in a decentralizing Indonesia*: [Tilburg Papers in Culture Studies, Special Issue 162.].
- Goebel, Z., Jukes, A., & Morin, I. (2017). Linguistic enfranchisement. *Bijdragen tot de Taal, Land- en Volkenkunde*, 173, 273-295.
- Goebel, Z., & Manns, H. (2018). Chronotopic relations and scalar shifters. *Tilburg Papers in Cultural Studies, Working paper number 204*, 1-31.
- Goffman, E. (1981). *Forms of talk*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Gumperz, J. (1982). *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Harvey, D. (1989). *The condition of postmodernity: an enquiry into the origins of cultural change*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Harvey, D. (2005). *A brief history of neoliberalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Heller, M., Bell, L., Daveluy, M., McLaughlin, M., & Noel, H. (2015). *Sustaining the nation: the making and moving of language and nation*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Heryanto, A. (1995). *Language development and development of language: The case of Indonesia*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Hobsbawm, E. (1992). *Nations and nationalism since 1780: programme, myth, reality* (2nd Ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jacquemet, M. (2011). Crosstalk 2.0: asylum and communicative breakdowns. *Text & Talk - An Interdisciplinary Journal of Language, Discourse & Communication Studies*, 31(4), 475-497.
- Jacquemet, M. (2015). Asylum and superdiversity: The search for denotational accuracy during asylum hearings. *Language & Communication*, 44, 72-81.
- Jaspers, J. (2018). The transformative limits of translanguaging. *Language & Communication*, 58, 1-10.
- Jørgensen, J. N. (2012). Ideologies and norms in language and education policies in Europe and their relationship with everyday language behaviours. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 25(1), 57-71.
- Jørgensen, J. N., Karrebæk, M. S., Madsen, L. M., & Møller, J. S. (2011). Polylinguaging in superdiversity. *Diversities*, 13(2), 22-37.
- Karrebæk, M. (2016). Rye bread for lunch, lasagne for breakfast: enregisterment, classrooms and national food norms in superdiversity. In K. Arnaut, M. Karrebæk, M. Spotti, & J. Blommaert (Eds.), *Engaging superdiversity: recombining spaces, times and language practices* (pp. 89-122). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Kitley, P. (2000). *Television, nation, and culture in Indonesia*. Athens: Ohio University Press.
- Le Page, R. B., & Tabouret-Keller, A. (1985). *Acts of identity: Creole-based approaches to language and ethnicity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.
- Lempert, M. (2014). Imitation. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 43(1), 379-395.

- Lempert, M. (2016). Interaction rescaled: how Buddhist debate became a diasporic pedagogy. In E. S. Carr & M. Lempert (Eds.), *Scale: discourse and dimensions of social life* (pp. 52-69). Oakland, California: University of California Press.
- Marcus, G. (1995). Ethnograph in/of the world system: the emergence of multi-sited ethnography. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 24, 95-117.
- Maryns, K. (2006). *The asylum speaker: Language in the Belgian asylum procedure*. Manchester: St Jerome.
- Meeuwis, M., & Blommaert, J. (1994). The "markedness model" and the absence of society: Remarks on codeswitching. *Multilingua*, 13(4), 387-423.
- Keputusan Menteri Pendayagunaan Aparatur Negara Nomor: 25/KEP/M.PAN/4/2002 tentang pedoman pengembangan budaya kerja aparatur negara, (2002).
- Milroy, L., & Muysken, P. (Eds.). (1995). *One Speaker, Two Languages: Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives on Code-Switching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Møller, J. (2016). 'You Black Black': polycentric norms for the use of terms associated with ethnicity. In K. Arnaut, M. Karrebæk, M. Spotti, & J. Blommaert (Eds.), *Engaging superdiversity: recombining spaces, times and language practices* (pp. 123-146). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Moore, R. (2011). Standardisation, diversity and enlightenment in the contemporary crisis of EU language policy. *Working Papers in Urban Language and Literacies*, 74, 1-31.
- Moriyama, M. (2012). Regional languages and decentralization in post-New Order Indonesia: the case of Sundanese. In K. Foulcher, M. Moriyama, & M. Budiman (Eds.), *Words in motion: language and discourse in post-New Order Indonesia* (pp. 82-100). Singapore: National University of Singapore Press.
- Pavlenko, A. (2017). *Superdiversity and why it isn't: Reflections on terminological innovation and academic branding (final version; in press, 2017)*. Working paper to be published in S.

Breidbach, L. Küster & B. Schmenk (Eds.), *Slogans in language education discourse*.
Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Pennycook, A., & Otsuji, E. (2015). *Metrolingualism: language in the city*. New York:
Routledge.

Quinn, G. (2012). Emerging from dire straits: post-New Order developments in Javanese
language and literature. In K. Foulcher, M. Moriyama, & M. Budiman (Eds.), *Words in
motion: language and discourse in post-New Order Indonesia* (pp. 65-81). Tokyo: Research
Institute for Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies.

Rampton, B. (1995). *Crossing: language and ethnicity among adolescents*. London: Longman.

Rampton, B. (2011). From 'Multi-ethnic adolescent heteroglossia' to 'Contemporary urban
vernaculars'. *Language & Communication*, 31(4), 276-294.

Reyes, A. (2014). Linguistic Anthropology in 2013: Super-New-Big. *American Anthropologist*,
116(2), 366-378.

Risanto, E. (2009). Deklarasi Pembentukan Propinsi Cirebon. Retrieved from

<http://ekorisanto.blogspot.com.au/2009/08/deklarasi-pembentukan-propinsi-cirebon.html>

Scollon, R., & Scollon, S. W. (1981). *Narrative, literacy, and face in interethnic communication*.
Norwood, N.J.: Ablex Pub. Corp.

Scott, J. C. (1998). *Seeing like a state: how certain schemes to improve the human condition have
failed*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Setiawan, H. (2012). Gubernur Cirebon akankah terealisasi [Will we have a governor of
Cirebon]. Retrieved from [http://politik.kompasiana.com/2012/09/01/gubernur-cirebon-
akankah-teralisasi-483552.html](http://politik.kompasiana.com/2012/09/01/gubernur-cirebon-akankah-teralisasi-483552.html)

Silverstein, M. (2015). How language communities intersect: Is "superdiversity" an incremental
or transformative condition? *Language & Communication*, 44, 7-18.

Stiglitz, J. (2006). *Making globalization work* New York: W. W. Norton & Company.

- Sutrisman, D. (2013). Provinsi Cirebon, Sebuah Dilematis [The province of Cirebon is a dilemma]. Retrieved from <http://politik.kompasiana.com/2013/01/05/provinsi-cirebon-sebuah-dilematis-522693.html>
- Swigart, L. (1992). Two codes or one? The insiders' view and the description of codeswitching in Dakar. In C. Eastman (Ed.), *Codeswitching* (pp. 83-102). Clevedon, Avon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Tannen, D. (1984). *Conversational style: Analyzing talk among friends*. Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex.
- Tsing, A. (2005). *Friction: an ethnography of global connection*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Tsuda, T. (2003). *Strangers in the ethnic homeland: Japanese Brazilian return migration in transnational perspective*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Vertovec, S. (2007a). Introduction: New directions in the anthropology of migration and multiculturalism. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 30(6), 961-978.
- Vertovec, S. (2007b). Super-diversity and its implications. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 30(6), 1024-1053.
- Wallerstein, I. (2004). *World-Systems analysis: an introduction*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- World Bank private sector development unit East Asia and Pacific region. (2001). *Indonesia: World Bank group private sector development strategy (Report No. 21581-IND)*. Retrieved from
- Wortham, S. (2006). *Learning identity: the joint emergence of social identification and academic learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.