JSL, Volume 4 (2008), 37–50

Enregistering Ethnicity and Hybridity in Indonesia*

Zane Goebel

In this article I draw on linguistic notions of enregisterment to account for how associations between language and identity have been reproduced in Indonesia. Generally, I argue that language education and language usage in television serials have helped reproduce indexical relationships between language and ethnic identity. However, I qualify this with recourse to some examples that appear to disembed language from ethnicity and as such contribute to the validation of hybrid identities. Throughout the paper I maintain that language usage in such television serials offer constituting possibilities for viewers to appropriate in their own interactions.

1. Introduction

Indonesia is reported to be one of the most religiously, linguistically, and ethnically diverse regions of the world (e.g. Abas 1987; Hoon 2006; Bertrand 2003). For example, most linguistic accounts of diversity in Indonesia list over 400 different languages excluding the province of Irian Jaya (e.g. Abas 1987; Sneddon 2003; Anwar 1980; Dardjowidjojo 1998). While there has been much scholarly attention focused on the origins of ethnicity in Indonesia (e.g. Steedly 1996; Smith-Hefner 1989; Errington 2001), subsequent inter-ethnic relations (e.g. Bertrand 2004; Bruner 1974; Chua 2004; Hoey 2003; Lenhart 1997; Hoshour 1997), and pluralism in Indonesia more generally (e.g. Hefner 2001; Hoon 2006; Suparlan 2002; Schefold 1998), there has been much less done on how ideologies linking language with ethnicity are reproduced. Indeed, much of the work on ethnicity conducted during the New Order period (roughly 1966–1998) took ethnicity as a given and proceeded to focus on the assimiliationist tendencies and policies of the New Order Government (e.g. Hoey 2003; Hoshour 1997; Schefold 1998; Lenhart 1997). Typically, such accounts examined how "imagined" (cf. Anderson 1983) ethnic minorities where assimilated forcefully or otherwise into an imagined homogenous Indonesian community.

More recently Indonesianists focusing on schooling and the media (e.g. Hoon 2006; Parker 2002) have aligned their discussions with those of cultural theories of identity which see identity—ethnic and otherwise—as situational, procedural and hybrid rather than fixed (e.g. Ang 2003; Hall 1996; Werbner 1997). In adding to these discussions I draw upon work in linguistic anthropology—especially the concept of "enregisterment" (Agha 2003), which

* This is a revised version of an inauguration lecture presented to the Faculty of Letters, Nagoya University on the 24th of January 2007.

shows how social characteristics are indexed with linguistic forms in public space—to explore how the links between language and ethnicity are maintained through the education system and the television media in Indonesia.

While I demonstrate that certain Indonesian languages are indexed to region and ethnic identity in a number of television shows, I point out that in some of these shows such links are much less fixed. I go on to argue that this and the fact that many of these programs were broadcast nationally conveys messages that present hybridity as a normal part of everyday life where languages are disembedded from ethnic identity. Moreover, I argue that such messages represent resources for Indonesians to appropriate in their own interactions. In doing so I align my discussion with other work on hybridity, identity, and hope in the fields of sociolinguistics (e.g. Antaki and Widdicombe 1998; Sweetland 2002; Bucholtz and Hall 2004), literary theory (e.g. Bakhtin 1981), sociology (e.g. Goffman 1983; Giddens 1984), and anthropology (e.g. Wise 2005; Mar 2005; Bauman and Briggs 1990). In concluding, I highlight the utility of using enregisterment as an analytical tool for exploring issues of social change and reproduction in diverse settings.

2. Enregistering Identity in the Media

Within the fields of cultural studies (Hall 2006 [1980]), sociology (e.g. Collins et al. 2000; Poynting et al. 2004) and linguistic anthropology (Agha 2003) the media is portrayed as one means by which stereotypical and ideological characteristics of certain people or groups of people are (re)produced. One common theme of these studies is the ability of television to associate or "index" (e.g. Ochs 1990, 1996) linguistic forms with certain identities. Thus, for example, the work of Collins and colleagues (2000, 2004) has shown how the media links 'Arabic speaking' folk with criminality. Similarly, Agha (2003) has argued that media is one avenue by which people, social characteristics, and more generally cultural values are associated with certain linguistic forms to become registers.

Agha refers to this process as enregisterment and defines it as "processes through which a linguistic repertoire becomes differentiable within a language as a socially recognized register of forms" (Agha 2003: 231). As Agha argues, this process of imbuing social-cultural value to linguistic forms relies on the existence of meta-discourses about language use that might initially be found in dictionaries and prescriptive grammars, and then later in more widely accessible books on etiquette, novels, newspapers, magazines, radio, and television, which is arguably the most important medium in this enregisterment process (e.g. Bourdieu 2006 [1998]). Such meta-discourses often concern or develop into discourses about the type of people who habitually speak a certain variety of language (Agha 2003: 242).

This process of attaching cultural value to linguistic forms is dependent on individuals' access to or participation in speech chains and the demographic makeup of those involved in these speech chains. Essentially these speech chains consist of a "speech event" (cf. Hymes 1972) containing the type of meta-discourses noted above along with senders and receivers (which can be individuals or groups in various participatory roles, e.g. observer, ratified observer, participant, ratified participant, etc). Typically, speech chains do not involve whole

populations: thus while many people may understand a certain variety of language as well as be aware of its relationship with certain types of social structures and social characteristics, far fewer people will be competent in speaking such a variety (Agha 2003: 260).

The extent to which a population share and pass on ideas about the cultural value of a particular language variety depends not only on their exposure to such a variety, but also on their willingness to identify with and to use such a culturally valued language variety in their own interactions (Agha 2003: 243–244). Such a process is also assisted when the cultural value of a certain language variety is given authority or legitimized through public schools, as has been the case for Received Pronunciation English in Britain (Agha 2003: 260–265).

While the extent to which such enregistered forms are maintained or disseminated over time and through space is dependent upon whether readers/hearers/viewers take up these forms and use them in their own interactions (e.g. Agha 2005a, 2005b; Johnstone, Andrus, and Danielson 2006), here I stop short of looking at this aspect of the process. Instead, I concentrate on the “association process” or “encoding” (Hall 2006 [1980]) of linguistic forms with social messages to argue that such a process offers “constituting possibilities” (Mäkitalo and Säljö 2002: 63) for the Indonesian viewing public[1]. In this respect I am also aligning my discussion with literary, sociolinguistic, cultural, sociological and anthropological theory relating to the relationship between action and structure.

Of particular relevance is the argument that structures (including linguistic ones) and categories such as identity are not fixed (e.g. Werbner 1997; Hall 1996; Terry 1995) but represent resources that can be appropriated and changed (e.g. Goffman 1983; Bakhtin 1981; Antaki and Widdicombe 1998; Reyes 2005) or recontextualized (Bauman and Briggs 1990) in situated interaction. In a cyclical way, such interactions then contribute to the reproduction of these structure or to the formation of new structures (e.g. Giddens 1984). Thus, following Hall (1996: 3; Terry 1995) and Werbner (1997: 21–22), here I treat identity as a process rather than a product. This view sees identity as an outcome or potential of interaction, made up of many elements (including linguistic ones), hybrid, and often performed (e.g. Bucholtz and Hall 2004).

In late modern times all of this is important for nation-states because time and space compression have increasingly brought together peoples of diverse histories (Terry 1995). While governments of these nation-states are in part responsible for facilitating the doing of “togetherness in difference” (Ang 2003), it is more common that government multicultural policy helps to make difference more visible through the imagining of ethnic groups (e.g. Collins et al. 2000; Hoon 2006; Poynting et al. 2004; De Fina 2003; Paradies 2006). Moreover, as noted in the introduction to this section, in the US, Australia and Indonesia the media—helped in no small part by the actions and talk of politicians and government institutions—generally helps contribute to further imagining and essentialization of ethnicity while at the same time often tying this identity with impolite, uncivil, unpatriotic, anti-social and criminal behavior (e.g. Collins et al. 2000; Poynting et al. 2004; Hoon 2006).

1 Elsewhere I have explored this aspect of enregisterment by showing how these messages are taken up at the local level in interactions amongst government officials (Goebel 2007).

Locating more positive interpretations of media portrayals of doing togetherness in difference is much harder. However, if we turn to other related literature in the areas of anthropology, sociolinguistics, and sociology such portrayals can be found. One example is Wise's (2005) anthropological account of interactions between primarily elderly white middle-class people and younger migrants in Sydney, Australia. Of particular relevance to my paper is her use of the term "hope"[2], which combines notions of hybridity and togetherness in difference with communicative practices.

> For me, hope … represents an opening to the world, to the other, to the stranger. It represents an opening up to new possibilities, for new ways of thinking, doing, knowing, an opening up to the possibility of new relationships and connections and is therefore not about stasis or fixity, it is about possibility. (Wise 2005: 178)

Sociolinguistic portrayals of doing togetherness in difference provide a more nuanced account of communicative practices in the form of discussions about "styling the other" and "adequation". "Styling the other" is roughly a situation where "… people use language to index social group affiliations in situations where the acceptability and legitimacy of their doing so is open to question, incontrovertibly guaranteed neither by ties of inheritance, ingroup socialization, nor by any other language ideology." (Rampton 1999: 422). "Adequation", on the other hand, relates directly to those who by way of ingroup socialization learn and habitually use a language—which mainstream ideologies of race and ethnicity would not normally associate with that person—to authentically pass as a member of that group (e.g. Skapoulli 2004; Brown 2006; Bucholtz and Hall 2004).

The difference between what represents two ends of a spectrum relates partly to the often temporary context specific and performative nature of styling the other (e.g. Reyes 2005; Bucholtz 1999; Cutler 1999; Rampton 1995; Lo 1999) compared with the more habitual non-spectacular and everydayness of adequation (e.g. Sweetland 2002). Both those who engage in "adequation" and "styling the other" or "crossing" (cf. Rampton 1995) are members of a majority using a marginalized minorities language. However, it is usually a question of shared space, socio-economic background, and long term face-to-face interactions with such minorities that enables a person to be a legitimate user of a minority's language. Those who "style the other", on the other hand, do not need to share geography, socio-economic status or indeed interactional history with minorities whose language is appropriated (e.g. Sweetland 2002).

For example, in Sweetland's (2002: 528) study she argued that habitual linguistic crossing was made easier when the person doing it also engaged in geographical and socio-economical crossing. Thus, Delilah—a white American female—was accepted as an authentic speaker of African American Vernacular English (AAVE) partly because she lived in a predominantly socio-economically disadvantaged African American neighborhood and interacted regularly with her neighbors at an intimate level (Sweetland 2002: 532). Such doing of togetherness in difference through linguistic means can also be seen in Indonesian contexts in the studies of

2 For a related discussion of hope as it relates to transmigration see Mar (2005).

Bruner (1974) and Goebel (2002). These two studies examined how migrants from outside of the island of Java and their West and Central Javanese hosts practiced doing togetherness in difference through the learning and use of some of each others' linguistic resources.

Similar to the work of Sweetland, such practices were legitimate by way of the crossers shared geographic and socio-economic status. However, a significant difference was that these migrants chose to learn another language even though they had recourse to Indonesian as a language of inter-ethnic communication. Even so, in all three cases people have used linguistic resources (among other things) to display or bring about—in an ethnomethological sense (e.g. Antaki and Widdicombe 1998)—a hybrid identity as part of doing togetherness in difference.

For the purpose of this paper then, the performance of a hybrid identity can be seen as a way of doing togetherness in differences that is signaled through the use of communicative practices that are not normally ideologically associated with the person using these forms. Such communicative practices situationally suspend notions of "difference" or "the other". As such, these communicative practices should not be viewed as acts of assimilation but rather acts of adequation, which aid in the doing of togetherness in difference. Moreover, such practices can also simultaneously lead to a delinking of text to context. For example, if the practice of using a language that is ideologically associated with another group is performed habitually enough and by enough people, then this will also lead to a "denaturalization" (Bucholtz and Hall 2004) of the links between a particular language and the original owners of the language. Such cases are also examples of enregisterment whereby a new mixed variety will become linked to social characteristics, such as "hybrid identity" (e.g. Alvarez-Cáccamo 1998; Franceschini 1998; Meeuwis and Blommaert 1998; Oesch-Serra 1998; Swigart 1992).

Before looking at how schooling has helped maintain indexical associations between language and ethnicity I also wish to further delimit the topic of this paper. Following my brief discussion of language education in Indonesia my primary focus will be on whether and to what extent language usage is associated with identity and notions of hybridity in one particular type of television media, namely serials and soap operas. This is because television media seems to be the most influential medium by way of sheer numbers of viewers (e.g. Bourdieu 2006 [1998]). For example, Bourdieu has observed that the evening television news in France brings together more people than all the French newspapers combined (2006 [1998]: 328). In Indonesia a similar situation exists (e.g. Sen and Hill 2000: 114).

I have focused on soap operas and serials instead of news for two reasons. Firstly, work in sociolinguistics and linguistic anthropology has demonstrated the importance of media and pop music (among other things) in providing resources for speakers—especially youth—to appropriate when styling the other (e.g. Cutler 1999: 434). Secondly, from a language socialization perspective serials seem to offer an especially rich source of data for exploring the indexical relationships between linguistic forms and context (e.g. Ochs 1988; Ochs 1990, 1996; Schieffelin 1990; and the papers in Schieffelin and Ochs 1986). In other words, and in line with current understandings about indexicality (e.g. Agha 2005; De Fina, Schiffrin, and Bamberg 2006) as interactions unfold the language forms used are potentially indexed to multiple contexts, including identity, topics, affective stances, epistemology, visual images,

and so on. Such a perspective also sits well with current approaches to discourse analysis that focus on non-linguistic resources for meaning making (e.g. Kress 2000; Iedema 2003) and the co-occurrence of these with linguistic resources in the process of producing and interpreting meaning (e.g. Auer 1992; Gumperz 1982).

3. Government Policy, Regional Languages and Schooling

In this section I discuss how government education policy helped maintain the relationship between language and ethnicity in New Order Indonesia. In doing so, I will not cover other areas of the curriculum, such as citizenship studies as they relate to pluralism, which Parker (2002: 20–24) has shown to concentrate on cultural diversity as a fashion show where teaching about difference was more about obeying rules than exploring or understanding difference.

If we examine the Indonesian constitution, it is clear that the state has an ideological view about the link between region and language. For example, as Anwar (1980: 137) notes Chapter XV (Article 36) of the Indonesian constitution explicitly states the need to preserve *bahasa daerah* "regional languages". Government language policy has realized this ideological viewpoint in Indonesian primary and secondary school education systems through the teaching of regional languages (e.g. Nababan 1991: 124; Lowenberg 1992: 65). Indeed, often a child's first introduction to language as a named phenomena tied with literacy practice will be in school settings (e.g. Ochs 1988; and the papers in Schieffelin and Ochs 1986). Thus, children may not know that what they speak is Javanese, Indonesian or some other language. It will be their experience in school that well help index the language(s) they speak with names. In other words, children's educational experience allows them not only to name the languages that they speak but to also be able to identify themselves as a member of a particular group of people who are defined as such by way of residence and language usage (for a related discussion see Nababan 1991: 122–123; Lowenberg 1990: 118).

We can say that children's' exposure to such discourses about languages and their users and uses enregisters languages other than Indonesian (LOTI) with ethnicity as part of a constitutionally sanctioned language maintenance program. This relationship between language and ethnicity is further enhanced through the learning of Indonesian at school where Indonesian is portrayed as the language of unity and communication among geographically dispersed ethnic groups with their own languages (e.g. Abas 1987: 116; Lowenberg 1990; Dardjowidjojo 1998; Sneddon 2003: 201–202). That is to say, the propagation of Indonesian at schools as the language of national unity also brings into focus further criteria for defining communication with members of other ethnic groups (i.e. 'they' or 'them') as "a communicative practice requiring Indonesian".

Maintenance of LOTI and the propagation of Indonesian as the national language is also encouraged through the use of mass media (Lowenberg 1992: 71). In the following section I provide excerpts from a number of television serials which I recorded whilst carrying out linguistic anthropological fieldwork in Java from 1996 until mid 1998. In these excerpts there are clear examples of LOTI being used. In discussing this usage I point out that there are two types of usage. The first contributes to the process of enregistering language with ethnicity

while the second tends to have the opposite effect. In particular, the second type of usage contains the message that hybrid identity is part of normal everyday life where ideological ties between language and ethnicity do not hold.

4. Media and the Enregisterment of Ethnicity

As Sen and Hill (2000: 119) have noted the emergence of the first private television channels in Indonesia in 1990 were accompanied by programming and operating rules that stated that the language used by such stations should be standard Indonesian with regional languages only being used when suitable. However, as they go on to note the entry of these television stations led to problems of gaining and maintaining market share (Sen and Hill 2000: 123–124). One of the ways in which private and public stations tried to gain and maintain their market share was to include more local content, including that which was heavily in a local language (Sen and Hill 2000: 123–124). In this section I argue that this localization of content also contributed to the further enregisterment of language with region and ethnicity. In particular, I provide transcripts of talk found in serials broadcast at the provincial and national level. These instances of talk contain languages other than Indonesian (LOTI). I argue that this usage is interpretable as a regional and thus ethnic language through recourse to the storyline and the existence of other semiotic resources that tie the speakers of these languages to regions within Indonesia.

Extract 1 is taken from *Si Kebayan*, ("Kebayan" is a person's name), which is a long running popular series set in a village in West Java, and broadcast both nationally and locally by SCTV (a privately owned television station). At this stage I should also point out that I use the following transcription conventions to highlight the types of differences that a hearer might perceive: with Indonesian in plain font, Sundanese in bold, and bold italics indicating those forms that can be classified as either Sundanese or Indonesian. The first column just indicates line numbers which I refer to in the analysis below. The second column has speaker names. The > arrow between speaker names means the first name is speaking to the second name. Thus, Abah>Ambu means Abah is speaking to Ambu. The third column has the Indonesian languages with the fourth column containing the English gloss.

Extract 1

1	Abah>	Kenapa **Ambu**? Melihatnya	What's up **Ambu**?
2	Ambu	sampai **melongo** begitu,	**Gawking** at me like that, as
3		kaya melihat ***kebo***.	if you were looking at a ***buffalo***.
4	Ambu>	Heran. **Abah teh** udah	[I] don't understand. **Abah**
5	Abah>	puluhan tahun tidak pernah	[you] haven't done any
6		***olahraga***. **Naha ayeuna**	***exercise*** for years, **why are**
7		***olahraga*** **deui atuh**?	[you] **now** taking ***exercise*** up **again**?

This particular interaction occurs after the person referred to as Abah has finished exercising, to the astonishment of his wife (Ambu) and their daughter Iteung. Of course using

a LOTI between intimates is not unusual in Indonesia. What is perhaps more unusual is the fact that this is shown nationally for viewers to appreciate, many of whom will not understand the language used. However, the existence of other dialogue and semiotic resources, such as car number plates, uniforms with provincial badges and so on may allow viewers to identify the region (in this case West Java). This coupled with viewers educational experiences—especially as they related to labeling languages and groups of people who speak such languages—may enable them to surmise that the language was Sundanese. Such a practice can be argued to contribute to the association of language, region, ethnicity and intimacy. Similarly, we can say that for speakers of this language the usage described above will contribute to the reproduction of associations between language, region, and intimacy.

The enregisterment of language to region and intimacy also occurs through the contrasting of LOTI usage with that of national language usage (i.e. Indonesian). In particular, as I argue below, such contrasts help enregister Indonesian with the identity of the "stranger" or "other". Extract 2 is drawn from an episode titled *Cipoa* "Con artist" of a series called *None* "Missy", broadcast nationally in 1995 by the state-owned educational television station *TPI*. In this setting a young woman (YW) has come to see if she can rent a house and also needs change for her taxi. She is met by another young woman (Dewi) at the door, who turns out to be the owner of the house. After the exchange (lines 1–21) Dewi sees the older male taxi driver in the street and they realize that they know each other. Dewi then runs down the steps while smiling and calling out to greet him (With the exception of italics used to indicate colloquial Indonesian, transcription conventions are the same as for Extract 1.)

Extract 2

1	YW	ada orangnya *nggak sih* di	Is anyone there or *not*? Heh!
2		situ? Heh!	
3	Dewi	Ya	Yeah.
4	YW	ada orangnya *nggak* di	Is anyone there or *not*?
5		situ?	
6	Dewi	Ada.	Yes there is.
7	YW>	panggil, eh ada uang kecil	Call [the house owner] eh,
8	Dewi	*nggak*?	*haven't* got any change [have you]?
9	Dewi>	Ha? ada kamar kecil, ada	What, is there a bathroom,
10	YW	*tu* di dalam, masuk *aja*	yeah there is one inside, *just*
			come inside.
11	YW>	waduh oh *my god* bagus	Wow, of *my god* this house
12	Dewi	juga ini rumah ya ya tapi	is great yeah. But [we] need
13		mesti diganti lagi sama	to change some of the things
14		barang-barang yang lebih	(furnishings) with more
15		*trendi* saya *sih nggak* suka	trendi ones. *If its* [me] I *don't*
16		sama warna warna *kayak*	like colors *like* this, they are
17		*gini* kurang *aktif* ya kita	not *active* enough. Yeah if its

18		*kan* artis mesti *glamor gitu*	artists like us *right* [we] are
19		*dong* eh tolong *dibayarin*	usually glamorous *right*. Eh,
20		taksi dulu itu *tu* yang di	please *pay* the taxi first, *that*
21		luar ya	*one*, the one outside, yeah.
22	Ucup> Dewi	**Neng** Dewi	**Miss** Dewi?
23	Dewi> Ucup	**Mang**. Heh. **Mang**	**Uncle**? Huh! **Uncle**?
24	Ucup> Dewi	**Neng** Dewi. **Neng**	**Miss** Dewi. **Miss**!
25	Dewi> Ucup	**Mang Mang Mang**	**Uncle Uncle Uncle**
26	Ucup> Dewi	Ini **teh Neng** Dewi **téa**	You're **Miss** Dewi **aren't you**?
27	Dewi> Ucup	*Ya* **Mang**	*Yes* **Uncle**.
28	Ucup>	**Euluh euluh euluh mani**	**Gee gee gee wow you're**
29	Dewi	sudah besar begini ah. masih	already grown up; do [you]
30		*inget* **ka Mang** coba. he.	still *remember* **to Uncle**, try [and remember].
31	Dewi>	Ya masih **atuh** ini **teh Mang**	Yeah **of course** you [are]
32	Ucup	**Mang kéheula kéheula**	**Uncle**, **Uncle**, **hang on**,
33		**kéheula kéheula**. **Mang** …	**hang on**, **hang on**, **hang on**,
34		**Mang** Ucup	**Uncle**, **Uncle** Ucup
35	Ucup> Dewi	*Wah* betul. **damang Neng?**	*Wow* right. **how are** [you] **Miss**?
36	Dewi> Ucup	**SAÉ Mang**	**Good**, **Uncle**.

As with Extract 1, at the national level most Indonesian television viewers will not understand much of the language used on lines 22 to 36. Even so, as argued earlier they may pick up on symbols associated with regions within Indonesia, such as number plates on cars (in this case Mang Ucup's taxi has a number prefixed with a "D" indicating it is registered in Bandung, the provincial capital of West Java). Given that the majority of viewers at the national level would be speakers of a LOTI as a first language—with such experience including usage in intimate contexts—they may also interpret the usage as displaying some sort of intimacy or solidarity. Thus, for some viewers such usage may enregister certain language varieties with region and intimacy while for other viewers—especially those who actually speak the language being used—this may also contribute to the reproduction of such associations. Moreover, when the use of such language is contrasted with the use of Indonesian in other contexts with strangers—in this case the exchange between Dewi and YW (lines 1–21)—then this will contribute further to the enregisterment process. That is to say, it will (re)produce indexical

associations between Indonesian and “stranger” or “other”.

5. Language Choice and the Enregisterment of Hybridity

Thus far I have argued that the use of Indonesian and languages other than Indonesian in television serials has contributed to the enregisterment of identities, such as “ethnic group member”, “stranger”, and “intimate”. In this section I want to look at some of the less obvious messages that can be considered as counterweights to the above-mentioned process. In particular, I will focus on how particular situated language choices help disembed ethnicity from language. In interpreting these language choices I argue that such alternation also presents hybrid identity as something everyday and normal.

Extract 3 is drawn from a long running popular series *Si Dul Anak Sekolahan* “Dul an educated lad” originally broadcast by RCTI at the local level in Jakarta (Sen and Hill 2000: 123), but latter nationally by SCTV. This serial is more striking than the previous one because of its music accompaniment, a song that starts with *Anak betawi* “a child of the betawi area …”, which directly links this series to the local. In this case, the local refers to the Betawi of Jakarta who according to some linguistic accounts were the indigenous inhabitants of the area who speak their own language (e.g. Wallace 1979, 1977; Grijns 1983). This extract is of an interaction between a male named Basuki, who in the film is portrayed as an ethnic Javanese (and who in real life identifies himself as a Javanese from Semarang) and the mother of Basuki’s girlfriend, *Maknyak* Leala, who is portrayed as an original inhabitant of Jakarta (*Betawi*) and who in interviews in popular magazines and on television identifies herself as an ethnic Betawi. This particular interaction occurs in the early morning as Basuki arrives at *Maknyak* Leala’s *warung* (a small canteen type construction selling food and home necessities), which stands beside *Maknyak* Leala’s house located in the poor outer fringes of Jakarta. Indonesian is in plain font, Betawi is in bold, and bold italics indicates those forms that can be classified as either Betawi/Jakartanese/colloquial Indonesian.

Extract 3

1	Basuki>	**Maknyak**, **Bang** Mandra	**Maknyak**, **Bang** Mandra
2	Leala	sudah jalan ***toh***?	has already gone ***heh***?
3	Leala>	***Udah***.	***Yeah***.
	Basuki		
4	Basuki>	***Kok tumben lho*** pagi pagi!	***Gee that’s unusual*** [for him
	Leala		to get up] so early.
5	Leala>	**Iyé**, mau ke rumahnya	**Yeah**, [he] wants to go to
6	Basuki	Munaroh	Munaroh’s house.
7	Basuki>	Ke rumah Munaroh?	To Munaroh’s house?
	Leala		
8	Leala>	Iya.	Yeah.
	Basuki		
9	Basuki>	***Ngelamar*** ya?	[He wants] to ***propose***

	Leala		[marriage] yeah?
10	Leala>	***Nggak***, cuma mau ***nanyain***	***No***, [he] only wants to ***ask***
11	Basuki	kapan lamarannya bisa	when [is the best time to
12		**diterimé**, ***gitu***.	propose so that] it is **accepted** [by his girlfriend and her parents].
13	Basuki> Leala	Oh jadi belum ya **Mak** ya?	Oh so not yet heh **Mak** ya?
14	Leala> Basuki	**Belon** *dong*.	***No of course not yet***.
15	Basuki> Leala	Atun ada **Mak**.	Is Atun (Basuki's girlfriend and Leala's daughter) around **Mak**?
16	Leala> Basuki	Ada Noh ***lagi*** sarapan.	Yeah Noh ***is having*** breakfast.

Again, viewers may not understand some of the language used here but their own experience as a bilingual, the introductory song, the storyline, and other semiotic resources, such as number plates and skyscrapers in the background (in Indonesia most skyscrapers are found in Jakarta) would not only help index language with region and ethnicity, but would at the same time help viewers interpret the import of such usage. Of particular interest here is the choice of the Betawi kin term *Mak(nyak)* and other forms instead of Indonesian ones on lines 1, 12–14 and 15 in an 'inter-ethnic' interaction broadcast on national television. This suggests that accommodating to one's new linguistic environment is not unusual and perhaps desirable. It is important to note here that such usage is situational and in other parts of the serial Basuki (the Javanese) uses the Indonesian kin term *Ibu* "Mum" instead of Betawi *Mak(nyak)* with those he doesn't have close social relations. He only appears to use Betawi ways of speaking through kin term usage when interacting with familiars.

While we might see such usage as indicative of an assimilationist ideology, such an interpretation can be mediated with recourse to subsequent episodes with Basuki not only keeping his heavy Javanese accent but also through his usage of Javanese with his Betawi girlfriend. Such usage contextualizes the talk in Extract 3 in a way that shows how accommodation can work both ways. Thus, while Basuki's usage is situational it is also habitual and as such represents adequation rather than styling the other.

In summary this usage suggests that accommodating to diverse language uses is common and situation specific in everyday interactions but it also contributes to a disembedding or disassociation of language with ethnicity. As such identity in these contexts is hybrid, situated and very much mediated by a speaker's language choices.

6. Conclusion

In this paper I have argued that schooling and television media have helped reproduce—

via enregisterment—links between Indonesian and other Indonesian languages with various contexts, including region, ethnicity and stranger. Moreover, while we have seen how ethnicity can be enregistered with language, in my discussion of the last extract I have also argued that such constructions can be temporary and context specific. What makes the usage in Extract 3 especially significant is that presents adequation as a more widely used everyday social practice. As such, it authorizes such practices by providing (whether intentionally or otherwise) resources for Indonesian viewers to appropriate and use in their own intercultural encounters. In such cases this usage will contribute to a different process of enregisterment than described in Extracts 1 and 2, namely a process whereby language alternation is enregistered with hybridity. As such, we might expect linguistic markers used in identifying the "ethnic other" to decrease in use, especially in cases where such resources/ideologies were taken up by viewers in their everyday communicative practices.

In concluding, it is worthwhile highlighting one point, which relates to the general applicability of this approach in providing an extra tool for researchers to explore issues of social change as it relates to processes of identity (re)production. I hope that I have demonstrated how enregisterment can be used as a theoretical and methodological approach to social change and reproduction in the field of media studies more generally.

References

Abas, H. 1987. *Indonesian as a unifying language of wider communication: A historical and sociolinguistic perspective*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.

Agha, A. 2003. The social life of cultural value. *Language and Communication* 23/3–4: 231–273.

———. 2005a. Introduction: Semiosis across encounters. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 15/1: 1–5.

———. 2005b. Voice, Footing, Enregisterment. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 15/1: 38–59.

Alvarez-Cáccamo, C. 1998. From 'switching code' to code-switching. In *Code-switching in conversation: Language, interaction and identity*, edited by P. Auer. New York: Routledge.

Anderson, B. 1983. *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. London: Verso.

Ang, I. 2003. Together-in-difference: Beyond diaspora into hybridity. *Asian Studies Review* 27: 141–154.

Antaki, C., and S. Widdicombe. 1998. Identity as an achievement and as a tool. In *Identities in Talk*, edited by C. Antaki and S. Widdicombe. London: Sage Publications.

Anwar, K. 1980. *Indonesian: The development and use of a national language*. Yogyakarta: Gadjah Mada University Press.

Auer, P. 1992. Introduction: John Gumperz' approach to contextualization. In *The Contextualization of Language*, edited by P. Auer and A. Di Luzio. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Bakhtin, M. 1981. *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Translated by C. Emerson and M. Holquist. Edited by M. Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Bauman, R., and C. Briggs. 1990. Poetics and performance as critical perspectives on language and social life. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 19: 59–88.

Bertrand, J. 2003. Language policy in Indonesia: The promotion of a national language amidst ethnic diversity. In *Fighting words: Language policy and ethnic relations in Asia*, edited by M. E. Brown and S. Ganguly. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

———. 2004. *Nationalism and ethnic conflict in Indonesia*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press.

Bourdieu, P. 2006 [1998]. On television. In *Media and cultural studies: Keywords*, edited by M. G. Durham and D. M. Kellner. Oxford: Blackwell.

Brown, D. 2006. Girls and guys, ghetto and bougie: Metapragmatics, ideology and the management of social identities. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 10/5: 596–610.

Bruner, E. 1974. The expression of ethnicity in Indonesia. In *Urban ethnicity*, edited by A. Cohen. London: Tavistock Publications.

Bucholtz, M. 1999. You da man: Narrating the racial other in the production of white masculinity. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 3 (4): 443–460.

Bucholtz, M., and K. Hall. 2004. Language and Identity. In *A Companion to Linguistic Anthropology*, edited by A. Duranti. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
Chua, C. 2004. Defining Indonesian Chineseness under the New Order. *Journal of Contemporary Asia* 34/4: 465–479.
Collins, J., G. Noble, S. Poynting, and P. Tabar. 2000. *Kebabs, kids, cops and crime: Youth, ethnicity and crime*. Sydney: Pluto Press.
Cutler, C. 1999. Yorkville Crossing: White teens, hip hop and African American English. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 3/4: 428–442.
Dardjowidjojo, S. 1998. Strategies for a successful national language policy: The Indonesian case. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 130: 35–47.
De Fina, A. 2003. *Identity in Narrative: A Study of Immigrant Discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
De Fina, A., D. Schiffrin, and M. Bamberg. 2006. Introduction. In *Discourse and Identity*, edited by A. De Fina, D. Schiffrin, and M. Bamberg. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Errington, J. 2001. Colonial Linguistics. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 30: 19–39.
Franceschini, R. 1998. Code-switching and the notion of code in linguistics: Proposals for a dual focus model. In *Code-Switching in Conversation: Language, Interaction and Identity*, edited by P. Auer. New York: Routledge.
Giddens, A. 1984. *The constitution of society: Outline of the theory of structuration*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Goebel, Z. 2002. Code choice in inter-ethnic interactions in two urban neighbourhoods of Indonesia. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 158: 69–87.
———. 2007. Enregisterment and Appropriation in Javanese-Indonesian Bilingual Talk. *Language in Society* 36/4: 511–531.
Goffman, E. 1983. The interaction order. *American Sociological Review* 48: 1–17.
Grijns, C. 1983. Language use in three neighborhoods of Tanah Abang: The speaker's view. *NUSA* 16: 37–51.
Gumperz, J. 1982. *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Hall, S. 1996. Introduction. Who Needs 'Identity'? In *Questions of Cultural Identity*, edited by S. Hall and P. du Gay. London: Sage.
———. 2006 [1980]. Encoding/Decoding. In *Media and cultural studies: Key words*, edited by M. G. Durham and D. M. Kellner. Oxford: Blackwell.
Hefner, R. 2001. Introduction: Multiculturalism and citizenship in Malaysia, Singapore, and Indonesia. In *The politics of multiculturalism: Pluralism and citizenship in Malaysia, Singapore, and Indonesia*, edited by R. W. Hefner. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i.
Hoey, B. 2003. Nationalism in Indonesia: Building imagined and intentional communities through transmigration. *Ethnology* 42/2: 109–126.
Hoon, C.-Y. 2006. Assimilation, Multiculturalism, Hybridity: The dilemas of the ethnic Chinese in post-Suharto Indonesia. *Asian Studies Review* 7/2: 149–166.
Hoshour, C. 1997. Resettlement and the politicization of ethnicity in Indonesia. *Bijdragen tot de Taal, Land- en Volkenkund* 153/4: 557–576.
Hymes, D. 1972. Models of the interaction of language and social life. In *Directions in sociolinguistics: The ethnography of communication*, edited by J. J. Gumperz and D. H. Hymes. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.
Iedema, R. 2003. Multimodality, resemiotization: Extending the analysis of discourse as multi-semiotic practice. *Visual Communication* 2/1: 29–57.
Johnstone, B., J. Andrus, and A. Danielson. 2006. Mobility, Indexicality, and the Enregisterment of "Pittsburghese". *Journal of English Linguistics* 34/2: 77–104.
Kress, G. 2000. Multimodality. In *Multiliteracies: Literacy learning and the design of social futures*, edited by B. Cope and M. Kalantzis. South Yarra, Vic.: Macmillan.
Lenhart, L. 1997. Orang Suku Laut ethnicity and acculturation. *Bijdragen tot de Taal, Land- en Volkenkund* 153/4: 577–604.
Lo, A. 1999. Codeswitching, speech community membership, and the construction of ethnic identity. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 3 (4): 461–479.
Lowenberg, P. 1990. Language and identity in the Asian state: The case of Indonesia. *The Georgetown Journal of Languages and Linguistics* 1/1: 109–120.
———. 1992. Language policy and language identity in Indonesia. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication* 3/1: 59–77.
Mäkitalo, Å., and R. Säljö. 2002. Talk in institutional context and institutional context in talk: Categories as situated practices. *Text* 22/1: 57–82.
Mar, P. 2005. Unsettling Potentialities: Topographies of Hope in Transnational Migration. *Journal of Intercultural Studies* 26/4: 361–378.

Meeuwis, M., and J. Blommaert. 1998. A monolectal view of code-switching: Layered code-switching among Zairians in Belgium. In *Code-Switching in Conversation: Language, Interaction and Identity*, edited by P. Auer. New York: Routledge.
Nababan, P. 1991. Language in education: The case of Indonesia. *International Review of Education* 37/1: 113–131.
Ochs, E. 1988. *Culture and language development: Language acquisition and language socialization in a Samoan village*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
———. 1990. Indexicality and socialization. In *Cultural psychology*, edited by J. Stigler, R. A. Shweder and G. Herdt. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
———. 1996. Linguistic resources for socializing humanity. In *Rethinking Linguistic Relativity*, edited by J. J. Gumperz and S. C. Levinson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Oesch-Serra, C. 1998. Discourse connectives in bilingual conversation: The case of and emerging Italian-French mixed code. In *Code-switching in conversation: Language, interaction and identity*, edited by P. Auer. New York: Routledge.
Paradies, Y. 2006. Beyond Black and White: Essentialism, hybridity and Indigeneity. *Journal of Sociology* 42/4: 355–367.
Parker, L. 2002. The subjectification of citizenship: Student interpretations of school teachings in Bali. *Asian Studies Review* 26/1: 3–37.
Poynting, S., G. Noble, P. Tabar, and J. Collins. 2004. *Bin Laden in the suburbs: Criminalising the Arab other*. Sydney: Institute of Criminology.
Rampton, B. 1995. *Crossing: Language and ethnicity among adolescents*. London: Longman.
———. 1999. Styling the Other: Introduction. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 3/4: 421–427.
Reyes, A. 2005. Appropriation of African American slang by Asian American youth. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 9/4: 509–532.
Schefold, R. 1998. The domestication of culture: Nation-building and ethnic diversity in Indonesia. *Bijdragen tot de Taal, Land- en Volkenkund* 154/2: 259–280.
Schieffelin, B. 1990. *The give and take of everyday life: Language socialization of Kaluli children*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Schieffelin, B., and E. Ochs, eds. 1986. *Language socialization across cultures*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Sen, K., and D. Hill. 2000. *Media, culture and politics in Indonesia*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Skapoulli, E. 2004. Gender codes at odds and the linguistic construction of hybrid identity. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education* 3/4: 245–260.
Smith-Hefner, N. 1989. A social history of language change in highland East Java. *The Journal of Asian Studies* 48/2: 257–271.
Sneddon, J. 2003. *The Indonesian language: Its history and role in modern society*. Sydney: University of New South Wales Press.
Steedly, M. 1996. The importance of proper names: Language and "national" identity in colonial Karoland. *American Ethnologist* 23/3: 447–475.
Suparlan, P. 2002. Menuju Masyarakat Indonesia yang Multikultural [Towards a Multicultural Indonesian Society]. Electronically published at http://www.scripps.ohiou.edu/news/cmdd/artikel_ps.htm.
Sweetland, J. 2002. Unexpected but authentic use of an ethnically-marked dialect. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 6 (4): 514–538.
Swigart, L. 1992. Two codes or one? The insiders' view and the description of codeswitching in Dakar. In *Codeswitching*, edited by C. Eastman. Clevedon, Avon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
Terry, L. 1995. 'Not a postmodern Nomad': A conversation with Stuart Hall on Race, Ethnicity and Identity. *ARENA Journal* 5: 51–70.
Wallace, S. 1977. Social correlates of some phonological differences in Jakarta Malay. *NUSA Linguistic Studies in Indonesian and Languages in Indonesia* 3: 27–33.
———. 1979. The linguistic modernization of Jakarta. In *What is modern Indonesian Culture*, edited by G. Davis Athens, Ohio: Ohio University Centre for International Studies, Papers in International Studies.
Werbner, P. 1997. Introduction: The Dialectics of Cultural Hybridity. In *Debating Cultural Hybridity. Multi-cultural Identities and the Politics of Anti-Racism.*, edited by P. Werbner and T. Modood. London & New Jersey: Zed Books.
Wise, A. 2005. Hope and belonging in a multicultural suburb. *Journal of Intercultural Studies* 26/1–2: 171–186.