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Abstract

Title: Multilingualism in transition: intergenerational code choice in two multilingual ‘totok’ Chinese families in Surabaya.

This thesis examines the code choice (and code-switching practices) of two multilingual totok families from Surabaya, Indonesia. The totok are people whose ancestors first migrated from China to Indonesia in the early part of the twentieth century, speaking different Chinese dialects. On arrival in Java, they were confronted with a range of local languages including Javanese and different varieties of Malay, but most families sent their children to Chinese schools where Mandarin was the language of instruction. The early Indonesian-born generations of totok were highly multilingual, speaking their families’ ancestral dialects and Mandarin as well as a range of local Indonesian codes. The closure of almost all Chinese schools in Indonesia in 1966 and then the rest in 1974 meant that subsequent generations attended Indonesian schools with Indonesian as the language of instruction, and learned little Chinese at home. Some have also developed proficiency in foreign codes such as English and German. It is argued that socio-historical and political changes have had a major impact on people’s language proficiency and thus on code choice and code-switching behaviour. Language shift is common in many migrant communities across the world, but most studies of such situations have discussed shift from a single migrant code to a single host code. The present study is distinguished by the complex multilingual nature of the language shift(s) involved. Although there has been language shift amongst these subjects, it is from competence in a range of migrant codes as well as host codes among the age cohorts born before 1965 to competence in a range of host codes and western codes among the age cohorts born after that date. These changes in language repertoire are a reflection of both acculturation and modernisation.

The major sources of data for this study were 33 hours of recorded family interactions and informal ethnographic interviews with family members, as well as participant observation over a period of three and a half years.

All participants were multilingual to varying degrees but the typical language repertoire of individuals varies from generation to generation, with different individuals having different code choice preferences for their interactions with individual family members. Unmarked choices can be explained as rational in terms of Myers-Scotton’s (1998 and elsewhere) Extended Markedness Model, with subjects preferring different codes because of differences in age, perceived language proficiency, family role-relations and other factors. While one code may serve as a marked choice for some subjects, it can serve as an unmarked code for others. Sometimes, code-switching itself is an unmarked choice, with different codes functioning similarly to speech levels in a language like Javanese.

The study concludes that the variation in the language repertoires of different subjects reflects wider societal changes, and that their complex code-choice behaviour indicates both their multilinguality and their rationality.
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WNA: Warganegara Asing Aliens
WNI: Warganegara Indonesia Indonesian Citizens

Fonts assigned to each code

In the transcriptions of conversation which appear in this study, different codes are represented using different fonts. The fonts found in the transcriptions are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Typeface used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td>ALL CAPS BOLD (COMIC SANS MS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hakka</td>
<td>ALL CAPS ITALICS (COMIC SANS MS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foochow</td>
<td>ALL CAPS UNDERLINED (COMIC SANS MS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hokkien</td>
<td>ALL CAPS BOLD ITALICS (COMIC SANS MS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Indonesian (SI)</td>
<td>ALL CAPS BOLD (Tiemes NEW ROMAN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Java Malay (EJM)</td>
<td>lower case italics (times new roman)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Java Indonesian (EJI)</td>
<td>lower case bold underlined (times new roman)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Malay/Indonesian CMI</td>
<td>lower case bold (times new roman)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jakarta Indonesian (JI)</td>
<td>lower case (times new roman)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Javanese dialect</td>
<td>ALL CAPS ITALICS (TIMES NEW ROMAN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>ALL CAPS (EUROSTAR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>ALL CAPS BOLD (EUROSTAR)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Transcription symbols

The following are symbols used in the transcriptions of the data. The symbols are modelled on those of Gardner (1994), with some adaptations. Since many codes are used in the conversations, and since various different fonts have been applied to identify the codes, some symbols such as using upper case to indicate loud talk cannot be used here. Instead, an explanation of what is taking place is provided to clarify what is taking place and the meanings that might accompany the raised voice.

1. SIMULTANEOUS, OVERLAPPING AND LATCHED UTTERANCES

[ ]: is to indicate an overlap. The point of onset is marked with left hand square brackets, and the point at which overlap stops is marked with right-hand square brackets:

= equal signs: contiguous stretches of talk between which there is no gap and no overlap (latched) are linked with equal signs

=[ : If more than one speaker latches into a previous turn, this is shown through combination of equal sign and square bracket

2. INTERVALS IN AND BETWEEN UTTERANCES

Intervals are measured in tenths of a second, and placed within curved brackets.

(0.0): Silences that occur within utterances (pauses) or between utterances (gaps)

e.g.
3FCTa: Sapa:: seng pigi Bo?
       (0.7)
3FCTa: Bo, sapa:: seng pigi?

( . ) : A very short pause, or micro-pause, of less than 0.2 seconds, is indicated by a period/full-stop between brackets:

3. PROSODIC FEATURES OF UTTERANCES

A full stop indicates a falling terminal contour, a ‘final’ intonation.
A comma indicates a continuing contour, typically a not very marked fall-rise or rise, but it can be a level tone, or a slight fall. It represents talk that is audibly incomplete.
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An exclamation mark indicates a strongly rising contour. Its characterizing feature is that it rises a long way in pitch and ends up at the high end of the pitch range.

A question mark indicates a rising intonation in a question.

Stress indicated by underlining (when it is permitted)

Loud talk over a stretch of talk is indicated by upper case (if it is possible, otherwise it will be explained individually)

An abrupt cutoff is represented by a single dash. This also represents a glottal stop.

>words<: Talk that is faster than its surrounding talk is enclosed by a right-pointing carat at its beginning, and a left pointing carat at its conclusion

<words>: Slow talk can be represented by either colons indicating lengthening or by a left pointing carat at its beginning, and a right pointing carat at its conclusion

Laughter is represented by an approximate phonetic rendition of the laugh, e.g. huh, huhn, hah, hih

Laughing while talking, or smile talk, can be enclosed within $ symbols e.g. A: huh huh huh hh $don’t bother$ huh huh hih (0.3) huh

(( )): Vocalizations that cannot be satisfactorily transcribed, references to other contextual features or occurrences, or prosodic features not otherwise captured, can be indicated within double parentheses:

e.g.: A: ((smoke exhalation)) hh
      (1.7)
      B: ((sniff))

4. INADEQUATE HEARING

- If part of the talk of a speaker is inaudible, it is indicated by the use of empty parentheses, and the distance they are apart in the transcript reflecting the approximate length of the unheard talk:

  E.g.: 2FCT-Pa: ( )

- If the talk heard is uncertain, this is placed within parentheses:
  e.g.
  2FCTa: (Tania meloq ta?)

- If it is not clear which speaker has produced a particular utterance, this is indicated by the use of a question mark between brackets:
  e.g.: (?): [iyha}
Coding of Individual Subject Attributes

Meanings of numbers and letters assigned to each subject

Numbers 1, 2, 3 and 4: to indicate ‘generation’
‘F’ and ‘M’: to indicate gender.
‘C’ stands for consanguineal: relation by blood
‘A’ stands for affinal: relation by marriage.
‘T’ and ‘T-P’ stand for Totok and Totok-Peranakan respectively: to identify their
ancestral origins.
a=first, b=second, c=third child etc.: to identify their place within a generation
For example:
1MCT-P means that the subject is a first generation male who is consanguinely related
to the family which is the Totok-Peranakan or family A.
2MATa represents a second generation male who has an affinal relationship to the
Totok family. Further, he is married to the first born of this generation, Lisa (2FCTa) in
the family.

Codes and Names of Subjects

Family A:
1MCT-P: Grandpa/Kong
2FCT-Pa: Mimi
2FCT-Pb: Titi
2FAT-Pd: Indah
2FCT-Pe: Jade
3MCT-Pc: Denny
3FCT-Pb: Cindy
3FCT-Pd: Amanda

Family B:
1FCT: Grandma/Bobo
2MATa: Filip
2FCTa: Lisa
2MATb: Jon
2FCTb: Ani
3FCTa: Tania
3MATa: Tom
3FCTb: Jenny
3MCTc: Gugun
4FCTa: Rina
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Introduction

1.0 Background of the study

As the largest archipelagic nation in the world, Indonesia encompasses more than 17,000 islands, of which around 1000 are permanently settled. Indonesia has around 350 recognized ethnolinguistic groups (Congress, 2004) and the Ethnologue (Gordon, 2005) estimates 737 distinct languages. Throughout its history, the Indonesian archipelago has always been multiracial, multiethnic and multicultural. As people have moved around and migrated from one island to another, being multilingual and/or multidialectal has, not surprisingly, always been an advantage to people from the region. In some cases multilingualism is an indispensable requirement for getting by and fitting in among people of different origins. In informal interethnic encounters especially, using a lingua franca which is a second or third language for the speaker is a normal practice, and indeed, is often expected in some situations. Given the degree of communal bilingualism, the practice of using two or more languages/language varieties or dialects in conversation and alternating between them in a switching manner is common\(^1\). In most encounters, a speaker has to exercise a quick mental calculation to decide which code is the ‘proper’ choice for addressing particular classes of interlocutors on particular occasions for particular purposes. Speakers also have to decide whether it is appropriate to switch to other codes, and if so, how code-switching should be done, so that it is appropriate to people’s cultural expectations.

As a result of migration, it is usual that some speech communities exhibit more complex multilingualism than the local people among whom they have come to live. These groups are the new settlers from other parts of Indonesia who came to stay or those such as the Arabs, the Indians and the Chinese who migrated from other parts of the world. As in other parts of the world, migrants from foreign shores usually invite

\(^1\) For reasons which will be outlined in detail later on, in this study, all languages, language varieties and dialects will be referred to as ‘codes’.
more scrutiny than do the people from other islands, especially in Indonesia whose people are very conscious of the distinction between *prêbûmi* ‘indigenous’ and *non prêbûmi* ‘non-indigenous’. Compared to other groups of immigrants such as Arabs or Indians, the ethnic Chinese, however, comprise the biggest and the most diverse group. Linguistically and culturally they consist of heterogeneous groups of immigrants coming from different parts of China, although socio-politically they are considered as one big group of ethnic Chinese and are treated as such by the Indonesian government and most locals. As a ‘big group of migrants’, the ethnic Chinese in the archipelago have always generated much controversy and unending discussion. Issues regarding their political status, social and economical involvement, their assimilation process in the host country, their state of citizenship, their education, and the discriminatory decrees stipulated against them, etc. have attracted the attention of many scholarly studies from Dutch colonial times up to the present time. Yet, so far the diversity in their linguistic and cultural state has not been fully covered, deeply explored and clearly exposed. This is the main reason why this study focuses on language use by ethnic Chinese people.

For example, as the most recent immigrants whose ancestors came to Indonesia in the early part of the twentieth century, ethnic Chinese from the *totok* communities and especially those in Java\(^1\) display more diverse and complex varieties of multilingualism than do their counterparts in other parts of Indonesia. They usually also have richer language repertoires than the earlier arriving *peranakan* Chinese. Besides having active control of the local regional language of Javanese, and one or more varieties of Malay, their linguistic repertoire can also be enriched with individual ancestral dialect(s) from China and/or Mandarin. Yet, so far, most of the linguistic studies of ethnic Chinese in Indonesia have concerned more of the language and culture of *peranakan* Chinese. The culture of the *totok*, and especially their multilingualism,

\(^2\) *Totok* Chinese are a group of Chinese immigrants who arrived in the archipelago in the early part of the 20th century. The migrating men came with their wives and hence could maintain their language and culture. They are considered to be distinct from the *peranakan* Chinese who are the progeny of Chinese men who came to the archipelago as early as the 13th century, married local women and developed a distinct language and culture known as *peranakan*. More extensive discussion on *totok* and *peranakan* Chinese Indonesians is found in chapter 3.

\(^1\) From my observation and that of Suryadinata’s, in many of the outer islands, Mandarin and/or ancestral dialects are still spoken by the younger generations to a greater extent than they seem to be in Java. These ethnic Chinese from the outer islands also do not speak the regional language within their own communities as much as their counterparts in Java.

\(^2\)
remains under-explored (see §1.1).

As will be discussed further in chapter three, one of the reasons for the complex multilingualism among totok Chinese is their socio-political history and cultural background. Over the course of history, unlike other migrant groups, Chinese Indonesians, both from peranakan and totok background, have seen many different languages serve as their medium of instruction at school—Dutch, Mandarin, Malay, and Indonesian. Before 1966, most children from totok backgrounds went to Chinese schools with Mandarin as the language of instruction, while the peranakan went to Dutch, Malay or Chinese schools. This typically different educational background contributed to the perceived distinction between totok and peranakan Chinese and their different affiliations. However, a fundamental change in the education of ethnic totok Chinese in Indonesia occurred after the closing of nearly all the Chinese language schools in 1966 and the remainder by 1974. The schools closed as a result of the abortive coup d’etat in 1965. The closures were endorsed by government initiatives prohibiting the practice of Chinese culture and belief in public. These decrees brought to an end the different educational systems catering for different communities – totok, peranakan and other speech groups – that had existed alongside each other since Dutch colonial times. From this time on, then, both peranakan and totok went to the same schools where Indonesian was the language of instruction. Hence, subsequent generations of both totok and peranakan speak the ‘same’ language, Indonesian.

This change had a major impact on the ethnic Chinese in Indonesia, especially those who had been sending their children to study in Chinese schools, who were usually of totok background. After the Indonesian government closed all Chinese schools and banned the use of Chinese characters in public, all students were forced to go to Indonesian schools. Many children who had already begun their schooling in

---

4 The first of these decrees was Cabinet Presidium Instruction No. 37/II/IN/6/1967. This prohibited further residency or work permits to new Chinese immigrants, their wives, or children. It also froze any capital raised by ‘foreigners’ in Indonesia and forced the closure of ‘foreign’ schools except for those catering for diplomatic corps and their families. In local schools, the Indonesian students had to be a majority of those enrolled, and they had to be in proportion to ‘foreigners’ in any state schools. The implementation of the ‘Chinese issue’ became the responsibility of the minister for political affairs. The second of the decrees was Presidential Instruction (Inpres) No. 14/1967 on Chinese religion, beliefs and tradition. This decreed that all public expressions or activities that were the manifestations of Chinese cultural traditions (see further discussion in chapter 3) were prohibited.
Mandarin had to complete it in Indonesian\textsuperscript{5}. Earlier generations completed all their schooling in Mandarin and later generations did it all in Indonesian. The closing of all Chinese schools marked the beginning of Indonesian as the only official language of education/instruction throughout the country\textsuperscript{6}. Except for one Chinese newspaper which was allowed to remain, a few English newspapers and a handful of journals or magazines in regional dialects, Indonesian also became just about the only language used in the Indonesian mass media. So far there has been no sociolinguistic study of the generations who were directly affected by the closing of Chinese schools in 1966, forcing people to go to schools with a different language of instruction. This is why this study focuses in part on what happened to the tolok Chinese at that time, and the effects these changes in the law had on their language use.

Today, about forty years have elapsed since the Indonesian government decreed Bahasa Indonesia to be the only official language of education/instruction. Indonesian of one form or another permeates all aspects of peoples’ lives in Indonesia. It must be said though, that standard Indonesian as promulgated by institutions such as the Pusat Bahasa\textsuperscript{7}, is in a diglossic relationship with colloquial Indonesian (Sneddon, 2003b), the daily spoken variety of Indonesian. Use of standard Indonesian is largely confined to formal situations or formal institutions. However, closer observation reveals that in

\textsuperscript{5} I call these people members of the 'transitional' generation.

\textsuperscript{6} Although Bahasa Indonesia was declared the national language at the National Youth Congress in 1928 and was 'formally' used as the national language from the time of Indonesian independence in 1945, it was not the only language officially employed at schools. Bahasa Indonesia or Indonesian will be used interchangeably in this chapter with the term Bahasa Indonesia used when it is related to specific events in the Indonesian history involving this language.

\textsuperscript{7} Pusat Bahasa (Indonesian for 'Language Centre') is the institution responsible for designing and regulating the growth of the Indonesian language in Indonesia. It began in 1947 with the takeover of the Instituut voor Taal en CultuurOnderzoek (ITCO) which was part of the University of Indonesia. In March 1948, the Indonesian government created Balai Bahasa (lit. 'Home of Language') which was part of the Culture Division of Kementrian Pendidikan, Pengajaran dan Kebudayaan ('Ministry of Education, Teaching and Culture'). In 1952, Balai Bahasa and ITCO were integrated into Fakultas Sastra (The Faculty of Literature) at the University of Indonesia. It was named Lembaga Bahasa dan Budaya (Division of Language and Culture). On June 1, 1959 it was renamed Lembaga Bahasa dan Kesusasteraan (The Division of Language and Literature). On November 3, 1966 it was again renamed as Direktorat Bahasa dan Kesusasteraan (Directorate of Language and Literature). On May 27, 1969, the name was changed to Lembaga Bahasa Nasional (National Division of Language) under Direktorat Jenderal Kebudayaan (Directorate General of Culture). On April 1, 1975, the institution was renamed once again as the Pasat Pembinaan dan Pengembangan Bahasa (appr. The Center of Language Learning and Research). However, it was unofficially referred to as the Pusat Bahasa. Then, in 2000 with the President’s mandate it was officially renamed the Pusat Bahasa and it retains this appellation up to the present time. Now, it is officially constituted as part of the Sekretariat Jenderal Departemen Pendidikan National (Secretariat General of the National Department of Education). As of 2006, the Pusat Bahasa has a division named Balai Bahasa in twenty-one provinces of Indonesia. (retrieved from Depdiknas, 2001 and http://wikipedia.org/wiki/Pusat_Bahasa).
many interactions, especially in informal interethnic encounters, using a mixture of
daily Indonesian, regional Malay dialects, and other codes is a normal practice, and
indeed, is often expected. For this reason, sociolinguistically, standard Indonesian can
be said to have a polyglossic relationship with other varieties of Malay, the local
regional languages or dialects, and other languages. This situation presents Indonesians,
including both totok and peranakan ethnic Chinese, with an array of choices in
communicating with speakers from various segments of society.

Due to the changes described above, different generations of ethnic Chinese,
especially those of totok background, have different languages of instruction and they
thus have different languages or language varieties (codes) at their disposal. Like other
younger Indonesians, including peranakan, people from ethnic totok background who
were born in the late 1970s seem to employ more Indonesian than their parents. They
utilise Indonesian when they converse not only with people from other ethnic groups,
but also among themselves. The intermediate transitional generations who are in their
sixties now, although they employ similar linguistic behaviour practices in public, also
continue to speak Mandarin and/or their ancestral dialects among themselves. These
codes are also employed by the older generations of immigrant totok. The use of
Chinese dialects and/or Mandarin is most prominent during ‘in-group’ interactions, with
Chinese dialects used within their own speech group and Mandarin with the other ethnic
Chinese who speak Mandarin Chinese. On other ‘out-group occasions’, on the other
hand, people tend to utilize ‘indigenous’ codes such as the local regional language of
Javanese, Indonesian, colloquial Indonesian and/or other codes spoken in the wider
society. Thus, people may choose different codes in different situations with different
speakers, both Chinese and non-Chinese, in a phenomenon that Gumperz (1982) calls
situational code-switching. In other encounters, when individual interlocutors are
proficient in more than one code, conversational code switching, using more than one
code in a single interaction also takes place.

---

It has always been presumed that there are distinct differences between Peranakan and Totok Chinese in Indonesia, not only in terms of culture, life perceptions, life styles and worldview but also especially in terms of the languages spoken. In addition to the local language/dialect, the Totok Chinese traditionally spoke Mandarin and/or their ancestral dialects, while Peranakan spoke Peranakan Malay/Indonesian and/or Bahasa Indonesia. Nio (1961) observed that in the past, Mandarin served as a lingua franca among totok Chinese who spoke different ancestral dialects. These days, the differences between the two communities seem to be blurring. After 1966 (ever since Soeharto’s regime), these differences were totally ignored and politically they are considered as one big group of Chinese up to present time.
To further determine the focus of this study, I made some preliminary field-work observations by visiting family and friends from a totok background in my hometown. I started to find out what happened to them when the 1967 decree (see chapter 4 for further discussion on this matter) was issued. Mingling with them, I found many intriguing phenomena in their interactions, especially in the intergenerational interactions. Amongst these was the impressive multilinguality\(^9\) of the families as well as the complexity of their language use in terms of both situational and conversational code-switching. I further found out that Mandarin, as the ‘prohibited language’, together with the ancestral dialect, is still employed as one of the home languages in family interactions. Therefore, to find out how family members of different generations interact, and what languages are involved, the family domain is the best place to observe. It can be seen as a ‘haven’ where family members are at ‘liberty’ to use any language/dialect they want to, including the ‘stigmatized’ or ‘prohibited’ ones. Also, family is considered as the most central unit for social interaction for Chinese people (LiWei et al., 1997). Thus, the discussion in this study centers on the codes used at home. For the purposes of the study, I chose two totok Chinese families with different ancestral language/dialect backgrounds as subjects. I recorded their informal interactions within the family circle and scrutinized their language behavioural practices in order to answer the research questions presented in §1.3.

1.1 The Significance of the Study

A large number of studies of language use amongst immigrant groups have appeared in the literature and these are discussed in detail in 2.7.1. Almost all of these have been concerned with just a single migrant code and a single host code, but this study involves a much more complicated situation involving both multiple immigrant codes and multiple host codes.

Besides, unlike studies on code-switching which use either structural or rhetorical approaches (Macswan, 1999, Muysken, 1997, Myers-Scotton, 1997c, Poplack, 1980) to mention only a few, not many explore code-switching from the

\(^9\) Hamer and Blanc (2000) differentiate bilingualism from bilinguality. Bilingualism is where two languages (or dialects) are used and generally involve members of different ethnolinguistic groups. Bilinguality may be considered to be a psychological state of the individual who has access to two linguistic codes as means of communication. In this study their idea is extended into multilingualism and multilinguality to cover the use of more than two languages. See chapter 2 for further discussion.
speakers’ social and psychological background. As has been pointed out, this is something which is still very much under-explored in both the linguistic and sociolinguistic literature (Bentahila and Davies, 1995, Sachdev and Bourhis, 2001, Sachdev and Giles, 2004). Hence, this study focuses on the speaker’s sociopsychological background. In particular, it combines the sociology of language (Fishman, 1972b), as well as sociolinguistic (Labov, 1972) and social psychological approaches (Myers-Scotton, 1993b) to look at language choice and code-switching behaviours which involve different pairs of interlocutors using different groups of codes in bi- and multilingual code-switching processes.

A number of earlier studies of language use amongst ethnic Chinese in Java have appeared in the literature. These are discussed in more detail in 2.7.2. It is worth noting here, though, that none of these earlier studies address the issue of language use by totok Chinese at all, let alone those in the generations before and after the government’s 1967 decree on Chinese language and culture. Nor do any of these studies examine language use at a micro-interactional level or the motivations behind code choice in any detail.

To conclude, this study will provide a significant contribution to the field of sociolinguistics and especially to the understanding of code-switching phenomena since the phenomenon of multilingual code-switching involving three or more languages remains very much under-explored.

1.2 Aims of the study

Based on the background described in the previous two sections, a major aim of this research is to uncover the sociolinguistic behavioural patterns of the subjects born before and after the already mentioned legislative changes made in 1967. I argue that societal changes have directly or indirectly affected the degree of contact subjects have had with different languages, and that these experiences have been instrumental in their code choice (and code-switching) behaviour in the family domain and elsewhere. To put it in more practical and researchable terms, this study aims at excavating the linguistic habits of ethnic Chinese families from totok background who were directly affected by the 1967 legislation.

Therefore, to find out the impact of this legislation on language use, the study
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aims to investigate what codes are used within the family domain of *totok* families, how family members from different generations interact within and across generations at home: how the immigrant generations who are in their eighties or nineties now communicate with their children and/or grandchildren and vice versa, and what kind of language behaviour they exhibit at the interactional level. Also, it attempts to establish whether Chinese dialects, and Mandarin Chinese still survive. Further aims are to ascertain to what extent the ‘host’ codes (Indonesian and other local codes) and ‘western’ codes, if any, are used in the family repertoire, and to see what roles these codes play in both intra- and intergenerational interactions. In particular, it is fascinating to see whether Indonesian is starting to establish a role for itself within this domain. Thus, the study provides more information on the degree of shifts in language use both within and across generations.

It also looks behind the complexity of language use in the family interactions in an effort to determine the rationale, i.e. the social or psychological motivations behind code choice behaviour in both dyadic and group interactions. The possibilities of subjects using two or more codes together based on such variables as age, family membership (role-relations), educational background, length of language contact experience and the quality of such contact are also considered.

1.3 Research Questions

The above aims have led me to posit the following major questions which I address in this study:

A. What are the sociolinguistic patterns of the two families chosen as subjects with regard to their language choice behaviour and what changes have taken place across generations?

B. How do family members from different generations communicate with each other?

C. Why do they communicate the way they do?

In order to answer these three major questions, some further preliminary questions have been identified:

1. What languages do the *totok* Chinese speakers use?
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1. What are generational differences in language repertoire, language proficiency and language use?

2. Do differences in language repertoire or exposure to different languages have effects upon code choice behaviour for different subjects in different families?

3. How does their multilingualism relate to their language competence in general?

2. How do the subjects communicate with each other in the family domain?

a. What code-choice practices do they employ in their dyadic and group interactions?

b. What explains the variation in code-choice behaviour in both dyadic and group interactions, between as well as within generations?

c. Is there a relationship between the speakers’ language of education and his or her code choice behaviour?

3. How can differences in language use be explained in terms of sociolinguistic and social-psychological factors?

a. What motivates this different code choice behaviour?

b. What do the subjects do with their multilingualism?

The answers to these questions yield some findings which are generalized in the following section.

1.4 An overview of general findings

This study shows that changes in the socio-political background of people have brought about changes in the socio-psychological makeup of language speakers. Factors such as length of language contact, quality of language contact, role and status of languages in the community and the language of education are significant in determining changes or shifts in individual as well as generational or community language use. Those changes are manifested in variations in individual or generational language repertoire and language proficiency which in turn influence the different patterns of code choice or code-switching behaviours among language speakers (in terms of the codes paired/used).
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From the speaker's perspective, language choice is governed by the properties of his or her language repertoire, and language proficiency. In addition, it is constrained by his/her socio-cultural and psychological background, the social norms and most of all, a speaker's 'rationality'. Within family group interactions involving different generations, individual speakers exploit their multilinguality to participate in the ongoing interactions, represent themselves in terms of the topics discussed, and at the same time 'demonstrate' their 'we-ness' and identity, as well as their rights and obligations as family members. The subjects also make use of different codes in their repertoire which function much like speech levels do in languages like Javanese and Balinese.

The family members in both totok families can be nicely fitted into age cohorts representing every ten years of the history of ethnic totok Chinese education, from 1910s to the 1990s. Thus, although the totok Chinese in Surabaya are a heterogenous group, the age cohorts in the subject families might be regarded as a microcosm of the ethnic 'totok' Chinese speech communities there. In addition, although the subjects are of different ancestral language and socio-economic backgrounds, they experienced and underwent similar socio-political and cultural changes that affected everyone in Indonesia. Both families also show similar trends of language shift. Therefore, even though the findings of this study are not meant to be generalized for a wider scope, the subjects' language behaviour, especially in relation to the younger subjects, might be considered to reflect more generally the language behaviour of ethnic Chinese in Surabaya or possibly even Indonesia nowadays.

1.5 The organization of the thesis

Chapter two presents a discussion of the theoretical framework to be adopted in the study. The discussion starts by defining multilingualism, multilinguality and code choice. It also presents the integration of macro-societal perspectives of language use with those of micro-interactional ones which is bridged by a social network perspective in order to understand the code-choice practices which occur in the data.

Chapter three provides an overview of the history of ethnic Chinese in Indonesia with special reference to those living in Java. More specifically it discusses the

---

10 Rationality is an innate capacity a speaker has which enables him to choose the best choice to get the most optimum end result from his interactions. See § 2.6.2.2.2 for further discussion on this issue.
educational history of tolok Chinese in Surabaya, and the impact of education on the languages different generations speak. The chapter also pays attention to the multilingualism of tolok Chinese, a multilingualism brought about as a result of living in a multilingual and polyglossic place like Surabaya.

Chapter four discusses the methodology used in the study. The chapter commences by describing the process of choosing families as subjects, and the rationale for choosing them. The chapter describes the kind of data collected (conversational recordings, ethnographic questionnaire interviews and participant observation) and the manner in which these were collected. Transcription methods and the tools utilised for organising and analysing the data are described.

Chapter five provides a discussion of the languages and language varieties found in the subjects’ repertoire. The description of each language starts with its general features and affiliation, followed by a discussion of the particular varieties spoken by the subjects. This chapter also introduces the conventions used for presenting as many as seven or eight different languages in example sentences.

The following four chapters deal with the results of data analysis. Chapter six discusses the subjects’ language behaviour in different societal domains as elicited through interview, supplemented by participant observation and supported by some recorded interactional data. Differences and similarities in the subjects’ linguistic repertoire based on their age-cohorts are presented. In general the findings reflect a pattern of language shift from the first generations’ ‘immigrant codes’ (ancestral dialects such as Hakka or Foochow, and the ancestral lingua franca of Mandarin) to later generations’ use of what we might call ‘host codes’ of Malay (and its different varieties) and Javanese, etc. The subjects’ language proficiency on all the languages spoken together with the shifts in the generational language proficiency is also discussed in this chapter. Chapter six ends with a description of intergenerational shift in the subjects’ multilinguality from immigrant codes to the host codes.

Based on the questionnaire interview, participant observation activities and natural interactional data, chapter seven presents and discusses the unmarked code choice in dyadic interactions that took place between and within generations from the two families. From this data, a generalised pattern of code-choice practice is generated for each family which displays which code(s) is frequently preferred or mostly chosen
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by a particular set of interlocutors in inter- and intra-generational interactions. Language use might consist of more than two codes mixed together as the mode of interaction, especially between particular pairs of interlocutors. Later on, the motivation behind this unmarked code choice behaviour is explained using the framework of the Markedness Model and Rational Actor Theory which are introduced in detail in the theoretical framework in chapter two. Chapter seven focuses on broad patterns of language choice in different situations rather than on micro-patterns of switching within utterances and the like which is the focus of chapter eight.

Chapter eight discusses the details of the interactions that took place in the family group interactions within the framework of the Markedness Model with the five maxims proposed by Myers-Scotton. The unmarked code choice patterns in dyadic interactions are used as a parameter or template for code-choice practices that take place in group interactions. Based on this template the motivations behind unmarked and marked code choice practices are unravelled. Other matters to be discussed are whether or not a code-switching is taking place and most importantly whether or not there are negotiations to change the set of rights and obligations between pairs of interlocutors. The marked code choices in dyadic interactions are also covered in this chapter.

Chapter nine provides a discussion of the applicability of the notion of speech levels to characterise some of the linguistic behaviour that was observed. I argue that different age cohorts/generations use different sets of codes in their interactions with interlocutors from other age cohorts in much the same way that speakers of, say, Javanese, use different speech levels in their interactions with different groups of people. I also present some of the subjects’ code choices in the friendship and work domains. I go on to compare individuals’ use of different codes as speech levels in their family interaction with the polyglossic functions of those codes in wider society. It is shown that the subjects choose the codes with high status and prestigious roles in society to function as their acrolect, and codes with lesser societal prestige to function as mesolect or basilect in their individual interactions.

Chapter ten concludes the study. The first section summarises the thesis. Then I present some major findings on the subjects’ multilinguality in multilingual environments and I provide an overview of the transition in multilingualism among the subjects. The last section offers observations on code-switching practices and the subjects’ using codes as multiple speech levels.
Chapter 2

Theoretical Perspectives: Multilingualism, Multilinguality & Code Choice

2.0 Introduction

This chapter constitutes a literature review of selected aspects of multilingualism as a societal phenomenon and multilinguality as an individual phenomenon. It starts by defining the concepts of multilingualism and multilinguality as these terms are used in this study. Other relevant concepts relating to code-switching (and code choice) and multilingualism/multilinguality are also introduced. This chapter also discusses how the integration of societal multilingualism and individual multilinguality in language use can be seen from a variety of different perspectives. Further detailed theoretical discussion of points specifically relating to the discussion in later chapters will be found as they arise in later parts of the thesis.

2.1 Defining multilingualism and multilinguality

Contemporary research on multilingualism has emerged from earlier research on bilingualism. This early work includes work in areas such as the sociology of language (e.g., Fishman, 1965, 1972b), sociolinguistics (e.g., Labov, 1970, 1972, Trudgill, 1974), the ethnography of communication (Gumperz, 1970, Hymes, 1962) and on social psychology (e.g., Giles and St Clair, 1979, Lambert, 1972, Sachdev and Bourhis, 1990, 2001, Sachdev and Giles, 2004), as well as many other disciplines. Although scholars have agreed in general that bilingualism and multilingualism refer to the use of two or more languages in communication, there are differences in the detail of what different authors mean. Trudgill (1992: 53) defines multilingualism as “a sociolinguistic situation in which more than one language is involved, usually involving also language contact and individual bilingualism”. He points out further that

“many sociolinguists use the term ‘bilingualism’ to refer to individuals, even if they are trilingual, quadrilingual etc., and reserve the term ‘multilingualism’ for nations or societies, even if two languages are involved”.

This definition suggests that bilingualism and multilingualism be differentiated through their coverage, whether individual or societal use, with bilingualism for individual use, and multilingualism for societal use. Bilingualism, in particular has very often been used to refer to individual proficiency in more than one language.\footnote{Fishman (1967, 1971) states that bilingualism usually refers to an individual’s ability to speak two languages. Weinreich (1970) defines bilingualism simply as the alternate use of two languages while Bloomfield (1935: 56) gives a definition of bilingualism as ‘the native-like control of two languages’ and thus implying individuals as ‘perfect bilinguals’. Proposing a contrasting definition, MacNamara (1967) proposes that a bilingual is anyone who possesses a minimal competence in only one of the four language skills, listening comprehension, speaking, reading, writing in a language other than his mother tongue. Haugen (1953:7) suggests that individual bilingualism understood “... to begin at the point where the speaker of one language can produce complete meaningful utterances in the other language”. A similar view of bilingualism are found in Hakuta (1986), and Romaine (1989, 1995) who more or less say that bilinguals use language at home to talk about home life and use language at school to talk about school life. So there is a complementary distribution with regard to a bilingual’s ability in different topics. Bilinguals use languages to communicate with both the monolinguals and mostly with other bilinguals in the society. Also there is one view on bilingualism which perceives that bilingualism is the sum of two monolinguals in one person and thus has two separate language competencies (Jeßner, 1997). It is apparent that the term ‘bilingualism’ is interpreted and defined differently by different scholars. However, all these definitions suggest that bilingualism refers to individuals and their language use or language choice.}

Sridhar (1996: 47) points out that other scholars have used both terms, bilingualism and multilingualism, interchangeably in order to refer to the knowledge or use of more than one language either by individual or a community, while Romaine (2004) uses both terms to refer to the routine community use of two or more languages. Sridhar (1996) explains further that there may be more to multilingualism than just ‘a magnified version of bilingualism’. As an individual phenomenon, the central issues studied cover things such as “how one acquires two or more languages in childhood or later, how these languages are represented in the mind and, how they are accessed for speaking and writing, and for comprehension”. As a societal phenomenon, the concerns taken up are issues covering the status and role of the languages in a given society, attitudes towards languages, determinants of language choice, the symbolic and practical uses of the languages, and the correlations between language use and social factors such as ethnicity, religion and class. Edwards (2004: 8) also acknowledges that different kinds of issues are involved when individual and societal levels of bilingualism are discussed: individual bilingualism involves linguistic and psycholinguistic dimensions which might not be as prominently manifested at the social level where other dimensions—historical, educational, political and so on—emerge for consideration. Thus, these two scholars, Sridhar and Edwards, do not differentiate
bilingualism from multilingualism language use in terms of their coverage (individual or community), but instead they differentiate the individual from community based on the issues concerned. For them either bilingualism or multilingualism can be used to refer to both individual and societal/communal issues.

Another approach to terminological distinctions is taken by Hamers and Blanc (2000) who propose that the terms 'bilingualism' and 'bilinguality' should be used to refer to the societal and individual domains respectively. They state that

"the concept of bilingualism refers to the state of a linguistic community in which two languages are in contact with the result that two codes can be used in the same interaction and that a number of individuals are bilinguals (societal bilingualism); but it also includes the concept of bilinguality (individual bilingualism). Bilinguality is the psychological state of an individual who has access to more than one linguistic code as a means of social communications; the degree of access will vary along a number of dimensions which are psychological, cognitive, psychological, social psychological, social, sociological, sociolinguistic, sociocultural and linguistic (Hamers, 1981)".

Clearly, we need to be able to distinguish the use of two languages from the use of more than two languages. We also need to be able to distinguish the use of two languages at a societal level from an individual's use of two languages, and the use of more than two languages at a societal level from an individual's use of more than two languages. I propose, following Hamers and Blanc (2000) to talk about the use of two languages by using the terms bilingualism and bilinguality, and to refer to the use of more than two languages with the terms multilingualism and multilinguality. In the following discussion when referring to societal use of two or more languages I will use the terms 'multilingualism'; when referring to an individual's use of two or more languages, or their competence in two or more languages, I will use the term 'multilinguality'.

2.2 Reasons for multilingualism

Relating to the phenomena of multilingualism and multilinguality, it is noteworthy to unravel what lies behind the rise of multilingualism in the first place. There are many reasons why multilingualism arises. In some places, many different small languages exist one alongside each other, and in these areas people often learn their neighbouring languages as well as their own. Such a situation exists today in many parts of the

---

2 With respect to multilingualism in particular, Nelde (1992:380) differentiates researches on multilingualism dealing with the individual speakers to be discussed under the umbrella of psycholinguistics while the language communities (the society) are covered by sociolinguistics.
Indonesian archipelago, and particularly in the eastern islands of ‘Nusa Tenggara’, West Papua, the Moluccas, etc. People in these areas are usually multilingual.

Another major reason for multilingualism is through imperialism and colonial expansion. This has occurred where, for example, English, French, Spanish or Portuguese are used alongside indigenous languages in many of the (ex-) colonies of Britain, France, Spain or Portugal respectively. In addition, there are also cases of migration. Usually, at least the migrants themselves and the first generation born in the host country speak both their native language from their country of origin and the language of the country to which they have moved or the languages of the community among which they live.

Another factor leading to individual and societal bi-/multilingualism is education, and in particular policies about the languages used in education. In the post colonial language policies of many countries, a nation may adopt the former colonial language as the official language (as is common in former British and French colonies), while in other countries a regional lingua franca may have been adopted to serve for this purpose (as in Indonesia). In former British colonies such as Singapore, Lesotho, Malawi, and South Africa (Kamwangamalu, 2004), English, together with other official or national language(s), are used in education, so bilingual education is practised. In other case like the Philippines, English is the official second language in addition to indigenous Tagalog. In Indonesia, on the other hand, Indonesian, adapted from a Malay variety spoken in the archipelago, is decreed as the language of instruction at all educational levels throughout the country\(^3\). Although Indonesian functions as the national language, languages like Javanese, Balinese, and Sundanese, to name just a few, have important roles as regional languages in the areas in which they are spoken. In other places there may be a colonial language, a dominant regional or community language, as well as the official or national language of the country which exist side by side. For example, Singapore has four official languages: English, Mandarin, Malay and Tamil.

---

\(^3\) In some areas the regional languages may still be used transitionally in the first three years of primary schools; thereafter, these regional languages are also taught as school subjects (Nababan, 1991: 50).
Nowadays there seems to be a ‘modern’ reason for multilingualism. In many places people need to use and study the language of globalization and technology which makes English as the language of technology very important as a foreign or second language.

The sorts of circumstances stated above therefore, often lead to people becoming at least bilingual and in these circumstances a bilingual competence is a requirement (Edwards, 1994). In many parts of the world, though, where more than two languages are spoken, a multilingual individual would be regarded as the norm, especially among minority communities who have to learn the language of the majority to get by and survive (Nelde, 1992: 379). A similar multilingual situation is observed among the subjects in this study. The next section presents discussion of what speech communities are and how they help promote or create bilingualism/multilingualism both in the society and among individuals.

2.3 Speech communities

The term ‘speech community’ is not easy to define. The simplest definition I have found is offered by Lyons (1970) who describes a speech community as “all people who use a given language (or dialect)”. A more detailed definition is offered by Hymes (1972: 54-5) who defines speech community as “a community sharing rules for the conduct and interpretation of speech and rules for the interpretation of at least one linguistic variety…” and emphasises the fact that speech communities are social, rather than linguistic entities. Hymes (1974) goes on to say that members of a speech community are unified in their attitudes towards the uses of language, or at least one variety of language. In turn, Gumperz (1971a:114, 1968) argues that “the speech varieties employed within a speech community form a system because they are related to a shared set of social norms”. Similarly, Labov (1972: 120-121) stresses the importance of shared attitudes and shared norms of evaluation and usage in a speech community:

“The speech community is not defined by any marked agreement in the use of language elements, so much as by participation in a set of shared norms. These norms may be observed in overt types of evaluative behaviour, and by the uniformity of abstract patterns of variation which are invariant in respect to particular levels of usage”.

Later research tends to suggest that so-called speech communities can be fragmented. Trudgill (1972) points out that some speakers positively identify only with a dialect approaching the standard while others award ‘covert prestige’ to non-standard dialectal
variants. Other research (Genesee and Bourhis, 1988) points out fragmentation of norms
in which not all subjects studied expect a speaker in a public-speaker encounter to use
the variety which has been normatively/officially sanctioned (in the case of their study,
French as spoken in Quebec city, Canada). In other words, although there may be
shared attitudes, norms of evaluation or even agreed standard forms among members of
a speech community, there might also be fragmentation of these norms among the
speech community concerned. Synthesizing Gumperz and Hymes above, Romaine
(1994: 22) states that

"A speech community is a group of people who do not necessarily share the same
language, but share a set of norms and rules for the use of language. The boundaries
between speech communities are essentially social rather than linguistic. A speech
community is not necessarily co-extensive with a language community."

Some research focuses on bi/multilingual speech communities. Baker and Jones
(1998: 96) speak of bilinguals who formed a speech community and who use a given
language for part of their daily existence and another language for other parts of it. If, as
Hymes and others have suggested, speech communities are really social groupings of
people who share speech norms, nothing prevents a speech community from being
multilingual. The individuals of many small speech communities are also part of larger
language communities in which they may participate to varying degrees (Romaine,
2004: 386). This is usually the case of indigenous and immigrant minorities. These
groups typically speak their own 'community languages' in addition to the language
spoken by wider society 4. Romaine discusses Haitian Creole-speaking family members
who live in Miami and who are also members of the larger United States English
speaking communities, even if they have varying degrees of English language
proficiency. In the same vein, the subjects of the present study are also immigrants who
speak their own community language(s) in addition to the languages spoken by the
wider speech community.

As seen above, with respect to immigrants in particular, the connection of
bilingual/multilingual individuals with their own speech community as well as with the
nation-state as a larger speech community helps to explain why certain individuals are
bilinguals in the first place. The majority groups in society usually have the power to

4 Clyne (1991) has coined a term CLOT (community language other than English) to refer to
community languages in Australia.
force their language upon minorities, and while minority groups share some linguistic norms with the wider society within which they live, they also share other norms and attitudes embraced by their own (minority) speech community.

2.4 Verbal repertoire: societal and individual

It was revealed in the above section that there might be different language varieties used by different members of speech communities. This brings us to the concept of verbal repertoire. Trudgill (1992) defines verbal repertoire as “the totality of language varieties including styles, dialects (in bidialectal or diglossic communities) or different languages (in multilingual communities) available to a speech community”. Hymes (1972: 290), on the other hand, refers to ‘communicative repertoire’ which he defines as “the set of varieties, codes or sub-codes, commanded by an individual, together with the types of switching that occur among them”. Individual speakers use the varieties available to them according to social norms that are established by the speech community. Thus, while Trudgill situates the notion of repertoire at a community level, Hymes locates it at the level of the individual.

Sridhar (1996:50) does not differentiate between verbal repertoire as communal and communicative repertoire as individual phenomena but states instead that ‘verbal repertoire refers to the total range of linguistic resources available to an individual or a community’. In the case of multilingual individual or society, he further asserts that “…it encompasses not only varieties of the same language but also entirely different languages” and that “each language in the repertoire brings with it its own set of grammatical, lexical, pragmatic, and sociolinguistic rules and conventions (norms)”. Schiffman (2001:1) postulates a more detailed definition of repertoire as “an individual’s particular set of skills (or levels of proficiency) that permit him/her to function within various registers of (a) language(s)”. He clarifies that “different individuals’ repertoires will vary (plus or minus, active or passive) and will be gradient (scaled from low to high proficiency)”. This individual repertoire will serve as a resource for interpersonal interactions as discussed in § 2.6.2 on micro-interactional perspective.

Platt and Platt (1975b:35) differentiate 'speech repertoire' from 'verbal repertoire'. They suggest using “the term speech repertoire for the repertoire of linguistic varieties utilized by a speech community which its speakers as members of
the community may appropriately use, and the term verbal repertoire for linguistic varieties which are at particular speaker’s disposal”. Referring to multilingualism among the English-medium educated Singapore Chinese, Platt (1980a: 69) states that some codes are allocated for certain domains and other codes are allocated for others. Chinese dialect is the main code spoken within the family, while colloquial Singaporean English, Chinese dialects and possibly colloquial Mandarin and bazaar Malay are used among friends. For transactions, the languages used might be chosen from Chinese dialects, colloquial Singaporean English, bazaar Malay, and some Mandarin. For education on the other hand, the choices range from a formal or semi formal Singaporean English to formal or semi formal Mandarin, while for religion the choices are the formal forms of Singaporean English, Mandarin or other Chinese dialects. Among members of this community, different languages or language varieties are reserved for different domains. Singapore is a society with both societal multilingualism and polyglossia. Thus, in these multilinguals’ verbal repertoire, different languages represent distinct identities of the speakers. Together, the languages complement each other to meet the complex communicative demands of a pluralistic society.

Pandit (1972:79) offers a classic example of an individual multilingual’s verbal repertoire in a day in the life of a spice merchant in India:

A Gujarati spice merchant in Bombay uses Kathiawadi (his dialect of Gujarati) with his family, Marathi (the local language) in the vegetable market, Kacchi and Konkani in trading circles, Hindi or Hindustani with the milkman and at the train station, and even English on formal occasions. Such a person may not be highly educated or well versed in linguistic rules, but knows enough to be able to use the language(s) for his purposes.

Thus, as illustrated above and also suggested by Myers-Scotton (1998c:19) individual language repertoire is determined by one’s social group membership. So the broader one's social network in a multilingual society is, the larger the number of codes one must have at one's disposal, and the greater one's repertoire must be.

The scholars just discussed offer various terms to refer to more or less the same thing, with some of them making a distinction between an individual's repertoire and a society's repertoire. In this study, the term ‘language repertoire’ is used to refer to the sets of languages, language varieties and styles, standard or colloquial, (hereafter, codes) a subject has at his or her disposal. Following Sridhar, I also use ‘language repertoire’ to refer to the total range of linguistic resources available in a community.

It can be inferred from the above discussion that in multilingual speech
communities in which individual members have more than one language variety in their verbal repertoire, using more than one language alternately or switching between them in a conversation is a common thing. The concept of code switching is introduced in the next section.

2.5 Code switching and code choice

There seems to be no unanimous agreement as to what code-switching (hereafter, CS) is exactly, nor what areas are covered by terms such as code-switching, code-mixing, borrowing, or code-alternation.

Code-switching is usually defined as using two or more codes alternately within one conversational event⁵. Grosjean (1982) defines code-switching as “the alternate use of two or more languages in the same utterance or conversation”. Pfaff (1997) also defines CS broadly “as the use of more than one linguistic variety (language or dialect) by a single speaker in the course of a single conversation”. Meeuwis and Blommaert (1998) offer an even broader definition of CS by including speech style, variety or even perceived ‘quality’ of the linguistic material. MacSwan (1999) defines CS as “a speech style in which fluent bilinguals move in and out of two (or conceivably) more languages”. In her structural approach to code-switching, Myers-Scotton (1993a, 1997c) proposes another definition of CS as “the selection by bilinguals or multilinguals of forms from embedded variety (or varieties) in utterances of a matrix variety during the same conversation”. In her socio-pragmatic approach, on the other hand, she defines code-switching as a marked choice where “the speaker dis-identifies with the expected RO set” (Myers-Scotton, 1993b:131). I will not address Myers-Scotton's notions of code-switching directly in this section, but rather leave discussion of this until §2.6.2.1.3.

With regard to the linguistic structures involved in code-switching, Poplack (1980) proposes a three-way division, namely (1) inter-sentential switching of whole sentences or clauses, (2) syntactically independent switching of tags and (3) intra-sentential switching of phrases and smaller constituents within a sentence or clause which involve melding the morpho-syntax of the two or more languages. Appel and

⁵ In later literature, ‘code’ is used synonymously with ‘language’ or ‘speech variety’.
Muysken (1987: 121) and Muysken (1997) called this type of intra-sentential switching code-mixing, except in cases of clear borrowing. Muysken (1997) defines code-mixing as “all cases where lexical items and grammatical features from two languages appear in one sentence”, whereas code-switching is defined by Muysken (2000: 1) as “the rapid succession of several languages in a single speech event”. Hence, they refer to intra-sentential and inter-sentential switches respectively, a distinction shared by some other researchers (e.g., Kachru, 1983, Sridhar and Sridhar, 1980). As for Myers-Scotton (1997c), this intra-sentential switching is referred to as ‘codeswitching’, with no hyphen in between (Myers-Scotton, 1993b). In short Muysken and Myers-Scotton actually refer to the same phenomena, intra-sentential switching but name it differently.

Concerning the processes of CS, Muysken (1997) proposes three separate patterns, namely (1) alternation, that takes place between utterances in a turn or between turns, hence there is a true switch from one language to the other, so it is actually has the classical nature of code-switching, (2) insertion, that involves the insertion of word(s), even one lexical unit of one language to another language structure; this process is akin to code-mixing discussed above, and (3) congruence lexicalization that refers to a situation where two languages share a grammatical structure which can be filled lexically with elements from either languages. The last process is apparently similar to a borrowing process. Muysken (1997) further stipulates that insertion mostly happens in the language of first generation immigrants. However, later on there is a language dominance shift between the first and the third generation of immigrants that is reflected in a shift in the directionality of the inserted elements from the language of country of origin to the language of host country. Congruent lexicalization, on the other hand, is mostly prevalent in the second generation of immigrants and bilingual speakers of closely related languages with roughly equal prestige and no tradition of overt language separation. As for alternation, Muysken claims that it is frequently found in stable bilingual communities with a tradition of language separation. He also suggests that it might also occur in other communities.

These researchers and many others such as Auer (1984b, 1995, 1998) Appel and Muysken (1987), Poplack (1993) all define CS in various different ways but they refer to approximately similar ideas about the nature of CS, namely the alternation of two or more languages or language varieties within one conversational episode. In this context, Eastman (1992:1) claims that “efforts to distinguish code-switching, code-mixing, and
borrowing are doomed” and instead we should “free ourselves of the need to categorize any instance of seemingly non-native material in language as a borrowing or a switch” in order to understand the social and cultural processes involved in code-switching. In many instances it is not easy to make clear a distinction between code-switching and borrowing especially when the choice revolves around single lexical units. In this regard, Myers-Scotton (1997c: 16) proposed an arbitrary metric which can be used to distinguish code-switching from borrowing, with the higher-frequency forms as the borrowed forms. A type must occur in fewer than three different conversations to qualify as a CS form. Another criterion to rule out as CS forms are any cultural forms which stand for an object or concept new to the culture even if it occurs only once in the corpus.

With respect to the kinds of code-switching, one of the first attempts to distinguish different kinds of code-switching was made by Blom and Gumperz (1972:409). They distinguished two different kinds of code-switching: ‘situational’ and ‘metaphorical’ (or in other people’s work and Gumperz’ own later work ‘conversational' code-switching). Situational code-switching occurs when a change in the language used occurs at the same time as the social situation in which the conversational protagonists are involved also changes. According to Blom and Gumperz, “the alternation between varieties redefines a situation, being a change in governing norms… which corresponds to changes in the situation (setting), particularly participant and/or strategies”. In metaphorical switching, on the other hand, which Gumperz later also refers to as ‘conversational code switching’, there is a “juxtaposition within the same speech exchange of passages of speech belonging to two different grammatical systems or subsystems, and most frequently the alternation takes the form of two subsequent sentences, as when a speaker uses a second language either to reiterate his message or to reply to someone else’s statement” (Gumperz, 1982: 59). Hence, metaphorical code switching involves a change in topical emphasis or subject matters rather than a change in social situation (Blom and Gumperz, 1972: 409, 425). According to Gumperz, both kinds of switches are motivated by speaker-external factors. Blom and Gumperz (1972) mention that code selection rules, like grammatical rules, are “below the level of consciousness”. Close analysis of actual utterances in context is therefore necessary to determine the linguistic meanings of code-switches. Auer establishes a distinction between participant-related and discourse-related language alternation. Participant-
related code-switching is defined as ‘the attribution of the speaker’ (Auer, 1988:192), while discourse-related code-switching refers to “the use of code-switching to organize the conversation by contributing to the interactional meaning of a particular utterance” (Auer, 1998:4). Auer’s code-switching distinctions are similar to Blom and Gumperz’s ideas of situational and conversational code-switching respectively.

Woolard (1988:61), when discussing closely related languages like Castilian and Catalan notes that “it is sometimes possible to know that a code-switch has taken place but quite literally not to be able to identify where it began”. Some of the codes used in this study, such as Malay, Chinese Malay/Indonesian, Indonesian and Javanese have similar morpho-syntactic structures and share numerous cognates. So, even when an individual lexeme can be identified as belonging to a particular code, when there are shifts in the codes being used, it is often difficult to tell what phenomenon is happening—code-switching, or borrowing, or, as Woolard notes for Castillian and Catalan, when exactly any switch might have taken place.

In this context and following Eastman (1992), for this study I do not attempt to differentiate code-switching, code-mixing, style shifting, borrowing etc. one from the other. Instead, this study adopts Grosjean’s (1982) simple definition of code-switching as “the alternate use of two or more languages, language varieties, dialects, speech styles etc., if any, in the same utterance or within one conversational event”. In addition, I tie Grosjean’s definition of code-switching to Myers-Scotton’s socio pragmatic definition. So, in my terms speakers use any codes (language, language varieties, dialects, and speech styles) alternately, in order to ‘identify’ or ‘dis-identify’ with the expected RO set (see further discussion in §2.6.2.1.1). When people switch codes, it is clear that they are making choices—either fully consciously or through habitualized routines—about what codes they use at different times.

The following sections discuss code choice from a variety of perspectives and look at how code choice is employed in individual micro-interaction.

2.6 Integrating societal multilingualism and individual multilinguality: language choice

In multilingual settings, code choice varies along a number of different dimensions that may be social, cultural or psychological in nature. Baker and Jones (1998), Grosjean
(1982), Hamers and Blanc (2000) and other scholars suggest that the problems of bilinguals are both individual and social in nature and that psychological aspects are linked to social aspects.

Looking at these issues from a socio-psychological perspective, (see Genesee and Bourhis, 1982, Sachdev and Bourhis, 1990, 2001, 2004), Myers-Scotton (1993b) (Edwards, 2004) have paid particular attention to the correlation between societal and individual aspects of language use to better understand the social or psychological motivations behind language choice and code-switching. Myers-Scotton (1992: 417) argues that even with code-switching structures that seem to be cognitively determined, macro-level social forces as well as more micro-level socio-pragmatic motives may determine which permissible patterns are preferred. Tabouret-Keller (1983: 143) claims that the higher the predictability of code-choice is, the more likely that an act of switching is an instance of conforming to societal patterns. Tabouret-Keller also notes that “a distinction is necessary between a predictable switch and an unexpected one”. I will discuss this kind of distinction further in 2.6.2.1 when I discuss Myers-Scotton’s Markedness Model in more detail.

Li Wei (1994: 5) emphasizes that an individual bilingual language choice is *essentially a social phenomenon* (the italics are Li Wei’s). Following Grimshaw (1987), Li Wei (1994) makes a distinction between macro-societal and micro-interactional perspectives, in which he thinks many scholars of bilingualism and language choice such as Breitborde (1983) and Gibbons (1987) have conceived and located their work. To bridge these two perspectives, he proposes the use of *social network* analysis. He argues that social network theory enables the analyst to systematically account for the interrelation between the two perspectives to arrive at a sound interpretation of code-switching/code-choice practices. Li Wei (1994: 6, 34) explains that from a macro-societal perspective the assumption is that individuals’ language behaviour is structured by social and situational context. The micro-interactional perspective, on the other hand, emphasizes individuals’ capacity to make their own choices as required by social norms and values which, I tend to say, reflect their psychological state of bilinguality or in this study their multilinguality. Many other scholars share Li Wei’s view including among others Blommaert (1992), and Gal (1983: 64), and I also tend to agree with them.

In this context I move on to discuss the integration of sociological perspectives
on societal multilingualism with more psychological perspectives on individual multilinguality.

2.6.1 **Societal multilingualism: the macro-societal perspective**

As has been mentioned, the macro-societal perspective is formed on the assumption that individuals' language behaviour is structured by the social and situational context of the society in which they live. Li Wei (1994) identifies two analytic models for viewing societal bilingualism: the 'complementary distribution' model and the 'conflict model'. Adapting the models for multilingualism, each of them will be discussed in turn below.

2.6.1.1 **The complementary distribution model**

In the complementary distribution model, different codes are seen to be used in different domains for different purposes. One of the earliest approaches within this framework is Ferguson's (1959) concept of 'diglossia'.

A diglossic situation is described as occurring in a society in which there are two distinct varieties of the same language which show clear functional separation. One variety is used in one set of circumstances while the other variety is used in an entirely different set of circumstances. Thus, both varieties 'complement' each other. Ferguson (1959: 87) defines diglossia as follows:

"Diglossia is a relatively stable language situation in which, in addition to the primary dialects of language (which may include a standard or regional standard), there is a very divergent, highly codified (often grammatically more complex) superposed variety, the vehicle of a large and respected body of written literature, either of earlier period or in another speech community, which is learned largely by formal education and is used for most written and formal spoken purposes but is not used by any sector of the community for ordinary conversation".

Ferguson refers to the superposed prestige variety as the High variety, and the primary or regional dialects (which lack prestige) as Low varieties. High varieties are typically used for delivering sermons, formal lectures and for legal and administrative transactions (eg. in courts of law, parliament, for political speeches and for radio broadcasting, editorials in newspapers, and for literature, etc.). High varieties usually have standardized orthographies. Low varieties, on the other hand, are typically used in daily conversations), in casual communications within family and social groups, on popular radio and television, etc. Usually, low varieties are represented in literature only as embedded discourse and used to characterise particular people from particular socio-economic levels. Occasionally a low variety may be used to write an entire literary work, but low varieties usually lack established orthographies. In diglossic situations,
the expected social behaviour is that the two different varieties are used appropriately in appropriate situations. Although Ferguson's concept of diglossia has been widely adopted by many researchers, the classic notion of diglossia is rigid and unable to account for a number of different situations in multilingual societies where more complex forms of behaviour are found.

Fishman (1965, 1967) extended the concept of diglossia to include not only the standard and vernacular varieties of a language or two different languages but also 'functionally differentiated language varieties of whatever kind'. Relating diglossia to what I label bilinguality, but what Fishman referred to as bilingualism, he points out that in a number of speech communities, both diglossia and 'bilingualism' are found. He defines diglossia as 'a characterization of the social allocation of functions to different languages and varieties' and bilingualism as 'essentially a characterization of individual linguistic versatility'. Fishman's concept of diglossia is applicable to any form of linguistic differences between styles, registers, dialects or languages. He notes that in many bi-/multilingual migrant communities, using different languages without any of them having clearly defined social functions is a regular practice. Fasold (1984: 54) refers to this situation as 'leaking diglossia' and notes that this occurs wherever a creole co-exists with a standard language from which it has substantially drawn its lexicon.

Platt (1976a, 1977, 1977b) further extends Fishman's idea of diglossia and bilingualism to polyglossia and multilingualism, when noting that more than two languages can be found in complementary distribution. He presents the examples of Singapore and Malaysia which he labels as 'polyglossic' societies with multilingual speakers. As noted in §2.4, Platt (1977: 375) discussed the use of different speech varieties by 'English educated' Singapore Chinese and ascribed different codes to function as not just 'High' or 'Low' codes but also as 'Mid' level codes: Singaporean English and Mandarin are labelled 'High', Colloquial Singaporean English is labelled 'Mid' and Hokkien, Cantonese, other Chinese dialects and Malay are labelled 'Low'. For English-educated Malaysian Chinese, the distribution of codes to levels is somewhat different: formal Malaysian English and Bahasa Malaysia are the High Codes, Mandarin
is a 'Dummy High', colloquial Malaysian English and the dominant Chinese dialect are Mid codes and 'Native' Chinese dialect, other Chinese dialects and bazaar Malay are Low codes.

The situation in Singapore and Malaysia resembles the situation in Surabaya as reported in this study where both polyglossia (a manifestation of societal multilingualism) and individual multilinguality operate. The polyglossic functions of the codes used by the totok subjects in Surabaya are discussed further in chapter 9.

While discussing diglossia and bilingualism, Fishman (1972a: 437) suggests that the following question is important to ask: “who speaks what language to whom and when in those speech communities that are characterized by widespread and relatively stable bilingualism”. In a state of relatively stable bilingualism characterised by diglossia, it would seem that languages are compartmentalized with different languages or language varieties having their own complementary place and functions within society. In order to discuss these complementary functions, I need to introduce the notion of 'domain of language use'. Hoffman (1971: 17) characterises domains as

> "institutionally relevant spheres of social interaction in which certain value clusters are behaviourally implemented. Domains are similar to the sociolinguist's institutions, but take into account behaviour, as well as structure".

He goes on to note that

> "Domain analysis in the multilingual setting provides a broadened understanding of language usage, because it involves the implementation of the rules of social behaviour which are derived from the value clusters of the society being studied, and allows us to make crucial connection between abstract value clusters and the more concrete social situations".

Fishman (1972b: 29) postulates that domains and social situations reveal the links that exist between macro- and micro-sociolinguistics, hence, society and individual face-to-face interaction. Thus, it is understood that individual language behaviours or attitudes that underlie interactional and conversational activities are connected one way or another to societal factors.

Commonly suggested anchor points of domains are family, friendship, religion,

---

6 Platt (1977: 373) introduces the concept 'Dummy High' which refers to "speech varieties of which some of the members have a certain knowledge, and which are given prestige ratings by the speakers and are even recognized either by government authorities, media or prestige groups within the speech community, but which are not in fact utilized extensively in any domain".
employment and education (see e.g., Greenfield, 1968, van den Berg, 1986), but
different scholars have often used slightly different lists of domains. Hoffman (1971)
suggests seven domains: home, work, neighbourhood, education, officialdom (and
government bureaucracy), religion, and voluntary organizations. Fishman (1978, 1972:
441) and Rubin (1968), discuss language choice in terms of the following domains: the
family, the playground and the street, the school, the church, literature, the press, the
military, the courts, and governmental administration. Barber (1952) suggests that
domains can be grouped into sets of domains which share some similarities: intimate
(family), formal (religious-ceremonial), informal (neighbourhood), and inter-group
(economic and recreational activities as well as interactions with governmental-legal
authority). Whatever the precise set of domains a particular scholar uses, one domain is
conspicuous for its presence on every list of domains I have seen reported in the
literature: the family domain. Clearly, the family domain holds a crucial role in all
situations of polyglossia.

Platt (1980a: 71) suggests that domains can be ranged along different scales:
from more public to more private and from more formal to less formal. For example,
government can be perceived as more public than friendship. In each given domain
there may be degrees of formality depending on variation in locale, topic, relationship
between interlocutors and even the numbers of interlocutors present. These sorts of
differences can be understood as sub-domains within a general domain.

All these scholars propose different sets of domains in their attempt to capture
the full range of linguistic behaviour that people exhibit which might vary from one
group of people to another and from case to case. What might be an important domain
to distinguish with one group of people may not be so important for another group of
people, because they behave essentially the same in this domain as they do in another
one that has been distinguished.

To present a full view of the subjects' verbal repertoire in chapter 6 the present
study adopts the seven domains suggested by Hoffman (1971). In addition to Hoffman's
domains, two further domains are distinguished: that of 'business transaction in
marketplace' and that of 'friendship'. For the school domain, apart from the language
used as the medium of instruction, I also include a subdivision first postulated by
Schmidt-Roehr (1932), which he labelled the language of recess and entertainment and
which I call the language of the school ground. As the codes the subjects use in these two domains vary extensively depending on the situations they are in, these two domains are proposed to provide sufficient variety of domains to characterise the full variety of behaviours exhibit by the subjects. Although some aspects of linguistic behaviour in all of these domains will be discussed, in accordance with the aims of this study the detailed discussion of language use will focus on language choice within the family domain.

To conclude, in the complementary distribution model, the distribution of language use can be explained in terms of di-/polyglossia and domain. With regard to this, Eckert (1980) notes that ‘complementary distribution of the coexisting languages virtually eliminates the possibility of random choice, and structures behaviour at the community and discourse level by means similar to those at work in the grammar of each language’. In this kind of diglossia, norms and values are treated as primary and basic features of social activities while power is a secondary phenomenon (Martin-Jones, 1989: 109). In other views of multilingualism, however, power takes a more central role. The 'conflict model' takes such a stance.

2.6.1.2 The conflict model

Li Wei (1994) points out that in Fishman's modification of Ferguson's concept of diglossia, an important question has still not been addressed, namely how the compartmentalization of language functions in diglossia came about in the first place. It has been pointed out by many researchers that languages in the society do not always have neutral and complementary societal functions. Instead they are in conflict, or in competition with each other. In some cases, languages even struggle to maintain their existence (see e.g. Joy (1972) on French and English in Canada, Wardhaugh (1987) and also Haugen (1966) on languages in Norway). Language shift can sometimes be counterbalanced by language maintenance, typically after ‘the imposition of foreign languages by colonial powers, and the reversal of this action through the imposition of revival national languages in postcolonial situations’ (Eckert, 1980: 1055). As summarized in Martin-Jones (1989: 118), studies taking a conflict perspective usually cover the following social issues:

1. the ways in which divisions between linguistic groups are related to class divisions and to political economic relations within the framework of the state;
2. the processes involved in the imposition of power and the reproduction of power relations;
3. the nature of conflicts and social struggles generated by relations of power.

The main argument put forward by these researchers is that the languages involved in diglossia (and obviously polyglossia as well) are unequal in terms of their social, political or economic status. Thus, polyglossia cannot be politically and socially neutral. As Eckert (1980: 1056) says: “One language is imposed from above in the form of an administrative, ritual or standard language. By virtue of its political and economic status, this language becomes requisite for access to power and mobility within the society” while as LiWei (1994: 13) notes “the other is deliberately devalued and its domains of use are restricted”. Thus, among linguistic minorities, diglossia (or polyglossia) can be but a stage in a process of shift to the dominant language (Martin-Jones, 1989: 112). As Eckert (1980: 1056) says

“The functions of the standard language exist in opposition to those of the vernacular, and this opposition can operate as a powerful force of assimilation by interacting with and reinforcing social evaluation of the domains in which the two languages are used. ....This sets up a situation that one might think could remain stable, but that under most circumstances will become dynamic through a continual redefinition of the standards and the vernacular and of their domains”.

In conclusion, there are two main models, complementary and conflict, subscribed to by scholars who study the macro-societal level of language use. Both models share with each other the view that there is a relationship between social structure and individuals’ language behaviour. However, while the complementary distribution model sees di-/polyglossia as a neat, neutral and relatively stable compartmentalization of languages and their social functions, the conflict model stresses inequality and competition between languages.

As I have already noted, both societal and individual perspectives on multilingualism-multilinguality are required if we are to gain a full understanding of the phenomena. As Eckert (1980: 1055-56) points out, the fate of an individual’s bi-/multilinguality depends closely on that of the community, as the nature of di-/polyglossia has a very personal effect on bi-/multilingual individuals. In the next section let us turn our attention to the individual/interactional level of language use.

2.6.2 Individual multilinguality: the micro-interactional perspective
At an individual level, the distribution of languages is determined by language or code choice in individual face-to-face interactions. As Li Wei (1994) puts it, we need to understand individuals’ capacity to take advantage of “the linguistic and social resources available to them in producing and reproducing social structures and social
relations". Clearly, this capacity is related to an individual's competence in the languages in his repertoire.

As illustrated in §2.4 above, Platt (1980a) and Pandit (1972) note that multilinguals are not necessarily well-versed in all the languages or language varieties in their individual or society’s repertoire. Sridhar (1996: 50) also points out that one of the important characteristics of multilingualism is that multilinguals do not necessarily have a native-like proficiency in all of the languages in their verbal repertoires. In fact, possessing a balanced, native-like command of all languages is rather uncommon. Knowledge of a language from within one's repertoire might range from a few lexical items and formulaic expressions, all the way to excellent grammar, vocabulary and specialized registers and styles. Grosjean (1982) notes that multilinguals’ linguistic competence is in fact a composite of many partial competences in each of the languages in their repertoire. These partial competences complement each other and form a complex resource which the multilingual uses as a gestalt to fulfil all their life functions. Their competence in each language is developed to the extent of their needs and it is used in the contexts within which the language is needed. This composite nature of multilinguals’ verbal repertoire is referred to as multi-competence by Cook (1992, 1995, 1996). Multi-competence is a feature of the subjects of this study too, as will be discussed later in chapter 6.

The study of social use and functions of language in the individual bilingual interaction and the contribution of social context to linguistic meaning have been considerably discussed in works such as those by Gumperz (1971b, 1971c, 1982), Gal (1979), Halliday (1973), Hymes (1974) and Myers-Scotton (1993b) to mention a few. Gumperz’s work, especially his efforts to distinguish kinds of code-switching are of particular interest here. However, it is Myers-Scotton’s Markedness Model which serves as the main theoretical framework for data analysis in this study.

Gumperz (1982: 75-84) proposes six major functions for conversational code-switching (some of Gumperz' functions of code-switching are found in chapter 7 and 8)

---

7 Other scholars have used different terms to refer to Cook's 'multicompetence': polylectal competence (Bickerton, 1975), varilingualism (Carrington, 1993, Youssef, 1996), etc., but I will use Cook's term here.
which he claims ‘hold across language situations’ (p. 75) but says that his list is ‘by no means exhaustive’ (p. 80). Blom and Gumperz only describe how and when code switching takes place, but they do not explain why a speaker code-switches. Gumperz’s studies of codes-switching have inspired many more scholars, one of the foremost of whom is Myers-Scotton. In the next section, I discuss Myers-Scotton’s Markedness Model, a socio-pragmatic model, of code-switching which also attempts to explain the ‘why’ of code-switching and in particular the societal norms which give social meaning to a code choice a speaker makes.

2.6.2.1 Myers-Scotton’s Markedness Models, her Rational Actor theory, and other approaches

2.6.2.1.1 The Markedness Model and code choice

Myers-Scotton (1990, 1991, 1993b) proposes her ‘Markedness Model’ (henceforth, MM) to incorporate the social symbolism of languages on the one hand and conversational strategy on the other. There are a set of theoretical approaches concerned with language use which motivate the MM, which among others are Labov’s (1972) sociolinguistic notions of ‘speech community’ and ‘social context’, Grice’s (1975) ‘cooperative principle’ with its conversational maxims, Hymes’ (1972b) ‘communicative competence’ and Fishman’s (1972) ‘allocation paradigm.

A basic idea underlying the Markedness Model is the idea that each code used in bilingual (and possibly multilingual) encounters is associated with specific roles which Myers-Scotton calls rights and obligations sets (RO sets), and is linked with particular types of relationships. Myers-Scotton (1993b: 85) explains that an RO set is “an abstract construct, derived from situational factors, standing for the attitudes and expectations of participants towards each other”. Thus, a code comes to index an RO set. Myers-Scotton (1993b: 85) illustrates how RO sets are associated with particular codes by giving the example of a Nairobi community where “speaking English in a white-collar office setting implicates an RO set in which higher education and authority have special salience in the way a speaker conducts himself or herself toward the addressee and in how he or she expects to be treated in return.... Speaking one’s ethnic language in the same interaction type indexes a different RO set, one in which the speaker’s right and obligations are based on ethnic solidarity...”

The model attempts to account for speakers' socio-psychological motivations
behind their code choice. A major motivation is the possibility of social-identity negotiations (Myers-Scottot, 1993b: 75). She proposes that the theory behind the MM is

"that speakers have a sense of markedness regarding available linguistic codes for any interaction, but choose their codes based on the persona and/or relation with others which they wish to have in place. This markedness has a normative basis within the community, and speakers also know the consequences of making marked or unexpected choices. Because the unmarked choice is 'safer' (i.e. it conveys no surprises because it indexes an expected interpersonal relationship), speakers generally make this choice. But not always. Speakers assess the potential costs and rewards of all alternative choices, and make their decisions, typically unconsciously".

So it can be inferred that when entering into conversation, participants 'know' or have similar expectations about the unmarked code choices or about unmarked communicative intentions based on their experience of language use in their community.

As postulated by Labov (1972), members of the same community share 'norms of evaluation' even though they do not share exactly the same linguistic repertoires. What this means is that there is sufficient uniformity in markedness judgments across a community for speakers to trust that their communicative intentions are received as intended. The unmarked RO set is then derived from whatever situational features are salient for that community in that interaction type. Myers-Scottot (1992) argues that speakers have an innate theory, which she called a 'markedness metric', of socially-relevant markedness and indexicality. This metric underlies the ability to assess the markedness of a particular code choice in reference to a specific speech event in a specific community (Myers-Scottot, 1993b:76). While, an unmarked code choice is indexical of the expected rights and obligations set for a given interaction type, a marked choice is not.

Modelled after Grice's 'co-operative principle' (1975), the centrepiece of all code choices and the speakers' motivations in MM is a 'negotiation principle' (Myers-Scottot, 1983a: 116, Myers-Scottot, 1993b:113) which directs speakers to

"Choose the form of your conversation contribution such that it indexes the set of rights and obligations which you wish to be in force between speaker and addressee for the current exchange" (original italics)

---

8 'Indexicality' is a concept figuring in the theory which is closely related to the assessment of situational factors (Myers-Scottot, 1993b:85).

9 Speakers make actual readings of markedness through experience with language use in a community (Myers-Scottot 1993b:109).
By choosing a particular code, a speaker signals his understanding of the situational features the code holds in the community. In switching to another code or using two or more codes in one conversational event, a speaker is negotiating a new set of RO. So, in switching codes, 'the speaker dis-identifies with the expected RO set' (Myers-Scotton, 1993b:131). As they depart from the unmarked code, the speakers employ the switch as a strategy to indicate certain intentions different from the expected one. In other words, whether speakers code-switch or not depends on the RO set they want to maintain, establish or challenge in a given interaction (Myers-Scotton, 1993b:113-114). It should be noted that RO sets do not determine code choice. Rather, they determine the markedness of code choices. In general, bi-/multilingual speakers use code choices to negotiate interpersonal relationships within a normative framework. The framework does not limit the choices that speakers can make but it limits the possible interpretations of those choices.

Hymes' (1972b) concept of 'communicative competence' is another approach supporting the MM. Hymes' notion of communicative competence implies that competent language speakers should have tacit knowledge not merely of the grammar of a language but also the ability to judge the acceptability of different kinds of speech in given social contexts to ensure communicative efficiency, an idea also shared by Gibbons (1987: 32). To be competent, speakers 'know the answers to four questions' (Hymes, 1972b: 281):

1. Whether (and to what degree) something is formally possible;
2. Whether (and to what degree) something is feasible...
3. Whether (and to what degree) something is appropriate (adequate, happy, successful) in relation to a context in which it is used and evaluated;
4. Whether (and to what degree) something is in fact done, actually performed, and what its doing entails.

In her MM, Myers-Scotton (1993b: 79) adds yet an additional item to Hymes' list of competent speaker, i.e.:

Whether (and to what degree) a linguistic choice is marked and how it is to be interpreted in the context in which it occurs

Related to this is another foundation stone of the Markedness Model: the basic principle of Fishman's (1972: 437) normative framework, i.e. an 'allocation paradigm' that "habitual language choice in multilingual speech communities or speech networks is far from being a random matter of momentary inclination". Myers-Scotton contends, however, that Fishman's allocation paradigm does not account for all the variation
encountered, so her MM has some seemingly small, but important differences with Fishman's original formulation. As code choices are modifiable and dynamic depending on the situations, MM attempts to cover all variations in its explanation, both the dominant unmarked choices and the marked ones.

It can be inferred that speakers recognize choices as either unmarked or marked in reference to its context, the norms of their speech community, i.e. the community patterns of language use which speakers are aware of through their experience of language use in the community (Fishman, 1972: 110). Myers-Scotton (1983a: 115) claims that community norms designate "specific linguistic code choices as the unmarked manifestations of a specific set of rights and obligations holding between a certain speaker and addressee". Myers-Scotton (1983a: 117) refers to the kinds of interactions using unmarked code choices as conventionalized exchange (i.e. the fact they occur more frequently than the marked choice implies a consensus). As the potency of unmarked choices is derived from existing norms, selecting a marked choice is an effort to construct new norms by negotiating a new set of rights and obligations (Myers-Scotton, 2000:1259). Therefore, markedness can only be interpreted within specific interactions in specific communities. The unmarked choice is the one that meets the beliefs, values, desires and goals of persons in the community who have sufficient power to set norms, while a marked choice does not (Myers-Scotton, 2000:1263).

In short, Myers-Scotton (1998c) argues that unmarked choices are norm-related and their theoretical construct can be identified on the basis of frequency (Myers-Scotton, 2002). Myers-Scotton further emphasizes that "...once the unmarked choice is objectively established, the analyst can certainly argue that marked choices mean 'something else' (2002: 216). Myers-Scotton believes that 'a code is linked with the unmarked RO set for certain types of participant in an interaction ... that a code choice is linked more with interpersonal relationships than with the situational frame ... and that code choices are dynamic depending on the circumstances (1993b:92-93). She goes on to claim that "MM explains both marked and unmarked choices, ... it attempts to answer the implied questions of what linguistic variation accomplishes in an interactional sense, ... that not every member of the same social groups makes the same linguistic choices at all times and that MM views all choices as speaker-motivated". Thus, a speaker can choose either the predicted unmarked codes or marked unexpected ones. Using a code serves as a negotiation to make it a norm and thereby bind other
participants (Myers-Scotton, 1998c:28). Although there is not necessarily a single unmarked or a single marked choice, there is usually a dominant unmarked choice, especially within relatively conventionalized interaction types (Myers-Scotton, 1993b: 82, 89).

Despite the societal normative framework involved in the MM, it is the speaker/actor who decides to make the actual code choices, and determines whether to use a code that is marked or a code that is unmarked. As will be discussed in the next section, Myers-Scotton states that the speaker can be seen as a rational actor who makes a decision about which code to use from a range of possible alternatives. Sometimes, however, out of ignorance, a speaker may unintentionally or unexpectedly make a marked choice (Bernsten, 1998). The presence of another person or an audience also can influence the speaker to change the set of rights and obligations between him and his interlocutor (Bernsten, 1998) and in turn cause the code choice to become marked.

As was pointed out by Myers-Scotton (2000:1264), it is also possible that different participants in the same interaction have different perceptions about the unmarked choice and acting on those perceptions. Myers-Scotton’s (2002:215) data corpus in her recent article demonstrates that not all participants in the same conversation have the same unmarked choice and that what is ‘marked’ for one speaker is not necessarily ‘marked’ for the other. This is especially true when participants include members from several generations and it is particularly prevalent when speech communities are in transition. What might be unmarked for one generation may be marked for another, as found in the study done by Li Wei (1994, 1998a) on Chinese immigrant communities in Tyneside Britain. LiWei reports that different generations choose different unmarked codes for different family members.

Following Grice’s (1975) maxim, Myers-Scotton proposes three major maxims in MM to explain the phenomenon of code-switching, (1) the unmarked-choice maxim, which has two auxiliary maxims, (a) the virtuosity maxim, and (b) the deference maxim, which both direct speakers towards seemingly marked choices, (2) the marked-choice maxim, and (3) the exploratory-choice maxim, which also has an auxiliary maxim associated with it, the 'multiple identities maxim'. The maxims are as follows:

*The Unmarked-choice Maxim*: Make your code choice the unmarked index of the unmarked RO set in talk exchanges when you wish to establish or affirm that RO set.
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The Virtuosity Maxim: Make an otherwise marked choice whenever the linguistic ability of either Speaker or Interlocutor makes the unmarked choice for the unmarked RO set in a conventionalized exchange infelicitous. (Switch to whatever code is necessary in order to carry on the conversation/ accommodate the participation of all speakers present).

The Deference Maxim: Switch to a code which expresses deference to others when special respect is called for by circumstances. (This maxim complements the unmarked-choice maxim by calling for deference where it is unmarked, i.e. when societal norms indicate it is appropriate. So what appears to be a marked choice becomes unmarked)

The Marked-choice Maxim: Make a marked choice which is not the unmarked index of the unmarked RO set in an interaction when you wish to establish a new RO set as unmarked for the current exchange.

The Exploratory-choice Maxim: When an unmarked choice is not clear, use code-switching between speech varieties to make alternate exploratory choices as (alternate) candidates for the unmarked choice and thereby as an index of an RO set which you favour.

The Multiple Identities Maxim: Optionally make more than one exploratory choice as metaphors for multiple RO sets, thereby implicating multiple identities for oneself.

Under MM, these maxims are manifested in five kinds of motivations for code-switching behaviour (Myers-Scotton, 1992: 419, 1993b: 114-149)

1. CS as a sequence of unmarked choices: make a sequence of unmarked choices in cases in which situational factors change during the course of a conversation and therefore a new code becomes unmarked

2. CS itself as the unmarked choice: in cases in which it is expected that a person with the sociolinguistic profile of the speaker will wish to index the social identities associated with two or more codes in the same conversation and therefore the speaker switches between these codes to invoke simultaneous identities

3. CS as a marked choice in cases in which the speaker wishes to dis-identify with the unmarked rights and obligations set for an interaction and negotiate a change in the social distance holding between other participants and himself/herself

4. CS as an exploratory choice in cases in which the speaker is unsure which norms apply in a given interaction, either because the interaction is novel or the speaker does not have full information about other participants.

5. CS as a deferential strategy in cases where speakers switch to a code which expresses deference to others when special respect is called for by the circumstances.

Some researchers have criticised Myers-Scotton for adopting Fishman’s approach. Li Wei (1994) argues that Myers-Scotton’s claims to having linked the social and the individual factors of code-switching have not been empirically proven. He suggests that how languages become marked or unmarked or how speakers acquire the set of rights and obligations in a given social interaction has not been systematically shown. However, in support of Myers-Scotton, Nilep (2006) suggests that one can always learn which languages are typically used in particular situations through ethnographic observation and that speakers learn these norms as part of the language socialization process. Although supporting Myers-Scotton on this point, Nilep does
point to another possible problem with the MM approach: that an analyst needs to make assumptions about each individual speaker’s knowledge and understanding of the speech situation. Code switching is explained on the basis of an analyst’s assumptions about speakers’ internal states (including shared judgments about rights and obligations) rather than its effects on the conversation at hand. I would argue that careful participant observation and interviewing of the subjects about their self-reported motivations can help to overcome this problem. Moreover, if an analyst is a native speaker of at least some of the languages involved and a participant in similar domains with similar people, his knowledge and familiarity of the RO sets the languages have, is surely a great advantage to support any assumptions and analyses.

Myers-Scotton has continued to refine and develop her markedness model over a number of years. This can be seen in publications such as (see Myers-Scotton, 1983a) and in her extended version of the Markedness Model (Myers-Scotton, 2002, 1993b, 1997b, 2000, and Myers-Scotton and Bolonyai, 2001b). The extended markedness model is described in the next section.

2.6.2.1.2 The Extended Markedness Model: a Rational Theory

Myers-Scotton’s Markedness Model inspired a great deal of research into code switching. Developments for Myers-Scotton's Markedness Model culminated after a number of years in what she called her 'Extended Markedness Model' (Myers-Scotton, 1993b: 100, 1997b). For Myers-Scotton, this model encapsulated a cognitively-based approach in which the speakers in conversations are all seen as rational actors. Speakers try to get the optimum result from their interactions through their use of rationality. They choose one variety over another because of the benefits they expect from that choice, relative to its costs. In the following pages, I review some of the work which led to Myers-Scotton recasting her model and then I look in detail at the extended Markedness Model itself.

Myers-Scotton applies the rational choice theory to code choices using Elster’s work. Elster’s (1989: 14) Rational Choice theory is used to model so-called rational choices by theorists from a number of different disciplines, including economics, sociology, political science, and philosophy as well as sociolinguistics. Elster (1989:14), himself a sociologist, proposed that before a choice could be made, it had to go through several filters. The first filter Elster referred to as 'structural constraints': “all the
physical, economic, legal and psychological constraints that an individual faces”. These constraints produce an ‘opportunity set’ which is the set of all possible courses of actions available to a person. The second filter consists of rationality and social norms. These are the mechanisms responsible for choosing alternative forms from those that were deemed possible by the structural constraints.

In her Rational Actor Models (1997b), Myers-Scotton applies these basic ideas as the underpinning for a new framework of filters and constraints that can be used to model code-switching behaviour. According to Myers-Scotton's extended Markedness Model, the following filters are relevant:

1. the structural constraints filter is social context. These constraints produce opportunity sets. For Myers-Scotton, the opportunity set is the speaker/the actor’s linguistic repertoire.

2. the second filter: rational choice and social norms as mechanism of choice

Explaining how the filters operate alongside each other, Myers-Scotton (1996:16, 1997b) argues that

“Rationality provides the mechanism necessary to explain choices from the available opportunity set. These mechanisms are rationally-based desires and beliefs... Like other Rational choice models, the Markedness Model sees speakers as making choices as individuals, not because norms cause them to do so. Speakers make the choices which they do because they are rational actors who consider the consequences, and then go ahead and do as well for themselves as they believe they can. And because perceptions are not the same as opportunities, not everyone makes the same code choice in the same circumstances”.

MM exploits the socio-psychological association of linguistic varieties to explain the choices made by speakers: the unmarked and marked choice, as well as the overall pattern of code switching as an unmarked choice. Thus, the important issue in the extended MM is its more apparent goal of optimizing the speaker’s choice. In her later works, Myers-Scotton (1998c, 2000: 1261, 2001b) adds another filter to the two filters already discussed above. The final set of filters:

1. external factors: structural constraints which produce opportunity sets which in MM are translated as social context which produces the speaker’s linguistic repertoire

2. internal factors: two innately available devices programmed by the speaker’s experience: Damasio’s (1996) idea of ‘somatic markers’ and MM’s ‘markedness
metric' which in the extended model, is referred to as the 'markedness evaluator'.

3. rationality and social norms

As written above, Myers-Scotton (2000: 1260, 2001b) postulates one additional filter to the existing two filters. They are the somatic marker: the organism’ (including humans’) innate capacity to make decision for survival and the markedness evaluator: the capacity to conceptualize markedness, i.e. the ability to perceive, to interpret, to recognize and differentiate the socially more unmarked from more marked choice along a continuum of choices. Myers-Scotton (1993b:80) argues that this metric of markedness is owned by speakers as part of their linguistic capacity.

She states that each speaker is a rational actor and as such he has certain rational motivations, intentions, or aims in choosing certain codes in his interactions (Myers-Scotton, 1993b, 1996, 2001b) and that his code choice is governed by the social norms he is in. “Social norms coordinate expectations” (Elster, 1989: 97), and “because norms, by their very nature, depend on an often unspoken consensus, norms necessarily favour unmarked choices, which themselves depend on a consensus” (Myers-Scotton, 2000:1261-1262).

Although a consensus is formed by the community, the exact code chosen depends neither on the speech norms nor the social network but on the speakers as the individuals who have intentions of one sort or another (Elster, 1979, 1989, Myers-Scotton and Bolonyai, 2001b). All linguistic choices, whether unmarked or marked, are intentional, and people make these choices in order to optimize certain social gains. Furthermore, speakers expect the interlocutors to recognise these intentions (see Myers-Scotton, 1997b, 1998c). The kind of intentionality discussed above, then, signifies rationality on the part of the speakers. Myers-Scotton (2002: 216) concludes

"speakers make choices that they think will give them the best return, given the circumstances. Thus, the argument of the Markedness Model and this paper is that marked choices should be interpreted as rationally-based; the speaker expects value from departing from his/her usual way of speaking. The good fit between these premises— that quantification can identify (un)marked choice and the deductive premise that marked choices are made because extraordinary value is expected – make an attractive basis for interpreting variation in code choice.”

Nilep (2006) claims that so far MM is the most influential and fully developed model to account for motivations of code-switching, and I would tend to agree. The Markedness Model offers a sound framework to account for the social motivations
underlying multilingual speakers’ code choice behaviour. Myers-Scotton’s extended version of Markedness Model recast under Rational Choice theory also offers a guideline for analysing the subjects’ normative unmarked behaviour and the rationality (intentionality/implicatures) behind their code choices. I will make frequent use of the Markedness Model in the later discussions of code switching in this thesis.

2.6.2.1.3 Other aspects of Myers-Scotton’s work and their relation to this study

As already noted in passing in §2.5 above, Myers-Scotton’s (1993a, 1997c) defined code-switching as “the selection by bilinguals or multilinguals of forms from embedded variety (or varieties) in utterances of a matrix variety during the same conversation”. The underlying assumption of this definition is that there exists an asymmetry regarding the participation of the languages involved, with one language being more prominent in a conversational exchange than another one.

In reference to this notion of one language being predominant, Myers-Scotton calls her approach to code-switching the 'Matrix Language Frame Model' (henceforth MLFM). In her earliest work she claimed that there were two interrelated hierarchies governing the juxtaposition of mixed structural patterns in code-switching: (a) The Matrix Language vs Embedded Language hierarchy, and (b) The system vs content morpheme hierarchy. The ‘matrix language’ (ML) is the predominant language and Myers-Scotton claims that this language has a more cognitively dominant role in CS. The other participating language(s) are inserted into the matrix frame but have lesser roles and these are labelled the ‘embedded language(s)’ (EL). Myers-Scotton claims that only one language serves as the ML. The ML plays a predominant role in language production and its grammar supplies the morpheme order, the morphosyntactactic order, and the system morphemes as well as content morphemes for the frame. On the other hand, the EL might supply some of the content morphemes but not the system morphemes. To determine the ML, Myers-Scotton (1993a, 1997c: 68) initially proposed ‘a frequency-based-criterion’: “The ML is the language of more morphemes in interaction types including intrasentential CS”. This MLFM is based largely on the notion that the participating speakers are equally proficient in both languages so that they could engage in monolingual discourse in any of the languages involved. Myers-Scotton explains that the speakers’ code-switching is termed ‘classic codeswitching’.

Following criticism of her original model, Myers-Scotton (1997c) modified and
refined the MLFM. In recent publications (Myers-Scotton and Jake, 2000b, Myers-Scotton, 2001a), Myers-Scotton augmented her Matrix Language Frame Model by suggesting two new sub-models which she called the 4-M model and the Abstract Level model. In the new model she discussed several compromise strategies: *embedded language islands* and *bare forms*. In both her revised version and also in the new model, her unit of analysis is neither the sentence nor the clause but the Projection of Complementizer (CP). One of the major innovations of her new model was the introduction of the notion of a Composite Matrix Language. In her new framework, a composite matrix language can structure the bilingual projection of complementizer CP, and thus more than one code can be involved in building the frame. In other words, the matrix language can be seen as having converged with the embedded language. The codeswitching which results from these situations is ‘composite codeswitching’ as opposed to the earlier version’s ‘classical codeswitching’ in which both the matrix language and the embedded language remain more or less intact.

Myers-Scotton also ties her revised model to the notion of linguistic competence. Under the old model, identification of the matrix language was based on frequency alone. Under the revised model, the distinction between content and system morphemes is enriched with three types of system morphemes. These different kinds of system morphemes are said to be different in the way in which they are accessed in language production. System morphemes consist of early system morphemes which are activated at the lemma level, and late system morphemes which consist of *bridges* and *outsiders*. Myers-Scotton (2001a: 43-44) explains that the early system morphemes are “always realized without going outside the maximal projection of the content morpheme that elects them” and cites examples such as the French determiners *(le and la, etc)* and English ‘*the*’ which expresses definiteness. Bridge late system morphemes are “similar to early system morphemes in that they depend on the information within the maximal projection in which they occur. Yet, ...they do not add conceptual structure to a content morpheme but unite elements in a maximal projection”. These include elements such as the English genitive possessive *of* as in *friend of the family*. Outsider late system morphemes depend on grammatical information outside of their own ‘maximal projection’. The examples she cites are the English present tense form in which the form of a verb for a third person singular is co-indexed with the singular noun or pronoun it represents. These kinds of morphemes look outside their immediate maximal projection
for information about their forms. Myers-Scotton (2001a: 42) argues that these subdivisions of system morphemes allow for a fuller explanation of why certain types of congruence problems arise in code-switching between certain language pairs. Myers-Scotton (2001a: 54) also emphasized that “matrix language is best understood, not as an actual language, but rather as a theoretical construct referring to the abstract morphosyntactic frame that structures bilingual utterances”.

Much controversy has been raised around the issues of what constitutes both the ‘matrix language’ and ‘the embedded language(s)’, but these need not concern us too much insofar as the present study is concerned, because the ML hypothesis as it is currently framed cannot be applied to the kind of code-switching found in the present study. It is the presence of so-called ‘late system morphemes’ which largely determines the matrix language under her new framework, and as we have seen, these are defined as morphemes that look outside their immediate maximal projection for information about their forms. Translating this claim into less theory-specific terminology, her current idea is basically that the matrix language is identified as the one that supplies all the agreement morphology. Since none of the languages that predominate in the conversation analysed in this study have any agreement at all, it is impossible to identify a matrix language using her current criteria.

In addition, as the code-switching data in this study involve languages or language varieties which have similar morpho-syntactic structures and share numerous cognates from Malay, Indonesian and/or Javanese: both content and system morpheme, it is not always easy to distinguish one code from another, especially when there is also no clear cut boundary in the codes ranging in a continuum. Also, almost all the languages or language varieties commonly involved in this study have neither inflectional affixes nor copula or other kinds of agreements which can differentiate one from the other. For these reasons, it is not always easy to determine which code serves as the default or dominant ‘matrix’ language and which ones as the embedded languages/varieties. Myers-Scotton (1997c:17) also admits that “in situations where syntactic convergence has taken place, or where switching is between dialects of the same language, it would be difficult (although not impossible) to test the claims of the model…” This stand is shared by Errington (1998: 162) who voices similar concern regarding Javanese and Indonesian which share many cognates and similar grammar: “When it is not possible to demarcate points of difference between the two languages, it
is correspondingly difficult to distinguish which might count as the ‘base’ or ‘matrix’ language for a switch from one into another”. Youssef (1996: 17) and Franceschini (1998: 58) state similar ideas that when two languages, language varieties or dialects share lexicon and grammar, it is difficult to determine which languages or language varieties serves as the matrix and embedded languages respectively.

Due to the nature of the code-switching data under study, the Matrix Language Frame Model is not used here. Moreover, as the purpose of this study is to analyse the subjects’ motivations behind their multilingual code choice practices, Myers-Scotton’s Markedness Model is deemed as more appropriate to serve as the framework of data analysis. The next section discusses the Markedness Model used in this study in relation to the use of more than one code as a conversational strategy.

2.6.2.1.4 Code-switching as an unmarked conversational strategy

As reported by Lawson and Sachev (2000), code-switching has been viewed negatively by some scholars. However, it is clear that code-switching is often part of the conversational strategies of many members of bilingual and multilingual communities. Some bilinguals/multilinguals rarely switch codes while others seem unable to avoid doing so. In many cases code switching is perceived as a fluid, smooth, unmarked, uneventful, quite normal and widespread form of bilingual interaction requiring a great deal of bilingual competence. Some scholars (Eastman, 1992: 177, Goynaerts and Zembele, 1992, Muysken, 1995, Swigart, 1992) are of the opinion that code-switching should be seen as the norm of interactions. Myers-Scotton and Ury (1977: 122) profess a similar view, saying that “…for many bilingual speakers, the unmarked choice for their unmarked RO set when speaking to peers who are bilingual is more than one code; code-switching is an unmarked choice for bilinguals in certain conventionalized exchanges”. In this case, Myers-Scotton (1983a, 1988a, 1983b, 1986) states that code-switching is not purposive or motivated since it serves as their interaction mode and she refers to this by labelling ‘overall switching as the unmarked choice’. Poplack (1980: 614) sees some code-switching as ‘an overall discourse mode’. Poplack emphasized that “the very fact that a speaker makes alternate use of both codes, itself has interactional motivations and implications, beyond any particular effects of specific switches. … It is then the choice (or not) of this mode which is of significance to participants rather than the choice of switch points.” (1980: 614). Since it is the ‘overall pattern’ which carries the communicative intention, unmarked code-switching usually occurs between
bilinguals with similar experiences, and in these cases code-switching occurs with no new indexicality involved. Instead, the overall pattern of code-switching itself carries the conversational intention (Myers-Scotton, 1983a: 122, 1993b: 117) and serves as a conversational strategy (see Franceschini, 1998:81, Meeuwis and Blommaert, 1998, Swigart, 1992).

Code-switching as the unmarked choice can serve as a medium of in-group (informal) interactions as has been noted for a number of multilingual urban communities in Africa and India, including for instance Swigart's (1992) Urban Wolof. This kind of code-switching also occurs in immigrant communities or families in Europe and North America (see Myers-Scotton, 1998c: 99), and among Chinese speakers in south and Southeast Asia (Pakir, 1989, Platt, 1976a, 1977, 1977b, 1980b) where English, Malay and Chinese languages (Hokkien, Cantonese, Foochow etc.) are involved. The alternation of different codes suggests a 'we-code' which draws upon some sub-cultural conventions inaccessible to outsiders (Pakir, 1989: 381).

The following section presents the sequential approach employed in the analysis of micro-interactional exchanges and the reasons why it is chosen.

2.6.2.2 Analyzing micro-interactional exchanges with sequential approach

To analyse multilingual data in relation to the background of social and psychological motivations of its speakers, a sequential method is used (as mentioned in §4.4.4.2) in this study. It means that the examples of code-switching are presented in their 'sequential environment'—a term borrowed from Auer (1995) — and analysed sequentially on a turn-by-turn basis (Bourhis, 1985: 126, Genesee and Bourhis, 1982, Lawson-Sako and Sachdev, 1996). In this sequential method, the meaningfulness of the switched utterance is analysed in light of the utterances that come immediately before and after it (Auer, 1988, 1991, 1995).

The reason behind it is that in order to understand a speaker's motivation, including his intended message, through his chosen code, it is important to analyse the code used by the previous speaker as well as by the next speaker. By analysing a succession of turns, it can be inferred whether a new set of RO is being negotiated when participants make their code choices. Since each conversational turn serves as a presentation of what Myers-Scotton refers to as negotiation, only through scrutinizing successive turns can one determine whether an earlier turn successfully negotiated a
new unmarked code choice. Turn-by-turn analysis of linguistic interactions helps classify the types of switches that have taken place and aids in the elucidation of the motivational factors behind code choice behaviour.

Another reason for using sequential analysis is that most of the extracts discussed (see chapter 8) are taken from long dialogues which sometimes have a main sequence of turns in addition to what might be seen as ‘side sequences’. In the side sequences, there may be sub-topics in which the speakers divert from the main topic in the main interaction in order to converse with a subset of the conversational participants before continuing with the main topic and the whole group of interlocutors. Code-switching might occur in the main sequence or the side sequences and whether it is marked or unmarked in either the main or the side sequences is heavily context-specific, very often sequentially determined, and may be determined by factors in either the main or side sequence.

As the communication studied happens in this intra-group (family) interactions, code choice is not employed to reduce, create or maintain inter-group boundaries as was found in Lawson and Sachdev’s (2000) study, but rather to preserve intra-group relationships and to maintain harmony among its members. In some cases, such ‘accommodative’ action only becomes apparent through a turn-by-turn analysis, especially in a delayed or disguised marked choice. In other cases, asymmetrical code choices might seem to be taking place in the group interactions; however, a sequential analysis implemented reveals that it is not the case as the next speaker is not the intended addressee.

In short, to trace the choice of codes employed in interactions, a sequential approach/method that analyses turn-by-turn is the best solution. This approach will enable us to analyse which code is chosen, whether it is marked or unmarked, how it is employed, as an indication of whether the interlocutor converges, diverges or code-switches and why it is chosen to reveal the motivations behind his code choice behaviour.

So far the discussion has covered the macro-societal perspective of multilingualism and the micro-interactional perspective of multilinguality together with

---

10 The marked choice in the exchanges is either unclear or postponed until later (see §8.3.1.4).
the models and approaches involved in each of them. The next section focuses on the third perspective: social network theory. Social network theory can be used as an analytical bridge between the perspectives of multilingualism as societal issues and individual multilinguality in micro-interactional behaviour.

2.6.3 The social network perspective

The following sections discuss social network theory which links the previous two perspectives discussed and thus helps explain the data analysed.

This concept of social network has emerged as a key technique in trying to explain human groups and social behaviour and has been used by scholars from various disciplines including social psychologists e.g. Giles and his associates (Giles and Powesland, 1975, Giles and St Clair, 1979, Giles et al., 1987, Giles and Coupland, 1991, Giles et al., 1991b), social anthropologists (e.g. Barnes, 1954) and sociolinguists (Gal, 1979, 1983, Milroy, 1980, Milroy and Milroy, 1992, Romaine, 1982a, 1982b, 2004).

Li Wei (1994: 23) suggests that “in addition to the speaker’s own identity, this approach examines the identities of the people with whom the speaker regularly interacts” since “speakers’ language use is influenced and shaped by the types of social contact they have which also contributes to the social relations the speakers maintain”. In the same way, Romaine (2000: 83) explains that the concept of ‘social network’ takes into account different socializing habits of individuals and their degree of involvement in the local community. The ways they are connected range from casual acquaintance to close familial bonds (Barnes, 1954). Employing the network theory in a Norwegian parish community, Barnes (1954) also suggested that social structure is revealed in the connectedness of individuals in a community. In the same vein, Myers-Scotton’s Markedness Model also takes into account social network theory since according to Myers-Scotton (1993b: 91) “for speakers to trust that their communicative intentions are received as intended, the markedness judgement should be based on sufficient uniformity across the community”.

In connection to this, Milardo (1988: 18) states that “the advantage of network analysis lies in its ability to specify attributes of local social structure influential in the formation and developments of personal relationships”. The use of network as an analytical construct, however, does not require grouping individuals into social classes.
Network may cut across social class boundaries and they may also reveal differences within social classes (Romaine, 2000: 84). Li Wei (1994) postulates that by combining the variables of the macro-interactional perspective with those of the micro-interactional perspective, 'the social network perspective' can offer adequate explanation for the phenomenon of language choice, especially with regard to the possible variation it generates.

It can be inferred that social network theory can be used to help integrate macrosocietal and micro-interactional perspectives on language choice. Social network theory can also be used to help account for the phenomena of assimilation into local language and culture, language maintenance and language shift that are usually found among migrant communities.

Among immigrant societies, social networks also play an important role in the learning of the language and culture of the new linguistic and cultural environment as explained by Peirce (1993). Peirce investigated how immigrants interacted with their surrounding community by learning a new language and looked at how these experiences brought changes to their social identities.

"It is through language that a person negotiates a sense of self within and across different sites at different points in time and it is through language that a person gains access to—or is denied access to—powerful social networks that give learners the opportunity to speak. Thus language is not conceived of as a neutral medium of communication, but is understood with reference to its social meaning" (Peirce, 1993: 14).

In order to be fully accepted into society, immigrants have to learn the language and to speak the language that is used in wider society. However, there have been many reports that immigrants may feel inadequate in the second or third language they are learning and that they cannot really express themselves in the language of the host country due to incorrect grammar, stilted expressions etc. The feeling of inadequacy is related then to the feeling of their identity: they do not feel as if they properly belong to the new society that they have joined and thus prefer to mingle with their own kind. In this sort of environment, they can function appropriately both linguistically and culturally (Winning, 1991). This kind of feeling and 'identity conflict' are usually found among first generation immigrants and will generally be reduced for the next generations born in the host country. By the time language and culture shift occur, the affected generation usually identify themselves with the host country.
With regard to language maintenance and language shift, Stoessel (2002: 96) suggests that social networks might be an influential factor in language maintenance and language shift because of the power they have in linguistic and cultural socialization. Individuals learn their language and culture from other individuals in their family, surroundings and society. The languages they speak, and their ways of speaking and behaving make them identifiable members of the cultural groups and society they belong to. According to Schieffelin and Ochs (1986) the act of socialization happens largely through the medium of language. Ochs (1986: 3) explains that “language in use is then a major if not the major tool for conveying socio-cultural knowledge and a powerful medium for socialization”. So, that is exactly what happens with the new generation born in the host country. They learn both the language and socio-cultural knowledge from the society and possibly also from their family to help them become fully assimilate in the host country.

Allard and Landry (1992 and also, Landry and Allard, 1992) integrate the societal and individual factors affecting attitudes towards language maintenance and language shift in a model to account for bilingualism for school age children in anglophone and francophone areas of Canada. The model emphasizes a relationship between ‘individual network of linguistic contacts’ and the competence in the mother tongue and the second language, on the one hand, and beliefs, attitudes, and values, on the other. What this model suggests is that individual experiences have to be taken into consideration in analysing the phenomena of language maintenance and/or language shift as these experiences help shape the individual’s present and future actions.

As will be seen later in this study, the first generation of the subjects under study are immigrants in the host country while the second, third and fourth were born in the host country. Each generation or age cohort speaks different languages or language varieties due to different language contact experiences individual speakers have experienced. Thus, the social network approach will serve as an adequate explanatory framework to account for language variation and language choice among these multilingual subjects, as well as for the phenomenon of language maintenance and/or language shift that has taken place.
2.7 Some previous studies

2.7.1 Studies of language use among families of immigrants
There have been many studies of immigrants and their language use behaviour. Yet, most of these published studies have been concerned with situations where there are only two languages involved: the subjects' native language and the language of the host country. Such studies include those by Backus (1999), Clyne (1972), Li Wei (1994), Nge and He (2004), Rubino (1991), Stoelting (1975) to mention only a few of many. Only a few studies, however, reported the involvement of more than two languages, language varieties and/or dialects. These few include studies of Chinese speakers in Singapore (Gupta and Siew, 1995, Platt, 1976a, Platt, 1977, Platt, 1980a) and the Indian communities in Hong Kong (Detaramani and Lock, 2003). However, none of these studies analyse the language use at its micro-interactional level.

Also, although there have been many studies of migrants using various languages, and some of them concern direct individual interactions of real genealogical extended family members from different generations (see Gupta and Siew, 1995, Ng and He, 2004, Stoelting, 1975), none of them discuss extended family interactions involving more than two languages with more than three participants from three generations taking part. Only Søndergaard's (1991) study concerns seven languages/language varieties, but it is not clear whether the subjects were members of a kernel or extended family or whether the interactions involved the intergenerational interactions of genealogical extended family members. Also Søndergaard's study only covered the types of code-switching used by the subjects and did not discuss the motivations behind the subject's code-switching behaviour.

2.7.2 Studies of language use among Chinese Indonesians
A number of studies of language use amongst ethnic Chinese in Indonesia have appeared in the literature, but most of these concern peranakan Chinese. Totok Chinese have received only passing mention. Amongst the works on peranakan Chinese Dreyfuss and Oka (1979) question whether 'Chinese Indonesian' is a new kind of language hybrid. Wolff and Poedjosoedarmo (1982) report on communicative codes in Central Java and devote a chapter to describing the language of the peranakan Chinese of the region. In her dissertation 'Discourse structures of the Chinese Indonesian in Malang' Rafferty (1982) employed a functional, semiotic approach to the study of
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Chinese Indonesian discourse in order to understand how pragmatic information is used to structure aspects of semantics and syntax. Rafferty (1984) also wrote a historical development of the languages of the Chinese in Java from the beginning of the twentieth century, through Dutch colonial times and Japanese occupation right up to the post independence period to the new order era.

Kartomihardjo (1979) wrote a thesis entitled ‘The ethnography of communicative codes on East Java: a study on the use of Javanese and Indonesian among the Javanese in East Java’. In this work Kartomihardjo mentions the language used by Peranakan Chinese and describes it as a variety resembling that spoken by non-educated Javanese. Kartawinata (1990) wrote his thesis on the Chinese Peranakan in Surabaya, East Java. He described differences in Peranakan speech that result from differences in things such as topic of conversation, domain of interaction, ethnicity of the participants etc. In particular, Kartawinata focused on the code-switching and borrowing that Peranakan Chinese use as a strategy for communication in free informal conversation. Code-switching occurred between Javanese, Malay/Bahasa Indonesia, Chinese and Dutch while borrowings came from Javanese and Bahasa Indonesia. Kartawinata notes in passing that different generations tend to use different languages, but he does not discuss in detail any of the actual changes that occurred.

Another dissertation on Peranakan Chinese was written by Oetomo (1984). This study was concerned with the language and identity of the Chinese of Pasuruan in East Java, a minority group which had been under pressure to assimilate into the majority since 1950 (Oetomo, 1984). In his sociolinguistic description of their speech variety, Oetomo looked into the interrelation between language behaviour and language attitudes on the one hand, and ethnic group as well as class on the other. He also discussed the linguistic repertoire of the entire community including the totok Chinese. This dimension had been omitted from previous studies. As far as the Chinese community was concerned, Oetomo examined the functions of Javanese, Chinese dialects, Dutch, and English as well as loanwords from these codes, especially with respect to his subjects' identity. He also mentioned the use of code switching and made some notes on its functions.

Of the above-mentioned works, only those by Oetomo (1984) and Rafferty (1984) include any discussion of Totok Chinese, but neither of these two studies
examines language use by *totok* Chinese at a micro-interactional level. Also, neither do they analyse the motivations behind code choice in any detail.

### 2.8 Summary and Conclusion

This chapter has provided a discussion and an overview of some of the sociolinguistic, socio-cultural and socio-psychological issues that lie behind this study. The chapter has also set out an analytical framework for the study. Specifically, this chapter addressed societal multilingualism and individual multilinguality, together with the models and approaches involved in each of them, and how societal and individual perspectives on language use can be integrated. In particular, the chapter discusses the integration of Li Wei's (1994) proposed sociological distinction between the macro-societal and micro-individual dimensions of code choice with social network theory, and also with socio-psychological theory, i.e. Myers-Scotton's Markedness Model. In addition, this chapter discusses the sequential approach (Bourhis, 1985, Lawson and Sachdev, 2000) employed for data analysis in this study.

The kind of integration just discussed is necessary in order to set out an adequate explanatory framework to account for the complex data of language choice found among the multilingual subjects. In other words, since the phenomenon of language (code) choice and especially that of code-switching is an intricate matter which involves myriads of factors: social, psychological, cognitive, linguistic, etc., a comprehensive and eclectic approach is deemed necessary to provide a satisfactory theoretical framework for sound analysis.
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The Ethnic Chinese in Indonesia

3.0 Introduction

This chapter provides an overview of the ethnic Chinese people in Indonesia. Section 3.1 covers a brief history of the ethnic Chinese in Indonesia and a discussion of the distinction between *peranakan* and *totok* Chinese. Section 3.2 focuses on the history of Chinese education. Section 3.3 provides a discussion of what has been called the ‘*peranakanized*’ of *totok* communities. Finally, section 3.4 zeroes in on the history of Surabaya and its Chinese inhabitants as well as providing some background on multilingualism in the community.

3.1 The ethnic Chinese population in Indonesia

The precise size of the ethnic Chinese population in Indonesia is unknown. Different sources give estimates of the Chinese population in Indonesia at between 3 and 6 percent of the total population. Suryadinata (1997) and Pan (1999) suggest that Chinese people were between 3-4 percent of the country’s entire population of 192 million in 1997. On separate occasions, some others suggest that it may be as high as 4-6 percent of the total population (Brunner, 1999; Jahja, 1991). Jacobsen (2003) claims that Chinese people constituted 3.5 percent of the total population of 220 million in 2003. Up until 2000, the Indonesian censuses never gave ethnic breakdowns (Coppel, 2002: 395). In the 2000 census, estimates of the population of some ethnic groups were given, but these are only based on results for the ten biggest ethnic groups in each province. From the 30 provinces in Indonesia, only 11 provinces have Chinese in the top ten and thus it is only for these provinces that census data can be used. Based on the 2000 census Suryadinata (2002) estimated that the number of ethnic Chinese in Indonesia was around 2% of the population or some 3.0 to 3.6 million of the total population of 220
million. The annual survey carried out by Statistics Indonesia (BPS) in Jakarta indicates that the size of ethnic Chinese people in 2002-2003 was 3,130,247 or as big as 1.5% of the total 211,823,986 population in Indonesia. This number was produced as a combination of a two-year survey result (2002-2003) in order to achieve a larger total sample size (SUSENAS, 2002-2003). Owing to the differences in estimates from different sources, it can still be inferred that at present the exact size of the ethnic Chinese population in Indonesia remains unknown. Chinese people are mostly concentrated in big cities such as Jakarta, Surabaya, and Medan, but groups of ethnic Chinese can be found residing anywhere across the Indonesian archipelago (and indeed the whole of Southeast Asia).

Outsiders, including the majority of Indonesians, tend to regard the ethnic Chinese Indonesian community as a homogeneous group and as a whole, they tend to be identified as ‘Chinese’ who still speak Chinese and who are culturally oriented towards China, whether this is true of the individual concerned or not. The ethnic Chinese are also classified as one homogenous Chinese community in the Indonesian government’s statistical records. In his description of ethnic Chinese in Indonesia, Taher (1997) judges that from their cultural, political and economic status, the ethnic Chinese minority in Indonesia is by no means a homogeneous group. Careful observation reveals that they are a socially and linguistically diverse community with distinct differences that are often overlooked by other people outside the community. Suryadinata (1976: 770, 1978: 142, 2002: 59) also states that the ethnic Chinese minority in Indonesia is a heterogeneous and complex community. These differences may stem from the provenance of ancestral immigrants, early settlement patterns, cultural orientation, religion, social class etc. These factors might be instrumental in their distinct ancestral heritage, languages/dialects spoken, and differences in terms of socio-political status, socio-economic background, and educational background, to mention a few. These

---
1 He assumed that most ethnic Chinese were probably reluctant to admit their ethnicity after the events of May 1998 when there was a riot directed against ethnic Chinese (Suryadinata 2002:285, Suryadinata et.al 2003:iii). Many women, mostly ethnic Chinese, were raped and killed. In addition, many houses and shops owned by ethnic Chinese people were looted and burned. The same reason is found in Wikipedia (an online dictionary) which writes that the 2000 census indicates there were 1,739,000 ethnic Chinese in Indonesia. Terry Hull (pers. comm.) suggests that inconsistencies in the 2000 census results must have been caused by computers misreading or misrepresenting data in some way. Hull estimates that if the data had been correctly stored and read, a truer estimate of the total ethnic Chinese population in Indonesia might be as big as 3.0 to 3.5 million people or as many as 1.7% of the total 205 million population. However, perhaps only 2.8 to 3.0 million would have wanted to claim that ethnicity.
differences have created various subgroups in the overall ethnic Chinese community itself.

Culturally, ethnic Chinese were traditionally divided into Indonesian-speaking peranakans and Chinese-speaking totoks (Suryadinata, 1978), a division that is no longer deemed appropriate and relevant by the younger generations of ethnic Chinese. Legally, ethnic Chinese in Indonesia are divided into two big groups: Warganegara Indonesia (WNI) ‘Indonesian citizens’ and Warganegara Asing (WNA) ‘Aliens’. This division cuts across the cultural division and other differences. There is probably a tendency for WNI status to predominate amongst those of peranakan descent, and for WNA status to be more common amongst those of totok descent. Whether WNA or WNI, ethnic Chinese are often referred to by non-ethnic Chinese as Cina or Tionghoa ‘Chinese’. Both terms are discussed below.

3.1.1 The terms Tionghoa, Cina, and ethnic Chinese

The term Tionghoa is a Hokkien word meaning ‘the ethnic Chinese’ or Chung Hwa in Mandarin Chinese and was traditionally used as a synonym of Chung Kuo ‘the Middle Kingdom’ to refer to China. Later the Chinese nationalists under Dr. Sun Yat Sen adopted the term to refer to the nation and the new nation state in Taiwan (Coppel, 2002, Suryadinata, 1978, Suryadinata, 2002). The peranakan Chinese in Indonesia were predominantly of Hokkien extraction (Skinner, 1958). After the rise of nationalism in China, the influence of which reached the overseas Chinese in the Dutch Indies, these peranakan Chinese people also adopted the term Tionghoa. For these peranakan Chinese, the Hokkien term was more favourable than its Mandarin Chinese counterpart. Before the twentieth century the term used to refer to Chinese people in the Dutch Indies was Tjina which comes from the word Chin and referred to Manchu, a regime occupying China until 1911 when it was toppled and the Republic of China Chung Hua Ming Kuo was declared. The term Tionghoa appeared for the first time in the Dutch East Indies as a name of a Chinese association founded by the peranakan people in Batavia—now known as Jakarta. They named the association Tiong Hoa Hwe Koan or THHK—All Chinese Association. Along with the flourishing growth of THHK and the schools it founded in all big cities in Java, the term Tionghoa was growing in use throughout the Dutch East Indies and was also found in the peranakan press and

---

peranakan literature. The older term *Tjina* soon lost favour and was later associated with inferior status and almost always invoked a feeling of resentment on the part of the ethnic Chinese (Suryadinata, 1978, 2002).

The term *Tionghoa* was later replaced by the older term *Tjina* or *Cina*—the standard spelling used now in Indonesia—when anti-Chinese sentiments became prevalent after the abortive coup d'etat in 1965 in which the Communist Chinese were allegedly involved. Although people like Mochtar Lubis and Dr. Lie Tek Tjong, recommended continuing to use the term *Tionghoa* instead of the term *Tjina* (Suryadinata, 1978 :166), the New Order government legally endorsed the change. Decree No: SE-06/PresKab/6/67 issued by the Presidium Cabinet under General Soeharto declared that the term *Tionghoa* was to be replaced by *Cina* to refer to both *Tionghoa* and *Tiongkok* (the people and the country respectively). The term *Cina* also became applicable to ethnic Chinese living in Indonesia. From that time, the term *Cina* was officially used in all government offices as well as the mass media. Very often this term is also used as a discriminatory, derogatory slur, or even as abusive name-calling, as it was during the colonial time of the Dutch East Indies.

After the toppling of the New Order government, the term *Tionghoa* started to gain favour again, and even some people at government level started to use it. However, there has been no official move to abolish the earlier decree issued by the New Order government. At present both terms *Tionghoa* and *Cina* are being used interchangeably, in the mass media and elsewhere. Among ethnic Chinese people themselves, opinions as to which term should be used are divided. Nowadays, however, many people have started using the term *etnis Tionghoa* 'ethnic Chinese' to refer to Chinese people, and the term has become more popular. In this study, I adopt the term *etnis Tionghoa* 'ethnic

---

3 In October 2002, the cybernetic world saw a vigorous debate about the use of the terms *Tionghoa* and *Cina* to refer to the ethnic Chinese in Indonesia. The debate involved Indonesian people living all over the world. The topic being heatedly discussed was by no means a new theme. However, at the end there was no clear-cut solution as to which of the terms it was most appropriate to use, for the opinions among those involved were divided.

4 Some people have suggested that this term is a misnomer since the major large ethnic groups in Indonesia such as Balinese, Sundanese, Javanese etc, tend to be named after their place of origins and/or vernacular languages. On the other hand, these Chinese people in Indonesia are of different provenances and ancestral dialects, and thus belong to different ethnic groups in their ancestral land. See Feith and Castles, 1970: 316-354 for further discussion on *sukuism* 'ethnicity' of Chinese Indonesians.
Chinese’ to refer to Chinese Indonesians. A brief historical account of their migration to the Indonesian archipelago is presented below.

3.1.2 A brief history of Chinese migration to Indonesia

Most ethnic Chinese Indonesians—especially the earlier settlers—originated from Fujian province in China and spoke Hokkien. However, others came from other parts of China and spoke different dialects/language varieties such as Hakka, Hainan, Teochew, as well as Cantonese. These people from places other than Fujian are particularly highly concentrated on the islands outside Java. Their different places of origin mean that there are also differences in the dialects or language varieties at their command. Differences in cuisine, cultural heritage, lifestyles etc. are also factors that might colour language behaviour. Different Chinese people migrated to Indonesia at different times, settled in different parts of the country, and in turn assimilated to different local language and culture throughout the Indonesian archipelago.

When exactly the first Chinese came to the archipelago is unknown. However, anthropological and archaeological remnants have been discovered dating back to the time before Christ (Hall, 1958:20). The Chinese visitors of this early period, who were mostly traders, visited large parts of the archipelago including Java, and especially the northern coastal part. Chinese visitors continued coming, married the local women and settled down. They were believed to have established their first permanent settlements by the 14th century (Skinner, 1958:1). They continued coming to the archipelago until the Dutch Indies government stopped the influx in the 1930s.

3.1.3 The development of totok and peranakan communities

As already mentioned in the previous section, the ethnic Chinese community in Indonesia is traditionally differentiated into two major groups ‘peranakan’ and ‘totok’. The totok are traditionally classified as those Chinese who were either themselves born in China or who are the progeny of relatively recent immigrants to Indonesia, while peranakan are those whose paternal ancestors migrated from China to Indonesia at least several generations ago.

The term peranakan (anak = ‘child’, peranakan=‘children of Indonesian soil’) was originally used to refer to the offspring of the Chinese men who came as traders to Java hundreds of years ago and the local women whom they married. These Chinese
men mostly came from Fujian Province in China. The Chinese traders married Indonesian, especially local Javanese, Balinese or Sundanese women who were either non-Muslims or nominal Muslims (Skinner, 1958:2). At that time, Chinese women did not immigrate to the Archipelago. Their offspring developed a distinct Hokkien-coloured dialect of Malay in terms of both its syntax and lexicon. They also adopted Javanese or Sundanese as their home or public language (Skinner, 1958). Later they tended to intermarry among themselves (Hering, 1982: iii).

In Dutch colonial times the term peranakan was also used to refer to anyone of mixed racial ancestry, and thus peranakan can also mean a person of mixed blood. Therefore, there were peranakan Dutch as well as peranakan Chinese (Rafferty, 1984). Another term that is used to refer to peranakan Chinese is ‘Baba’, but this term is most widely used in Malaysia (Freeman, 1979:13). In Indonesia intermarriage between Chinese men and local Javanese women resulted in the development of what Skinner identifies as Chinese peranakan culture (Skinner, 1963) that has a distinctive integrated set of both cultural traits and language behaviours that are neither purely Chinese (in this case, Hokkien) nor purely Javanese. These peranakan people are very keen on education and are mostly professionals (Suryadinata, 1978b:9).

The term totok (literally, ‘of pure blood’), on the other hand, refers to groups of Chinese immigrants that came much later, i.e. between the late 19th and early 20th century. These latter migrants came from a variety of provinces in China where dialects other than Hokkien were spoken i.e. Hakka, Cantonese, Foochow, Foochia, Hingwa, etc. Before this time, any newcomers were automatically and rapidly assimilated into the existing peranakan community and married peranakan women (Skinner, 1963:105). However, from the late 19th century, more and more women began migrating along with the men and these new arrivals tended to marry amongst themselves, thus enabling them to preserve their language, culture, beliefs and values for some time.

---

6 In West Java, Baba is used to refer to male Chinese, Nyonya to married and Nona to unmarried women. The word baba is actually a well-known honorific term used in Islam especially Turkey to refer to a syaikh, an Islam missionary (Lombard II, 1990:210). Nyonya comes from a Hokkien word nio’a or niowa ‘woman’ which was used to refer to a native woman who married to a Chinese man (Liem, 1933:12). In East Java the same terms are applied for female, but male Chinese are referred to as Tuan ‘Sir’. Baba refers to all peranakan, male and female alike. Tuan is also used to address a male Arab.
eventually outnumbered the older peranakan Chinese community. Since the Dutch government stopped the influx of immigrants in the 1930s, no more Chinese have migrated to the archipelago legally.

The totok have maintained their Chinese ethnicity much more strongly than the peranakan and most of them—especially the older ones who went to Chinese language schools—still speak Mandarin Chinese and/or their ancestral dialects as their daily language. Most continued to be what Suryadinata (1978b) has called either ‘China-oriented’ (after 1949), or ‘Taiwan-oriented’. The establishment of Chinese language schools, Chinese newspapers as well as Chinese Chambers of Commerce (amongst other developments in the archipelago) helped form the basis for a stable totok community in all major cities in Java by 1915 (Skinner, 1961:358). Totok Chinese mostly preferred to be self-employed. The totok community began to outgrow the peranakan community, not just in numbers but also in terms of their political and economic power, especially during the reign of the New Order Government. The term totok is often extended to include the local-born descendants of these immigrants who were brought up as totok, since they were mostly still Chinese-speaking and China-oriented (Skinner, 1963). Nowadays, the term is still ‘attached’ to their descendants even though they are no longer ‘China oriented’ in any meaningful way. However, some of the younger generations—especially those of the Outer Islands—were brought up in the totok way and still speak Mandarin Chinese and/or their ancestral dialect at home.

The segregation that existed between the peranakan and totok communities was brought to an end by the closing of Chinese schools in 1965-1966 (as discussed in the following section). Since then, there has been a gradual unification between the two communities and a move towards Indonesianization of everyone. Nowadays, the term peranakan has taken on a socio-cultural meaning and it refers to those Chinese who have settled in Java for generations, are no longer culturally oriented toward China, and

---

7 Compared to the Outer Islands, the number of peranakan in Java has always been higher than that of totok. However, throughout Indonesia, the number of totok is higher than peranakan (Suryadinata, 1986: 94-95).

8 Many of this young generation came to live in the cities of Java—including Surabaya—either to work or study, and they still use Mandarin and/or their ancestral dialect between themselves.

9 When Soeharto came to power, this group division was blurred and ethnic Chinese Indonesians were treated alike politically. They were either Indonesian citizen or alien (see §2.4).
who are not native speakers of any Chinese language (Rafferty, 1984, Wolff, 1997). Mely G. Tan (1997:42) differentiates peranakan and totok on the basis of their cultural orientation, an orientation that is the result of their educational experience, the number of generations their family has settled in Indonesia, their occupations and whether they are of mixed descent. The perception that there are major differences between peranakan and totok communities is actually subscribed to mostly by the older generation of Chinese Indonesians. At present, however, the idea that peranakan and totok are distinct has become less prevalent among the younger generations of ethnic Chinese Indonesians who feel that they are a distinct part of Indonesia.

In can be concluded then, that should there be any differences between these two groups at present, the differences are due more to levels and types of education, the occupations they have, and the family and social standing. These in turn will apparently colour their language behaviour, attitude towards their ethnicity, and lifestyles. However, this study still uses the term totok to refer to the subjects who, due to their cultural heritage, are classified as such. The term itself is still very much relevant to the older generation of the subjects under study who were brought up as totok.

The next section discusses the political status of ethnic Chinese in Indonesia, and focuses especially on the period after the presidential decree of 1967.

3.1.4 The citizenship status and the curbing of Chinese cultural tradition

Cross-cutting the distinction between peranakan and totok is another important division. As previously mentioned, ethnic Chinese Indonesians are divided into Warganegara Indonesia (WNI) and Warganegara Asing (WNA). Warganegara Indonesia (WNI) Indonesians are those Chinese—both peranakan and totok—who hold Indonesian citizenship while Aliens are those Chinese who do not have Indonesian citizenship even though they may have lived in Indonesia for generations. This division dates back to 1955 when the Indonesian and Chinese governments signed the Dual Nationality Treaty which abolished the principle of dual nationality for Chinese people in Indonesia. At that time, Chinese people in Indonesia were forced to reject either Indonesian or Chinese citizenship. Many Chinese were indecisive and some were ignorant about what was happening and left their choice until too late. By the time some of them finally decided to choose Indonesian citizenship it had already become very difficult to become
an Indonesian citizen. It has taken many of these people or their family members years, and cost considerable sums of money as well as much effort, to become naturalized.

One’s status as WNI or WNA plays a major role in one’s life. Being WNI entitles a person to better opportunities in education, business, and in many other spheres of life. Despite many discriminatory restrictions as a WNI, one can participate in higher education, operate legal businesses, own properties and vote. Under the present government, WNI from a Chinese background can also form and join political parties, and take office.

Yet, for many even though they may have lived in Indonesian for generations, and they may have been Indonesian citizens all their lives, both peranakan and totok are still commonly identified as Orang Cina, ‘Chinese’, or warga keturunan/WNI Cina, ‘The Indonesian citizen of Chinese descent’ by other Indonesians (Taher, 1997:79). Although outsiders may view them in this way, many members of the present generations of these communities do not identify themselves in any such way. Greif (1991) in his study on Chinese in other cities in Java and Bali revealed that new generations who were at that time in their 30s and 40s—who would now be in their 40s and 50s identify themselves as Indonesians rather than Chinese. Mely G. Tan (1991) also states that the younger generation of ethnic Chinese identify themselves socially as Indonesian and notes that they are also Indonesian-oriented culturally. Tan’s conclusions match well with my own observations of the young ethnic Chinese.

One influential political change affecting ethnic Chinese was the Presidential Decree on Chinese religion, beliefs and tradition known as Presidium Instruction or Impres No. 14/1967. This presidential decree curbed all public expressions or activities that were the manifestations of Chinese cultural traditions. The events banned included such things as Chinese Lunar year festivities, theatre performances, dances and other cultural activities. Such activities were then confined to the private circles of Chinese communities. From this time on, Chinese associations, Chinese mass media, Chinese literature and especially the use of Chinese characters all disappeared from public
view\textsuperscript{10}. The Chinese were urged to change their names and were also discouraged from giving their children Chinese names.\textsuperscript{11} Since then, very few Chinese have used their Chinese names, most having changed to Indonesian-sounding names (Suryadinata, 1978:151). Nowadays, those who still use their Chinese names are mostly \textit{WNA} aliens.

The political and legal status of ethnic Chinese Indonesians serve as crucial and influential determinants in the choice of education or schools for their children to. This is discussed in the next section.

3.2 A history of formal education and language use amongst ethnic Chinese

Education is one of the most important agents of cultural transmission because through education young generations learn the knowledge and skills of their parents as well as the norms, values and beliefs embraced by the society. Schools inevitably play a crucial role in this process.

The formal education of Chinese Indonesians in Indonesia has undergone substantial changes over the last one hundred years or so. The discussion of the education of ethnic Chinese Indonesians in the following paragraphs is extracted from many published sources\textsuperscript{12}, from the interviews with the subjects of the study, and also from the writer’s personal experience and observation. The following paragraphs provide a discussion of the education system for Chinese Indonesians and also of language policy which has been implemented in educational systems from the Dutch-Indies era up to the present time.

\textsuperscript{10} Resolution no. 32, 1966 (TAP MPRS No. 32/1966) of the Provisional People’s Consultative Assembly expressly banned the use of Chinese characters in public. Later, the Minister of Trade and Cooperation issued a decree No. 286/KP/XII/78 that prohibited the importation, distribution and trade of all printed matters in Chinese characters. Until 2003, having these materials in one’s possession was a crime equivalent to possessing narcotics/drugs according to the Disembarkation Card new arrivals to Indonesia were given.

\textsuperscript{11} The Decree issued by Presidium Cabinet No. 127/U/kep/12/1966 concerned name changing for Indonesian citizens who had Chinese names. Another Presidential Decree No. Keppres 127/1966 was later issued (Grief, 1991:xvii). Then a Presidium Directive No. 240/1967 (Inpres No. 240/1967) was issued to mandate assimilation of ‘foreigners’ and to support the previous directive of 127/U/kep/12/1966 for Indonesian Chinese to adopt Indonesian-sounding names.

\textsuperscript{12} Such studies include those done by Ong (1943), Purcell (1951), Skinner (1958, 1963), Liem (1968), Suryadinata (1972,1976, 1978, 1986), Bocquet-Siek (1988), and Lee (1995).
3.2.1 Pre-Independence

Prior to the 20th century not much is known about the education that Chinese typically pursued, as there were generally no Chinese schools. Wealthy peranakan Chinese families invited private tutors from China (Rafferty, 1984:251) to teach the male members of the family but females were usually not educated. The language of instruction was normally Hokkien. Only after 1875 were there Hokkien language schools operating in Java and Madura (Purcell, 1951, Somers Heidhuys, 1965, Suryadinata, 1978b). The language spoken among these peranakan Chinese when they were at home was Bahasa Melayu Tonghoa (Chinese Malay)13. At this time, peranakan Chinese families also made extensive use of Hokkien and Dutch terms (Suryadinata, 1986: 87). A few efforts at more formal systems of education for Chinese were initiated prior to the 20th century, but these tended to have little impact. In 1737 the VOC Verenigde Oost-Indische Compagnie or ‘Dutch East Indies Company’ founded a school for poor Chinese children only for it to be closed in 1740 when de Chineezenmoord or ‘the Chinese massacre’ took place14. Later in 1753 the Chinese community itself began to establish schools for their own children. These schools were very limited in their nature as the schools were more for those families who could afford it and were mainly for male family members as described above. The language of instruction was Hokkien (Mestoko et al., 1986, Suryadinata, 1972).

At the beginning of the 20th century, on 17 March 1901, and influenced by political movements in China, the peranakan Chinese community in Batavia (now Jakarta) founded Tiong Hoa Hwee Koan ‘All Chinese Associations’. Soon, other cities including Surabaya also established associations. Later, these associations established Chinese-language schools with the same name, namely Tiong Hoa Hwee Koan (henceforth, THHK) in major towns in Java. The first THHK school in Batavia was modelled after the overseas Chinese school in Japan (Suryadinata, 1972). Classical

---

14 In October 1740, over a period of just three days, about 5000 to 10,000 Chinese were murdered as a result of a mounting rift between the Chinese and VOC over the control of sugar in Batavia. Dutch authorities were later held accountable for the massacre (Engelfriet 2000, Purcell, 1951).
Chinese\textsuperscript{15} served as the language of instruction in these schools and there was great discrepancy between the traditional written forms and spoken words (Purcell, 1951: 526). The students were \textit{peranakan} who mostly did not speak Chinese anymore except for some Hokkien terms and a few formulaic expressions. In a way, then, the schools helped perpetuate Chinese language and culture among the Chinese communities. In addition to Chinese, English was taught rather than Dutch (Nasution, 1994, Suryadinata, 1972) as anti-Dutch sentiments were growing amongst the Chinese as well as the rest of the Indonesian community\textsuperscript{16}. Other sources stated that the curriculum used in these schools was similar to that used in modern schools of China, Hong Kong and Singapore and followed the Anglo-Chinese educational system, with Chinese and English used as language of instruction (Bocquet-Siek, 1985: 2). Most of the school graduates who could afford it continued their study in either China or English-speaking countries (Ong, 1943: 204). The fact that the schools adopted curriculum and books from China and Singapore, and even imported the teachers from these places, raised concerns on the part of the Dutch authorities, especially when the Chinese imperial government also showed their interests in the THHK schools.

To maintain their control and supervise these Chinese people closely and to prevent them from becoming too China-oriented, in 1908 the Dutch built HCS \textit{Hollandsch-Chineesche Scholen} 'Dutch-Chinese schools', which were modelled after the government schools for Europeans (Suryadinata, 1972). During the Dutch colonial period there were separate educational systems for each of the different ethnic groups found in the East Indies—Malay/Indonesian, Chinese, Arabic as well as for Europeans (Furnivall, 1939). Dutch and some Malay served as the language of instruction, but there was no teaching at all of either Chinese language or Chinese culture in these schools (Mestoko et al., 1986, Suryadinata, 1972). French and English were also taught and were looked upon more favourably than Malay, which was considered as a 'market language' to be used with the domestics (Nasution, 1994). These schools were mostly for well-to-do \textit{peranakan} Chinese while those of lower classes went to the Native

\textsuperscript{15} In the early years of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century, the main linguistic standard in China was the classical Chinese of ancient written form. Only in 1920, was \textit{Mandarin} or \textit{Guān huà} 'the officials' speech' adopted as a national language and became the language of instruction (Purcell, 1951:527). Later, in the 1930s the first \textit{Vocabulary of National Pronunciation for Everyday Use} was published, and this marked the modernization of the Chinese language (Ramsey, 1987:4-11).

\textsuperscript{16} The Chinese were to live in certain districts, or ghettos, in the towns—\textit{wijkenstelsel}— and were required to have a passport or \textit{passenstelsel} to go out and move about outside the area (Suryadinata, 1970).
schools (Liem, 1968: 76) or Maleisch-Inlandsche Lagere Scholen (Ong, 1943: 200) where Dutch was also taught as a supplementary language. Later MULO Meer Uitgebreid Lager Onderwijs or ‘advanced primary education’ or ‘Junior High School’ was founded in 1914 and AMS Algemeene Middelbare School, ‘upper secondary level’ in 1915 for ‘Foreign Oriental’ groups 17. All these schools employed Dutch as the language of instruction. While English and Malay were compulsory, French was elective (Nasution, 1994). For those not interested in entering MULO, there were other options such as the civil service or the teachers’ training schools which were introduced in 1915—the HCK Hollandsch-Chineesche Kweekschool. These different kinds of schools with different curricula and languages of instruction existed alongside each other and they catered for peranakan and totok Chinese of different social classes, cultural orientation etc.

Due to their rather peculiar cultural background which contained elements from local Indonesian culture as well as Chinese, and due to their belief that good education was to be highly valued, an increasing number of peranakan students preferred to enter Dutch schools rather than Chinese ones (Suryadinata, 1978b: 9). Another reason that prompted peranakan students to prefer Dutch education was that THHK provided only primary education—except in big cities like Batavia, Surabaya, Tegal and Malang where there were also secondary schools (Ong, 1943: 202). Thus, THHK soon lost favour with peranakan students especially when Dutch education promised more employment opportunities. Hence, many peranakan students moved to HCS while totok children remained in the Chinese schools. The founding of these Dutch language schools marked different educational paths to be travelled by peranakan and totok Chinese. From that time on there were dual educational systems—Dutch and Chinese—that offered completely different sets of political, cultural and ideological values. Moreover, they promoted language behaviour and lifestyles that were foreign to the natural social environment where these peranakan and totok Chinese lived. For most of them—except for a few peranakan who used Dutch as their home language—the languages employed and taught at schools were different from those they used at home. In spite of the differences in terms of the languages used at their respective schools, the

17 ‘Foreign Orientals’ include all the descendents of Chinese who had Chinese surnames, Arabs, Indians, peninsula-born Malays, and their descendents (Purcell, 1951: 441). For more discussion of ‘Foreign Orientals’ see Coppel (2002b:131-149).
home languages of peranakan Chinese were still Chinese Malay and the local vernacular language(s) of the region where they lived. As for totok children, the first generation born in Indonesia, who went to Chinese schools and were generally brought up as totok, they used Mandarin Chinese, their ancestral dialect as well as the local vernacular language(s) as a means of communication between themselves.

Not only did the Dutch provide schools for peranakan, but in 1910, the Dutch government also went as far as declaring peranakan Chinese to be Dutch subjects (Octomo, 1984). This declaration countered the National Law declaring that all overseas Chinese were Chinese nationals which had been issued by the Qing government of China (Suryadinata, 1981: 25-26). As a result peranakan Chinese held dual nationality, Dutch and Chinese. After Indonesian independence, all Dutch subjects automatically became Indonesian citizens unless they wished not to be.

The totok community, on the other hand, was reinforced and stabilized with further Chinese immigration in the late 1930s and again in the late 1940s (Skinner, 1958: 3). This community was still culturally oriented towards China, and still spoke Mandarin or other Chinese dialect(s) as their home language. They faithfully practised Chinese customs, embraced Chinese religion and were conscious of their cultural heritage. The emergence of this totok community brought about another nuance to the already colourful educational systems in the Indonesian archipelago, when, as an indirect result of the success of Kuomintang in unifying China, they set up new schools with Mandarin Chinese as the medium of instruction. These Chinese schools were either China or Taiwan-oriented, although they were established and owned by each speech group and their associations—Hokkien, Hakka, Foochow etc. These schools either provided education right through from primary to secondary levels or they only provided secondary education. Most of the teachers were Indonesian-born totok-Chinese. As they gained more power in terms of both economic and political status, they also took over some of the schools formerly run by the peranakan Chinese. Most of these schools were supervised by the Chinese consuls on behalf of the Chinese government to assure that they operated in the interest of Chinese nationals (Suryadinata, 1978: 17). In the 1930s, in addition to English, other languages were introduced in both peranakan and totok Chinese schools in Java. There were choices of German, French and even Malay. However, by the late 1930s, most THHK schools were run by totok and were catering mostly for totok children. The majority of
peranakan either went to either Dutch or Malay/Indonesian schools (Suryadinata, 1981: 11). Most of the school graduates from these schools either went into the workforce or advanced their studies in China, Taiwan, Holland or English speaking countries. These people later came back to colonial Indonesia and worked in the private sector (Suryadinata, 1986: 91).

Soon after the Japanese invasion in 1942, all Dutch and Dutch-Chinese schools were closed (Skinner, 1958: 4), so peranakan children who went to these schools had to choose either Chinese language schools or Malay/Indonesian language schools. Most of these peranakan children opted for the Chinese schools (Suryadinata, 1986:89). During this time, more and more peranakan had to go to Chinese medium or Malay/Chinese medium schools and were forced to learn Mandarin Chinese for the first time. Thus, from 1942 to 1945 and even up to 1957\textsuperscript{18} many peranakan children attended the then already toto\-operated Chinese-language schools (Skinner, 1963: 109). During this time, an Indonesian-oriented curriculum was introduced which included some Japanese language classes. Although Indonesian had been adopted as a national language by the Indonesian nationalists during the Youth Congress in 1928\textsuperscript{19}, it was in the 1940s, that it began to be seriously and widely implemented in schools as well as in the administration.

In summary, during the early part of the twentieth century, there were three types of schooling catering specifically for ethnic Chinese. They were Dutch-Chinese schools, both private and government sponsored; Malay-Chinese schools, predominantly government subsidized; and Chinese language schools, all of which were private and unaid (Murray, 1964: 76). Skinner (1958: 4) suggested that by the Second World War peranakan Chinese were divided into three groups. The elite sent their children to Dutch schools and these children were westernized, the middle class group utilized the Chinese schools and their children underwent resincification, whereas the lower-class sent their children to Malay-Chinese schools, native schools (Malay), or none at all. For them, the home language was either Malay, Javanese or Sundanese,

\textsuperscript{18} From 1957, after the decree from the War Authority, The Indonesian Minister of Defence, no 989/PMT/1957, all Indonesian citizens were required to enter Indonesian-language schools.

\textsuperscript{19} In 1928 there was an important gathering of independence-seeking youth from across the Dutch East Indies which resulted in 'Youth Pledge Day' and the first promotion of the motto of 'Indonesian' language in the slogan "One Country: Indonesia. One nation: Indonesia. And One Language: Indonesian."
while the elite employed Dutch\textsuperscript{20}. The \textit{totok} Chinese, on the other hand, were the ones who went to Chinese schools which were mostly Beijing-oriented. In addition to the regional codes, their home language included Mandarin and/or their respective ancestral dialect.

\textbf{3.2.2 Post Independence until the Era of the New Order Government}

The period from 1945-1949 can be seen as a transitional period. Early in 1945 the Japanese, who were losing control in the war, urged the Indonesians to plan their independence--including an independent educational system. The incipient Indonesian\textsuperscript{21} was to be the medium of instruction. Some European languages such as English and German were also included in the secondary school curriculum. The Japanese surrendered on 15 August 1945 and the Indonesians declared their independence on 17 August 1945. However, later in the year, Allied Forces came to reclaim Indonesia and were soon joined by Dutch troops. Dutch schools were reopened, and the \textit{peranakan} went back to their former Dutch schools. Only after the official transfer of sovereignty to independent Indonesia by the Dutch on 27 December 1949 were all Dutch-affiliated schools closed for good. In some Dutch schools, especially Catholic ones, Indonesian began to be employed as the language of instruction (Mestoko et al., 1986). In addition, as a consequence of educational grants for Chinese school graduates which were offered by both Communist China and Nationalist China, more Chinese language schools were established. During this time once again the \textit{peranakan} Chinese had to choose to enter either Chinese or Indonesian schools. In 1950, a new Indonesian educational system was established throughout the archipelago. However, due to their low standards, government schools were not popular among the ethnic Chinese. Thus, most parents preferred to send their children to private schools which also adopted the national curriculum (Bocquet-Sieck, 1985). Others sent their children to Chinese schools.

In 1955 the Dual Nationality Treaty (discussed in 3.2.1 above) abolished the

\textsuperscript{20} Rafferty (1984:249) suggests that until 1945, the home languages of \textit{peranakan} Chinese in Java were Low Malay and Ngókó Javanese. Only after 1945, their repertoire included Ngókó, Indonesianized Javanese, and standard Indonesian. These combined at a morphemic level making the mixture distinct from that spoken by the Javanese speakers. The Javanese speakers never mix the two languages at morphemic level. See Rafferty (1982), Dreyfuss and Oka (1979), and Wolff and Poedjosoedarmo, (1982) for a discussion of the two types of mixing.

\textsuperscript{21} See chapter V for elaborate discussion on Indonesian and its adoption as the official national language of Indonesia.
principle of dual nationality. Most *peranakan* chose to be Indonesian citizens, so it was mostly *totok* who became aliens. On 6 November 1957, PM Djuanda, the Indonesian Minister of Defence issued a decree aimed at strict control of Chinese schools (Clark, 1965, Greif, 1991, Suryadinata, 1972). It was decreed from 1 January 1958, that all Indonesian citizens had to go to Indonesian schools, hence, most of the *peranakan* children went to Indonesian-medium schools (Liem, 1968: 211). From that time, only *totok* children who were alien went to Chinese schools. As was decreed by the Minister of Education, Indonesian was to be taught as a compulsory subject in these schools.

On 16 October 1958, all schools with Chinese as the medium of instruction, and all schools operated by countries having no diplomatic relationship with the Indonesian government, were closed down. Thus, Chinese schools started to diminish and the number of Chinese Indonesians who were Chinese-literate began to decline (Greif, 1991: xvii, Suryadinata, 1978: 149). As already mentioned in chapter one, all formal Chinese schools were closed in 1966 after what was claimed to be an abortive coup d’etat by elements of the allegedly Beijing-backed Communist party. Then whatever informal Chinese schools remained were shut down by 1974. In spite of the alleged involvement of this *peranakan* association, it was mostly the children from alien *totok* families who were directly affected by the closing of these Chinese-medium schools. As we have already seen, most *peranakan* children went to Indonesian schools.

From 1968, after being deprived of any education for almost three years, students from Chinese-language schools were allowed to enter Indonesian language schools as long as they had a special study permit from the Indonesian Minister of Education and Culture (Heidhues, 1988, Hering, 1982, Suryadinata, 1972, 1976). Most of the students affected by this ruling were alien *totok*. ‘Alien’ students could also go to special schools called *Sekolah National Project Chusus* (SNPC) ‘Special Project National Schools’ which were established by presidential decree no. B 12/Pres./1/1968. These schools were to be established by private groups within the communities. Even

---

22 Skinner (1963:111) and many other writers wrote that it was mostly *Totok* who rejected Indonesian citizenship. Tan (1997:36-38) reported that by 1992 there were approximately 300,000 aliens who had been settled in Indonesia for decades. This was revealed in an MOU signed by the Indonesian Minister of Justice Ismail Saleh and the Minister of Justice of the People’s Republic of China, Cai Ceng in Beijing on 4 May 1992. Among other things, the aim of the MOU was to determine the citizenship status of these aliens.

23 In the months following this abortive ‘coup’ there was anti-Chinese violence and killings.
though admission was easy, the number of alien students enrolled in each school was not supposed to constitute more than 40 percent of the total enrolment. In reality, however, most of the students in these schools were alien. By 1975, all these schools had been converted into regular Indonesian schools or Sekolah National Swasta 'Private National Schools'. By this time, the transitional period was assumed to be over. The language of instruction in these schools was Indonesian although Chinese was also taught for some hours a week. To enter universities or other higher education institutes, however, the children of the totok community, who were still alien, had to either ask for special permits from the Minister of Education and Culture or simply refrain from continuing their education to tertiary level. Most of them appealed for naturalization when they became of age, 18 years old. However, a great number of these alien children were presumably deprived of any schooling at all and had home schools with hired teachers instead.

Since then, the Indonesian educational system with Indonesian as the language of instruction has been the only system applied throughout the country and all ethnic Chinese Indonesian children have been exposed to Indonesian at school. As a result, they all read and write in Indonesian but virtually all of them are illiterate in Chinese. This educational system supplied a new frame of reference for both peranakan and totok children and thus introduced new cultural models, a new cultural identity, new cultural values as well as new norms in language behaviour, different from those of previous generations. Coppel (2002: 123) suggested that “the younger generation of totok are in the process of being peranakanized just as the older peranakan communities are disintegrating and their younger generation increasingly becoming assimilated to Indonesian society”. The present generation of totok children, however, have become just like their peranakan counterparts, Indonesianized. This can be seen, for instance, in that they are typically using colloquial Indonesian as their home language (see chapter 5).

---

24 For further discussion on this issue see Suryadinata (1986: 154-159).
25 The article ‘Mapping the peranakan Chinese in Indonesia’ by Coppel was first published in 1973 in Papers on Far Eastern History 8 by Division of Pacific & Asian History, Research School of Pacific Studies, Australian National University, Canberra.
Even though all children of ethnic Chinese descent have to attend Indonesian schools, informal quotas restricting Chinese enrolments to ten percent of total enrolments were introduced and secretly enforced in all government-operated/subsidized and elite universities and professional schools. Thus, it was difficult for schools to admit students of ethnic Chinese background. As a result of this discrimination, these children were forced to opt for private schools which were more expensive. The majority of ethnic Chinese high school graduates decided to either enter private universities or study abroad if their parents could afford it. If they did go abroad, they usually went to English speaking countries or European countries such as Germany, Austria, the Netherlands, to name a few. These graduates then came back to Indonesia having learned the languages of the countries where they studied.

Many parents who could afford it sent their young children to Chinese-medium schools in Singapore where they were able to learn Chinese and English at the same time. Some also sent their children to Taiwan and even to China in order to learn Chinese. However, this practice was curtailed when the Indonesian government issued a decree prohibiting children under ten years from having their own passports and travelling unaccompanied by their parents.

Another change affecting the Indonesian educational system took place in 1972. As a further step in the standardization of the national language, in that year, a reform in the spelling of Indonesian the Ejaan Yang Disempurnakan 'the spelling reform' was introduced. The government also declared English as the only compulsory foreign language to be taught at all educational levels including secondary and tertiary levels. Then, in 1990 with the Presidential Decree no. 28, English was to be taught earlier than before, that is, from the fourth year of primary school (Dardjowidjojo, 1998).

Since that time, many private schools which have more time allocated for English were established. Parents who could not afford to send their children to study abroad had the option of sending their children to these 'special schools' which have boomed in large cities such as Jakarta and Surabaya over the past 15 years. These prestigious schools have curricula in which more and more subjects are taught in

---

26 Quotas for the ethnic Chinese were implemented in other fields as well. These fields include academia, the police force, the military and the civil service.
English and they employ some teachers whose native language is English. Some schools even use English as the language of instruction for all subjects. The school hours are longer than those of other schools in Indonesia, which generally are only open for about 5 hours per day. The longer hours are similar to those practised in foreign countries.

3.2.3 Recent developments: Post New Order Government

As Chinese have almost always been the targets of unrest in one way and another, more recent outbreaks of social unrest in many parts of Indonesia have also had an effect on the Chinese. Incidents such as the May Riot in 1998 have renewed feelings of insecurity among the Chinese communities. These incidents have resulted in more and more children of Chinese descent being sent away to study abroad, either by themselves or together with their parents, or at least with their mothers accompanying them. Many of these children have started coming back to Indonesia speaking more English or other languages than those who have stayed behind.

The toppling of the New Order Government in 1998 gave rise to a new series of governments that seem to be more lenient towards the ethnic Chinese. Since 1999 the Chinese have started practising their cultural activities in public again. They can perform public cultural activities, learn Mandarin, and sell Chinese books with Chinese characters. Chinese songs have been heard playing on radio and TV stations in Indonesia. On 17 January 2000, all these activities were legalized by one influential socio-political change. President Abdulrachman Wachid issued a presidential decree no.6/2000 that annulled the already mentioned Presidential Decree Inpres No. 14/1967 which had prohibited public expressions of Chinese religion, beliefs and tradition. The new presidential decree enabled the ethnic Chinese in Indonesia to freely practice their cultural, religious and other activities. Soon, Chinese magazines, tabloids, language textbooks, Chinese folklore and everything Chinese became available in virtually every bookstore. Chinese people are also allowed to use their original names but most no longer care and they keep their Indonesian names. Also, the requirements to provide SBKRI—the Certificate of citizenship—to prove their status as Indonesian in order to acquire important documents has been revoked.

In 2001 the Indonesian Minister of Religion decreed Chinese New Year as an optional holiday, permitting all ethnic Chinese students and workers who celebrate their
Chinese New Year to have a holiday on that day (Kompas, 14 March 2001). Starting from 2003, after president Megawati Soekarnoputri declared Chinese New Year as a national holiday with a Presidential Decree (Keppres No. 19/2002), Chinese Lunar New Year was observed as a national public holiday in Indonesia, and ethnic Chinese people were able to celebrate their New Year openly (Kustiman, 2004). Since this year people have also been able to watch oriental musical shows and news programs in Mandarin Chinese that are broadcast by some popular TV Channels in Indonesia.

Regarding Mandarin Chinese, in 2001 an outstanding private university in Surabaya, Petra Christian University, opened a Chinese Study Centre where students are taught Chinese language and culture. On Batam Island, a group of ethnic Chinese Indonesians founded a university, Batam International University, in which the students are encouraged to master English and Mandarin (Pos, 2001). Many study centres offer Mandarin Chinese courses and many Indonesians (both from ethnic Chinese and non-ethnic Chinese background) learn Mandarin Chinese. Mandarin Chinese is growing in importance in terms of business activities in Indonesia with more and more companies listing ability to speak Mandarin Chinese as one of their requirements for employment. Even during their presidential campaign in 2004, Megawati Soekarnoputri and Hasyim Muzadi used Chinese characters in their campaign posters for the presidential election. On the part of ethnic Chinese, there seems to be curiosity either to retain or to rediscover their Chinese heritage.

Yet, whether more ethnic Chinese high school graduates can be admitted to state universities or whether they are allowed to have careers in state-sponsored academia, serve in the military or public services or whether other discriminatory practices against Chinese will be abated or even abolished is still an open question. As for the educational situation for the ethnic Chinese today, not very much has changed since the time of the New Order government as described in the previous section. Children still go to private schools or if their families are well-off to prestigious special schools with ‘semi-westernized curriculum’. These schools are of course much more expensive than the state schools. Some well-off parents still send their children to study abroad for secondary and/or tertiary levels.
3.2.4 Summary of schooling for ethnic Chinese

A summary of the history of formal education for ethnic Chinese in Indonesia is presented in table 3.1. The table displays the history of the education for ethnic Chinese in Indonesia. Before 1945 ethnic Chinese in Indonesia which had already consisted of two distinct groups, *peranakan* and *totok*, were mainly split into three different educational backgrounds: Dutch, Malay and Chinese. Then, between 1942-1965, after the closing of all Dutch schools in 1949, there were only two choices left either the Chinese or the Malay/Indonesian system. Finally, the split system was forced to become one mainstream Indonesian educational system with the closing of most Chinese schools for in 1966 and the last ones in 1974.
| Year                  | Community | Schools\(^a\) | Language of instruction | Other languages taught\(^b\) | Home Language  
|----------------------|-----------|----------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------- 
| Prior to 20\(^{th}\) century | Peranakan | Private tutors | Hokkien                 | ?                           | Chinese Malay, local vernacular  
|                      |           | Traditional schools | Classical Chinese\(^d\) | ?                           | Chinese Malay, local vernacular  
| Since 1901           | Peranakan | THHK\(^e\)      | English                 | English                     | Chinese Malay, local vernacular  
| 1908-1930s\(^f\)     | Peranakan (& Totok) | THHK | Chinese, English\(^g\) | ?                           | Chinese Malay, local vernacular for peranakan & Mandarin Chinese and/or their respective dialect, and/or local vernacular (?) for Totok  
|                      |           | HCS etc.        | Dutch, Malay            | English, French             | Chinese Malay & presumably Dutch for the few elite  
|                      |           | Native (Malay) | Malay                   | Dutch                       | Chinese Malay, local vernacular  
| 1930s-1942           | Peranakan | THHK            | Mandarin Chinese        | Mandarin Chinese            | Chinese Malay, local vernacular  
|                      |           | HCS etc.        | Dutch, Malay            | English                     | Chinese Malay & presumably Dutch for the few elite  
|                      |           | Malay-Chinese  | Mandarin Chinese        | Dutch                       | Chinese Malay, local vernacular  
|                      |           | Native (Malay) | Malay                   | Dutch                       | Chinese Malay, local vernacular  
| Totok\(^g\)          |           | Chinese         | Mandarin Chinese        | English, Dutch, some Malay | Mandarin Chinese and/or their respective dialect, local vernacular  

\(^a\)It refers to both private and government/state schools unless otherwise specified.  
\(^b\) The question mark symbol (?) indicates that no information/data was found in the literature regarding this matter.  
\(^d\) Mandarin Chinese only started to be identified as the standard national language in the 1930s (Ramsey, 1987:8-13), so it was Classical Chinese that was used as language of instruction before this time.  
\(^e\) In 1901 THHK was founded and was operated by the Chinese association under the same name. English was the language of instruction with instructors from Singapore (Purcell, 1951:528).  
\(^f\) Up to this time, three different kinds of schools were catering for peranakans of different class distinctions (elite, middle and low class).  
\(^g\) Both English and Chinese were used as languages of instruction (Bouquet-Siek 1988:2).  
\(^h\) The 1930s marked the emergence of the totok Chinese community who built their own Chinese schools.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>Language of instruction</th>
<th>Other languages taught</th>
<th>Home Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1942 – 1945</td>
<td>Peranakan and Totok</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>Mandarin Chinese</td>
<td>English, Indonesian, Japanese</td>
<td>Chinese Malay, for peranakan &amp; Mandarin Chinese and/or their respective dialect for totok, local vernacular for both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peranakan</td>
<td>Malay-Chinese</td>
<td>Malay &amp; Mandarin Chinese</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Chinese Malay, local vernacular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peranakan</td>
<td>Native (Malay)</td>
<td>Malay/Indonesian</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>Chinese Malay, local vernacular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945–1949</td>
<td>Peranakan</td>
<td>HICS etc</td>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>English, German, French, some Indonesian, Mandarin Chinese</td>
<td>Chinese Malay, local vernacular and Dutch for the few elite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peranakan and Totok</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>Mandarin Chinese</td>
<td>English, Indonesian</td>
<td>Chinese Malay, for peranakan &amp; Mandarin Chinese and/or their respective dialect for totok, local vernacular for both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peranakan</td>
<td>Indonesian¹</td>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Chinese Malay, local vernacular Indonesianized Javanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949–1957</td>
<td>Peranakan and Totok</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>Mandarin Chinese</td>
<td>English, some Malay/Indon.</td>
<td>Chinese Malay, for peranakan &amp; Mandarin Chinese and/or their respective dialect for totok, local vernacular for both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peranakan</td>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Chinese Malay, local vernacular Indonesianized Javanese</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ During the Japanese occupation (1942-1945), the Dutch-Chinese schools were closed.

¹ After the All-Indonesian Youth Congress, Malay was known as Bahasa Indonesia (Liem 1968: 276) but was only introduced in schools in the 1940s during the Japanese occupation. However, due to the feelings of nationalism the name ‘Indonesian’ evoked then, the Japanese preferred to use the term ‘Malay’ and not ‘Indonesian’ (Sneddon, 2003a:111).
### The Ethnic Chinese in Indonesia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>Language of instruction</th>
<th>Other languages taught</th>
<th>Home Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1957-1965¹</td>
<td>Peranakan and Totok</td>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Chinese Malay, Mandarin Chinese and/or their respective dialect for Totok, local vernacular for both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Totok (Alien)</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>Mandarin Chinese</td>
<td>English, Indonesian</td>
<td>local vernacular, Mandarin Chinese and/or their respective dialect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966-1967¹</td>
<td>Peranakan and Totok</td>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Chinese Malay, Mandarin Chinese and/or their respective dialect for Totok, local vernacular for both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Totok (Alien)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no schools</td>
<td>local vernacular, Mandarin Chinese and/or their respective dialect for Totok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968-1975</td>
<td>Peranakan and Totok</td>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Chinese Malay, Mandarin Chinese and/or their respective dialect for Totok, local vernacular for both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Totok (Alien)²</td>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>local vernacular, Mandarin Chinese and/or their respective dialect for Totok</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ After the 1955 treaty, all Chinese had to have one citizenship only. Most *peranakan* chose Indonesian citizenship, so it was mostly *Totok* who were alien. *Totok* who were Indonesian citizens could go to Indonesian schools.

² *Totok* children who did not have Indonesian citizenship had to have a study permit to enter schools.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>Language of instruction</th>
<th>Other languages taught</th>
<th>Home Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1975-</td>
<td>Peranakan and Totok</td>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>Indonesian (and English for some private schools)</td>
<td>English, German, Japanese, French etc.</td>
<td>Peranakan Malay for older generation of peranakan; Mandarin and/or their respective dialect for older generations of totok. Local vernacular for both groups (older and younger generations), CMI* and Colloquial Indonesian for younger generations of both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>present</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.3 The emergence of educational and language repertoire differences in different age cohorts among the totok Chinese in Java

What has been described in the previous sections provides an understanding of why there are differences in the linguistic abilities between the older generations of the totok and peranakan communities. Further, the description also reveals that differences have still emerged amongst the present day totok community, especially after the closing of the Chinese schools when all totok children had to attend Indonesian schools. The following discussion will provide a summary of different subgroups of the totok community, with distinctive language repertoires.

It is now over 40 years since the closing of the Chinese schools, and various groups of peranakanized totok have emerged with languages and educational experiences different from their parents, grandparents, great-grandparents and even in some cases their siblings. Nowadays, there are at least four different sub-groupings in terms of the types of schooling they experienced and the language repertoire possessed.

---

*Chinese Malay/Indonesian is a variety of Peranakan Malay (or Chinese Malay) spoken by the present generation of both peranakan and totok. This variety is at present replete with either Javanese or colloquial Indonesian depending on where the speakers are from. The version spoken in Central Java still has more Javanese features than that spoken in East Java. The latter variety is discussed in those studies such as Wolff and Poedjosodarmo, 1982, Dreyfuss and Oka, 1979, Rafferty, 1982, and Oetomo, 1987.

**37 At that time Chinese people usually had many children. Thus, many families had children who went to schools with different curricula. The eldest one might have gone to Chinese schools while the youngest went to only Indonesian schools, while those children in between went to both Chinese and Indonesian schools (the transitional generation).
by each group.

Most of the *totok* born up to the late 1930s went to Chinese-medium schools, and therefore speak at least some Mandarin Chinese in addition to their respective family dialect. They were brought up in the *totok* way, exposed to Chinese daily newspapers, periodicals and books and were culturally oriented towards China. However, in addition to the Chinese dialect they used with their parents, they also speak the regional language of the area in which they grew up, some variety of Malay/Indonesian and, if they went to Chinese schools, some Mandarin which they might use with outsiders and siblings. Many still speak Mandarin actively, either in their workplace or with friends and relatives who also speak the language. Some also learned a little Dutch at school and can understand and speak it to a certain extent.

The second group is the transitional group. These people went to Chinese-medium schools at earlier stages of their education but then had to move to Indonesian medium schools. They were born between the mid 1940s and the late 1950s. They are either the children or the younger siblings of the previous cohort. This cohort usually has the richest repertoire of languages compared with the other groups. In this group itself there are also sub-groupings, which I refer to as the older and younger transitional group. These subgroups were at different educational levels, primary or secondary, when they had to move to Indonesians schools. In Java, the older group usually speaks Mandarin to some extent depending on the duration of exposure they had to it or level of Chinese schooling they had had. Besides, they also speak their ancestral dialect with their parents at home, and a mixture of Mandarin, colloquial Indonesian, and the local language with siblings at home. They also tend to speak Mandarin, colloquial Indonesian, and any other local codes they acquired to use with friends and others. For those who were still in primary school when the Chinese schools were closed, although they learned to understand Chinese, they tend to feel much more comfortable communicating in languages other than Mandarin Chinese or their family dialects. Most of this younger group opt for either Indonesian or the regional/local languages as their dominant code and many have gradually lost their active command of Mandarin.

---

28 Suryadinata (1986:92) refers to this cohort as post-war generation *totok* who grew up during and after the Second World War, were locally born, and had no experience of Dutch colonialism. The previous cohort is grouped as pre-war generation *totok*. Suryadinata, however, did not suggest any sub-groupings within the groups.
Chinese. Although their parents may address them in Mandarin or their ancestral dialect, they would tend to answer in a mixture of Mandarin, ancestral dialect, colloquial Indonesian or even in Peranakan Malay. Many of those from well-off families continued their education overseas. Thus, they acquired the languages spoken in the countries where they pursued their education and continued to speak those languages when they came back to Indonesia. The less wealthy just finished their secondary education in Indonesia. Many of these educated ones have become professionals and speak Peranakan Malay and often become ‘peranakanized’. This group is usually more competent in standard Indonesian or at least colloquial Indonesian than their parents and older siblings. Outside Java, this group tends to still use Mandarin Chinese and/or their ancestral dialect extensively with parents, siblings and outsiders.

The third group is the generation who were born from the early 1960s onwards, the post-1965 children, who only experienced Indonesian-medium schools and got their only ‘Chinese’ language exposure, if any, from home. In Java, this generation does not generally speak any Mandarin Chinese. If they do, it is due to extra Mandarin lessons they had with private teachers. They usually use their regional language or even Peranakan Malay or the Colloquial Indonesian mixed with the regional language as their home language\(^\text{29}\). In general, this group are the Indonesian-speaking ‘totok’ and the ‘totok’ identity among them has been greatly reduced or even replaced by Indonesian identity. They tend to have a different attitude from previous generations especially with regard to their identity as Indonesian. Among this group are those who went to Indonesian schools that allocated more time for English subjects or even offered some subjects taught in English. These people tend to speak good English. This present generation also tends to study more European languages such as German, French, Dutch etc. that are offered by study and cultural centres, in addition to the English that is compulsory at school. Those from well-to-do families often study overseas, either in the United States, Australia or European countries. Others go to prestigious domestic private schools. Many of them have become professionals and work in offices.

The fourth group is the emerging generation which are the children of the post-

\[^{29}\text{In the Outer Islands, however, many of this group still uses Mandarin Chinese and/or their ancestral dialects as their home languages with parents, siblings and relatives. In addition they tend to speak Indonesian but seldom the local language since they usually live either isolated from the natives or the native culture is still ‘underdeveloped’ (Suryadinata, 1986:92).}\]
1965 generation. This group tends to employ colloquial Indonesian or a mixture of colloquial Indonesian and standard Indonesian\textsuperscript{30} as their home language with their parents and siblings who address them in the same way. These children are also exposed to English, and other foreign languages, including even Mandarin Chinese in more recent times.

The rapid advancement of modern technology in the last two decades has had its effects on life conveniences. Advances include faster means of transportation, global world relations, and the spread of the mass media: radio, television, newspapers etc. In turn, all these factors, especially those of mass media, have helped facilitate the dissemination of information, provide language contact experiences and opportunities as well as accelerate language acquisition especially of the younger generations. In addition, the presence of foreign consulates, foreign companies, language centres and expatriates from foreign countries provide not only language contact opportunities and experiences but also motivations and means to learn foreign languages.

Therefore, it stands to reason that there has been a shift in individual language repertoire across generations not only due to the different educational experiences people have had but also due to the other external non-academic factors mentioned above. The change of status and role of Mandarin Chinese and Indonesian in the archipelago due to changes in the political situation in Indonesia have also influenced these shifts. These language shifts also accompany shifts in socio-cultural orientation across generation. The younger generations of totok who have been peranakanized or even completely Indonesianized identify themselves with Indonesia more than the previous generations. Therefore, as postulated by Tan (1997: 44) the validity of the distinction between peranakan and totok especially the distinction into totok is being questioned. This has also been borne out by the writer’s own observations. Educational experience, especially the language used at school seems to have been very influential on the language used at home as more and more children of totok descent use the informal colloquial Indonesian or the semi formal variety of Indonesian as their home language. All in all, like any other modern Indonesians nowadays, the totok children speak Indonesian, in addition to the local/regional as well as foreign languages they are

\textsuperscript{30} In a continuum of the informal variety, colloquial Indonesian, and the formal one, standard Indonesian taught at school, this variety lies somewhat in between. Sneddon (2003b) refers to this variety as semi informal variety of Indonesian.
exposed to.

The following section provides a short description of Surabaya and discusses the history of ethnic Chinese settlements in Surabaya and surrounding areas.

3.4 Surabaya and its ethnic Chinese

3.4.1 A brief history of Surabaya City

Surabaya is one of the oldest cities in Indonesia. Geographically, Surabaya is situated on the north-eastern coast of Java (see map 3.1 and 3.2). It stretches along Madura strait in the north-eastern part with Sidoarjo municipality in the south and Gresik Municipality in the west (see map 3.2.). In 2000, Surabaya’s population was estimated at 2,578,135 people (Gayo, 2000). The population is said to increase during the day as many people from the surrounding towns and cities come to work in industry and trade businesses in Surabaya.

Map 3.1 Map of Indonesia
However, exactly when Surabaya was built or started as a settlement remains obscure. One of the legends of Surabaya says that a mighty ikan Çura ‘a kind of shark’ and buaya ‘a crocodile’ were engaged in a fierce battle in Kali Mas, the ‘Gold River’ that flows through Surabaya city. The battle caused the water in the river to become red with blood. Later, a bridge was built and named after the red water, becoming Jembatan Merah ‘the Red Bridge’. Therefore, the figures of ikan Çura and Buaya have adorned the city’s colourful coat of arms since Dutch colonial times. A statue depicting the two animals in battle is found in front of Surabaya Zoo. The battle between a shark and a crocodile symbolizes the ‘eternal battle’ between land and sea, in terms of the natural phenomena of high tide and low tide that occur daily on Surabaya beach. Another interpretation is that ‘sura’ means courageous, fierce and daring while ‘baya’ means danger. Thus, ‘sura ing baya’ means courageous and fierce in any danger (von Faber, 1931: 4-5, 1953: 153). This concept was later connected to the battle between Surabaya youth and the Allied forces in order to defend Indonesian independence in November 1945.

The oldest historical written record on Surabaya is found in prasasti Trowulan I dated 1358 in which the name Surabaya—still a small village then—was mentioned as
one of the important ‘crossing points’ on the Brantas river. Von Faber (1931: 1) wrote that the name Surabaya was first mentioned in the book *Nagarakretagama* written by *Prapantja* in 1365 who was telling the story of Hajam Woeroek—the Majapahit King 1350-1389. Despite these written records, Von Faber (1953: 75-94) hypothesized that Surabaya was founded in 1275 by King Kertanegara from Singosari as a settlement for his soldiers (Singosari is a town near Malang which is located about 90 km from Surabaya). That settlement was named Surabaya. It was further written (von Faber, 1953: 95-103) that Raden Widjaya, Kertanegara’s son-in-law, and his people escaped from the Djayakatwang troops and passed through Surabaya in 1292, as was written in the book the Pararaton. Other sources mention that in 1292 Raden Wijaya drove the Kublai Khan troops away from Hujung Galuh, presumed to be the name of Surabaya at that time, and established the Majapahit Kingdom in 1293. This year was taken as the birth of Surabaya by decree No. 64/WK/75 signed by Suparno as the Mayor of Surabaya in 1975. The decree stated that 31 May 1293 was the date of the birth of Surabaya.

Little is recorded about the following several hundred years, but by the eighteenth century, Surabaya had started to become more important in the records. Surabaya was mentioned in the agreement between the VOC and Paku Buwono II from Mataram on 11 November 1743. Under this agreement, the northern coast of Java (including Surabaya) would be under VOC authority and administration. Soon, Surabaya became the centre of major administrative and trading activities in the East Indies, for a long time remaining larger than Batavia, which is now Jakarta. Until the 1900s the centre of Surabaya, which was at that time classified administratively as a regency, was around *Jembatan Merah* ‘the Red Bridge’ (see map 3.3).
The colonial government offices and Dutch housing were on the west side of the Red Bridge, *Europeesche Wijk*, while the settlements for Foreign Orientals *Vreemde Oosterlingen* such as Chinese, Malays, and Arabs were on the eastern side of the bridge. These settlements have remained on the east right up until the present. In 1905 Surabaya became an administrative municipality or 'Gemeente', and the city started to develop on the southern and eastern sides of the bridge. The business centre developed in Kembang Jepun (which used to be called *Handelstraat*), on the eastern side of the bridge, where
many ethnic Chinese lived. In 1926 Surabaya became the capital city of East Java province and it flourished to become the second largest city in Indonesia after Jakarta.

On 10 November 1945, several months after Indonesia declared its independence, there was major bloodshed in Surabaya when a battle broke out between Surabayan youth and the English, one of the Dutch allies. The Surabayan youths came from a variety of different ethnic backgrounds, different social classes and different social statuses. The Dutch and their allies had come back to reclaim Indonesia after Japan had been defeated in the Second World War. After this historic event Surabaya came to be known as the Heroes’ City ‘Kota Pahlawan’ and a monument was erected to commemorate the incident.

Surabaya is both a municipality (kotamadya daerah tingkat II) and the seat of the East-Java provincial government. Surabaya is known as the ‘Indamardi’ city: an acronym for industri, dagang, maritim and pendidikan ‘industry, commerce, maritime, and education’. As the second largest city in Indonesia it serves as a hub of industry, business, maritime, education and other activities for the eastern part of Indonesia.

As a major seaport with its harbour, Tanjung Perak ‘Cape Silver’, second only to Tanjung Priok in Jakarta in terms of size and shipping volume, Surabaya serves as a maritime gateway for inter-island traffic, especially to eastern Indonesia. Besides being a container port for big ships and tankers from around the world and other islands, Tanjung Perak Harbour is also a major port-of-call for Indonesian passenger ships and the terminus for the ferries to Madura Island which is only four kilometres off the coast. Surabaya also has an international airport—Juanda.

Industry continues to grow in Surabaya, particularly in areas such as Rungkut Industry and Tandes. There are many big factories, and other industrial enterprises. Branch offices and business affiliations of the main offices in Jakarta also have their representatives in Surabaya. At the time of writing this thesis, a bridge ‘Suramadu’, Surabaya-Madura, is being built to connect Surabaya and Madura island, thus making communication and transportation between Java, Surabaya in particular, and Madura island faster, easier and less expensive than before. Madura island is set to become another major industrial centre.

Like many big cities the work force in Surabaya consists of people from many
walks of life with different educational and working backgrounds. There are
government officials, members of the Armed forces—especially the navy as Surabaya is
one of the major naval bases in Indonesia,—as well as non-government officials such as
professionals, business and industry owners, workers, labourers, coolies etc. These
people live in different housing estates in Surabaya—from the most elite, down to the
kampongs and even ghettos. Surabaya also houses many consulates and representatives
from many foreign countries such as the United States of America, Japan, Germany, and
the Netherlands.

There are many schools, universities and colleges, state and private alike, in
Surabaya, and these attract people from other cities or islands to come to Surabaya to
study. Most of the state schools that were formerly Dutch or Chinese were turned into
Indonesian-owned state schools. Private schools are usually run by Catholic or
Protestant missionaries and many of them date back to the Dutch colonial times. There
are also private schools run by Muslim communities/organizations or other non-
religious institutions. Besides these Indonesian schools there are also some international
schools such as Surabaya International School that employ English as the medium of
instruction, or schools that allot more teaching time for English or English as one
medium of instruction amongst others.

The universities and colleges in Surabaya offer education in engineering,
architecture, computer technology, law, economics, education, medicine, psychology,
finance etc. Many universities are government controlled, but there are also no less
prestigious private universities throughout Surabaya. In addition to these formal
educational institutions, there are also many non-formal ones that offer various courses
for adults as well as children. Among those courses are foreign language courses
operated by locally owned organizations and/or foreign government-affiliated
organizations such as Goethe Institute, Centre Culturel Français, British Council and
PPIA31 (Perhimpunan Persahabatan Indonesia-America ‘American-Indonesian
Friendship Association’), to mention but a few. In other words, many foreign languages
such as English, German, French, and many others including Japanese, Arabic and
lately Mandarin Chinese are at the Surabaya people’s disposal.

31 It had used to be operated by the USIS (United States Information Service) before it was handed down
to a private institution.
To summarize, Surabaya is the second largest city in Indonesia and has developed into a big metropolitan and cosmopolitan city like any other of its kind. As a major metropolis, it has attracted people from other areas and outer islands to come and reside in Surabaya in order to earn their living, do business, study or just come for a visit. As the centre for business, and government activities, Surabaya also hosts many foreigners and expatriates. The presence of these people no doubt indirectly promotes the motivation to learn and use English, Mandarin, Japanese and other languages spoken by people in Surabaya.

3.4.2 Language and culture contact situations in Surabaya

The following paragraphs discuss the language, culture and people of Surabaya. As already mentioned, Surabaya is one of the major cities of Indonesia and is a centre for economic, social, political and educational activities. Therefore, many people from outside Surabaya or even outside Indonesia and from other islands come to live or stay in Surabaya. Some of the more prominent Indonesian ethnic groups found are the Javanese, originating from central & eastern parts of Java as well as, Madurese, Balinese, Sundanese, originating from the western part of Java, Manadonese, Ambonese, Bugis etc. (see the Indonesian map 3.1) and groups originating from outside the archipelago such as Chinese, Arabs and Indians. These people come with their various differences such as language, culture, religions, way of life etc. Thus, Surabaya has become a melting-pot in which people from innumerable ethnic backgrounds have come to live, work and interact, Indonesians and foreigners alike. This situation makes Surabaya very pluralistic in terms of its people, culture, language, art, buildings etc.

Of all these different ethnic groups, two groups predominate: the majority Javanese and the Madurese. Stereotypically, Javanese people are viewed as stoic, slow and poised because their principle is to maintain harmony and conformity in all sectors of life. They tend to be reserved, suppressing their feelings and, loving peace and stability in life. For these reasons, Javanese ways of speaking and doing things are characterized with four major principles animating prijaji\(^\text{32}\) etiquette: the proper form for the proper rank, indirection, dissimulation, and the avoidance of any act suggesting

\(^{32}\) The *Prijaji* are Java's gentry, while the *abangans* are its peasantry (Geertz, 1960:228). The old spelling 'prijajis' used here is Geertz' as compared to the new spelling 'priyaji'.
disorder or lack of self control (Geertz, 1960: 243). On the other hand, the Madurese are seen as more direct, open, down-to-earth, and high-spirited. They place great importance on their honor which they are quick to defend if it is in danger of being violated. The fusion of these two cultural values results in the Surabayan culture which is open, direct, democratic, dynamic and enjoying solidarity. Thus, the Javanese from Surabaya tend to be perceived by other Javanese as ‘rough’ and lacking in proper etiquette.

The Madurese originate from Madura island which lies to the north of Surabaya. Many Madurese migrate or come to earn their living in Surabaya. As there are many Madurese engaged in trading and economic activities in the busy life of Surabaya city, Madurese has become one of the languages spoken not only by the Madurese but also by the Javanese, and other ethnic groups including some Chinese who live in areas where there are substantial pockets of Madurese speakers. These Madurese people are usually found in the markets as fruit sellers, becak\textsuperscript{33} drivers, parking attendants, coolies etc. Thus, in order to get good bargains or to communicate with them one has to be acquainted with Madurese (see map 3.2 showing the areas where Madurese is spoken in East Java)

Many other languages or language varieties and even mixes of them are also spoken in Surabaya\textsuperscript{34}. The Javanese speak Javanese and most nowadays speak some varieties of Indonesian as well. The Madurese tend to speak Madurese, some Javanese, and Indonesian. The ethnic Chinese usually speak some variety of Indonesian, some Javanese, as well as, in some cases Mandarin Chinese and/or their ancestral dialect. A similar variety of linguistic repertoire exists for other ethnic groups living in Surabaya. The growing educated middle class speak semi formal Indonesian, informal colloquial Indonesian, their local language, and perhaps some degree of English, Arabic and/or

\textsuperscript{33} A traditional local three-wheeled cart similar to the Singaporean rickshaw.

\textsuperscript{34} There are also some speakers (not as many as that of Madurese) of ‘Basa Osing’ which is a Javanese variety spoken in the further east of East Java (Banyuwangi and its surroundings).
other foreign languages. Most of the population speaks either colloquial Indonesian or at least one of its varieties and their own local language whatever that may be. In addition, there are also many foreigners and expatriates who live in Surabaya, and who speak their own languages.

All these languages colour the linguistic situation in Surabaya. Much more detailed discussion of the languages spoken by the subjects of this study is given in chapter five.

3.4.3 Ethnic Chinese communities in Surabaya

3.4.3.1 The history of ethnic Chinese in Surabaya

When the ethnic Chinese first came to Surabaya to settle is not known. However, the history of Chinese settlement in Surabaya goes back further than the events that took place in the last years of the 13th century, which are well documented. In 1293 the Emperor Kublai Khan from the Yuan dynasty (1280-1367) sent his troops to Java to punish King Kertanegara from Singosari who was considered disobedient. When these troops landed on the northern coast of Surabaya, they found Chinese people along the northern coast of Java, mostly of Hokkien provenance (Skinner, 1963). Chinese people had clearly arrived in Java prior to that time. Later, after their failure and defeat, these Chinese soldiers—who were also of Hokkien extraction—were reluctant to go back to their homeland. Instead, many decided to stay among those Hokkien communities and married the local women (Cator, 1936:3, Williams, 1960:1). They taught their fellow Chinese how to make bricks, tiles, cannons and ships (Setiono, 2002).

By 1411 permanent Chinese settlements had been developed in Gresik and Surabaya35. These Chinese people resided in the eastern part of Kalimas ‘Mas River’, in the areas surrounding Jembatan Merah ‘The Red Bridge’. They were found to live near other foreigners such as Malays, Arabs and Indians. Only after the zoning and pass systems were abolished in 1917 and 1918 did the ethnic Chinese people leave this densely populated area to move and live in other parts of Surabaya city. These people

---

35 Baks (1970:251) quoted Raffles’ observation that the Chinese “...reside principally in the three great capitals of Batavia, Semarang, and Surabaya but they are to be found in all smaller capitals, and scattered over most parts of the country” (Raffles I, 74). Baks explained further that since the Chinese were mostly involved in commerce and crafts, it was not surprising to find their settlements in harbours and along main traffic routes. For centuries, Surabaya has been one of the important harbour cities in the archipelago. The majority of these Chinese were Peranakan.
were the ancestors of the present *peranakan* community.

As already mentioned, *totok* communities emerged in the 1930s after the arrival of a later wave of immigrants36, and in more recent years the distinction between the two communities has been breaking down. Since the closing of all Chinese schools, *peranakan* and *totok* alike have been regarded as one group of Chinese and have been pressured to assimilate into Indonesian society, as has already been mentioned.

Considering the composition of ethnic Chinese in Surabaya, Coppel (2002: 115) postulated that based on the daily language used, the 1920 census calculated that 54.2 per cent of the Chinese population in Surabaya were Chinese speakers, thus *totok*, and 45.7 percent Malay37 speakers and 0.1 per cent Javanese speakers. The last two belong to the *peranakan* category. Based on the end-of-year 1977-1978 East Java municipality statistical report, the number of ethnic Chinese having Indonesian citizenship was two thirds of the total ethnic Chinese population in East Java, which indicated an increase compared to the previous statistical report (Abdulmadjid et al., 1980: 80-81)38. Presumably those still considered as alien Chinese were mostly of *totok* descent, while those holding Indonesian citizenship comprised ethnic Chinese of both *peranakan* and *totok* descents. However, the exact number of ethnic Chinese in Surabaya at present is unknown. As was mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, the 2000 census reported that there were only about 190.968 ethnic Chinese in East Java39. (Suryadinata, 2002: 285). Yet, the census provided neither details of their citizenship nor how many there were in Surabaya itself. Regardless of their citizenship or political status (as described in §3.1.4), those generations who were in their 30s and 40s in 1991 identify themselves as Indonesians.

---

36 More and more Chinese women migrated to Java after 1900. Most of them arrived in Batavia, but Surabaya was also an important landing place (Baks, 1970:254).
37 The Malay spoken is the variety known as Bahasa Melayu Tonghoa ‘Chinese Malay’ which had lots of Malay words, and extensive use of Dutch and Hokkien terms.
38 At the end of 1977, the population in Surabaya was 1.869.097 and the number of alien Chinese or *WNA* was 50.376, while the Indonesian citizens or *WI* were 115,310 (Abdulmadjid, 1980: 80-81). Compared to those of 1978, these figures implied that more alien Chinese were granted Indonesian citizenship.
39 Comparing the 2000 census to the 1978 statistics, the number of the ethnic Chinese in East Java showed a huge decrease, nearly by half, which was very strange. As mentioned earlier Suryadinata assumed that probably most ethnic Chinese were reluctant to admit their ethnicity after the events of May 1998 (Suryadinata 2002:285, Suryadinata et.al 2003:iii), hence the big discrepancy in numbers resulted. In addition to these and other factors, it seems that the 2000 census was plagued by other troubles, including data misinterpretation by computers (Terry Hull, pers. comm.).
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The following section focuses on the ethnic Chinese from the so-called ‘totok’ community. It is to this group that the subjects of this study belong.

3.4.3.2 Totok communities in Surabaya: culture, language and social background

The Surabaya totok communities spoke a wide variety of dialects when they arrived in Indonesia, including Hakka, Cantonese, Foochow, Hokchia, Hingwa etc. A generation later, their offspring also spoke a wide variety of dialects. Nowadays, the totoks and their descendants are far more numerous than the peranakan. As already mentioned, the younger descendants of totok have to a large degree become ‘peranakanized’. Although the distinction between totok and peranakan has become blurred amongst the younger generations, in the following sections I refer to both original totok and their descendants as totok for the sake of simplicity in the presentation.

The totok community is scattered all around Surabaya, although there are still some areas where Chinese people are concentrated. The most important of these is the Chinese quarter, the Pecinan or ‘Chinatown’ which still exists with its sprawl of old shop houses, crumbling warehouses and modern buildings in between. These shop-houses are found in most of Pecinan although most have now been modernized and serve as retail or wholesale shops, banks, electronic showrooms, or other kinds of business centres. The main street is called Kembang Jepun now and in the past few years has been turned into a brightly-lit night food market named Kya-kyia a Hokkien word for ‘sightseeing while having fun’. During the day, it remains a wholesale business centre. The place is decorated in a Chinese style with typical red Chinese lanterns hanging around, statues of lions and dragons situated here and there as well as the sign Kya-kyia written in the Latin script using Chinese strokes. The area has become a well-visited recreation centre for Surabaya people and there are many food stalls owned by different ethnic groups living in Surabaya including those of the ethnic Chinese. Security is well taken care of by the civilian guards who are mostly ethnic Madurese. This night food market has injected some life back into this area of China town where the ethnic Chinese used to live and work before they moved to other housing areas in suburban Surabaya. These changes have served to keep the Chinese community highly visible to Surabaya people in general.

Most of the older generation of Totok go to Confucian or Tri Dharma temples, but many of the young generations are not interested in their parents’ religion. Many young
people have converted to Christianity and other religions40 or opt for Buddhism or do not practice any religion at all, even though each person officially subscribes to one of the five official religions on their identification cards. Some of the young generations consider religions other than Confucianism to be less Chinese and thus more Indonesian.

Economically, the ethnic Chinese people of totok background in Surabaya are like other ethnic groups; they belong to different social classes and, have different educational backgrounds and family standings. Some of them are engaged in businesses—private, family or corporate owned—while many others, especially among the younger generations, have become professionals. The generation after 1965—like their peranakan counterparts—are keen for their children to receive a good education, and thus, most of the young generations nowadays go to universities, either in Indonesia or overseas if their parents can afford it. Otherwise they enter the workforce and work in companies, factories, banks etc. Thus, totok Chinese in Surabaya, like totok Chinese elsewhere in Indonesia, have changed their views towards education in response to changing external circumstances. Nowadays these totok families also send their children to private primary, secondary and tertiary level educational institutions since only a privileged few can enter the state schools and universities.

The languages spoken by the totok ethnic Chinese in Surabaya vary not only across generations, but also across social classes and educational background. In addition to the languages spoken by the majority, Javanese and East Java Indonesian (a variety of Colloquial Indonesian spoken in East Java), another language often heard in the market and business centres where there is a concentration of ethnic Chinese is Mandarin Chinese. Mandarin is spoken by those attending Chinese schools and language courses and those who have learned it from home. To a certain extent people usually also speak their respective ancestral dialect. On the other hand, those who attended both Chinese

---

40 This process accelerated after 1965. Since the abortive coup of Communism in Indonesia, every Indonesian citizen is required to show their religion in their Kartu Tanda Penduduk—Identification card—or otherwise they will be suspected of being members of the communist party. They have to choose from the six official religions endorsed by the government: Islam, Catholicism, Protestantism, Hinduism, Buddhism, and Confucianism. Confucianism ceased to be a permissible official religion in Indonesia with the presidential decree on 27 January 1979. Those who had previously elected to enter Confucianism on their identity cards were forced to choose another religion instead. Today Confucians still seek recognition for Confucianism as one of the approved religions in Indonesia.
and Indonesian schools may be proficient in both Mandarin and Indonesian. The young generations usually speak neither Mandarin nor their ancestral dialect. The better-educated young generations are usually also equipped with knowledge of at least one western code such as English. In addition to all of these languages and codes and, in response to advances in technology, and communications, etc. nowadays, English, together with other foreign languages, such as German, French, and even Dutch, and Asian languages like Japanese, are also learned and spoken by the young generation of this totok group. English is employed as a language of communication, and a language of business activities, education and even just for prestige. In addition, Mandarin Chinese has recently joined the array of foreign languages offered by private language centres available throughout Surabaya and this generation has started to seize these opportunities of learning Mandarin Chinese too.

More detailed discussion of the languages spoken by the subjects of this study is found in chapter five.

3.4.4 Multilinguality and polyglossia among the totok Chinese in Surabaya

Platt (1977, 1977b) found what he termed multilingualism and societal polyglossia in Singapore and Malaysia. The same situation is found in Surabaya in which there is a fusion of individual multilinguality (the term used in this study, see §2.1) and polyglossia. Across domains, people in Surabaya may have more than one code (language or language varieties) as their High, Medium or Low code. High varieties are usually used in the fields of education, religion, administration, etc. while Low varieties are usually used at home, among friends, and during daily activities etc. Across communities, there might also be different sets of codes as High, Mid or Low codes. It may also be that within each domain people may use these codes differently as their high, mid and low codes in their individual interactions with different people.

The ethnic Chinese in Surabaya usually have at least three languages or language varieties in their language repertoire, and each of these is utilised in different domains, e.g. school, home, peer/playground/environment. The composition of the language repertoire varies between the peranakan and totok communities, and inside each community itself, between families and even between generations of the same family. Consequently, the codes which function as High, Mid and Low vary across communities, families and generations.
With regard to the subjects under study, an extensive discussion of this issue is found in chapter six where the subjects' individual multilingual repertoire is addressed. Further discussion is found in chapter nine where the polyglot functions of different codes as high, mid and low codes is addressed.

3.5 Summary and conclusion

It is true that there used to be a clear cultural distinction between peranakan and totok ethnic Chinese in Indonesia. In terms of education, prior to Indonesian Independence, most peranakan children went to Dutch language schools while most totok children attended Chinese language schools. Their indigenous counterparts tended to go to Malay schools. Unlike Dutch schools, Chinese and Malay-Indonesian schools, seemed to survive right through the Japanese occupation until Indonesian independence. This situation changed, however, in 1955 with the decree that prohibited Indonesian citizens from attending Chinese language schools. From that time, only alien totok children attended Chinese schools. After 1965, with the closing of all Chinese schools, the dualistic educational system was replaced by one national system for all students. There was one medium of instruction, namely Indonesian, and this was used (officially at least) at all educational levels in all institutions throughout Indonesia. From this time on, both peranakan and totok went to schools with Indonesian as the language of instruction. Hence, the generations after that speak the 'same' language, Indonesian⁴, at school, work and even at home, a practice different from that of their parents or grandparents.

Also, there are other similarities between young generations of both totok and peranakan in terms of profession, religion etc. Under the present constant pressure exerted by the indigenous majority, the totok or the Chinese minority in general are also becoming more and more assimilated into the indigenous population. Twenty years ago, Suryadinata (1986: 204) observed that …

"the younger generation totoks have rapidly become peranakanized. It appears that the new generation peranakans are being Indonesianized more rapidly than peranakanized

⁴Together with the government campaign to promote the use of Indonesian nation-wise initiated in 1974, school as a socializing agency has helped the development of Indonesian 'Indonesian' as the national language of Indonesia.
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... in a continuum: totok is being peranakanized while the peranakan is being Indonesianized.

This observation is not completely true any more. While it is true that the totok children belonging to the transitional period seem to have undergone the process of peranakanization, this process has continued so that the next generation of both peranakan and totok have now undergone ‘Indonesianization’, and differences between the younger generations of these communities have become neutralized. However, whether this can be seen as the end of segregation between peranakan and totok is still debatable.

It can also be concluded that the differences in educational policy experienced by different cohorts of the totok community have helped to force changes in the varieties of languages used in multilingual Surabaya. In turn, these changes have influenced the polyglossic functions of the different varieties spoken by different generations. More extensive discussion of the polyglossic functions and varieties found among the subjects is found in subsequent chapters.
Chapter 4

The Methodology

4.0 Introduction

This chapter discusses the methodology used for the study. It constitutes the following parts: the research site and the selection of subjects, the data collection methods, procedures, activities and tools, the transcription methodology and data analysis.

4.1 Selection of research site and subjects

This section describes how a research site was chosen and why and how the particular families involved were selected for the purpose of the study.

4.1.1 Researcher’s home town as the research site

The research site is the writer’s home-town of Surabaya, the capital city of East Java, Indonesia. Preliminary research was done in 1999 while the major field research was done from 19 December 2000 to 8 November 2001 with some other short visits later in 2002, 2003 and 2004.

Surabaya was chosen for a number of reasons. First, the totok Chinese community in Surabaya has a variety of background language repertoires. Secondly, being metropolitan city dwellers, the totok Chinese community in Surabaya, and especially the younger generations are more exposed to Bahasa Indonesia and other foreign languages, especially English than their counterparts in the rural areas. Third, being a native of the city, the researcher had good access not only to the community and its culture but also to most of the languages spoken by the subjects. Thus, the writer had the advantage of being sensitive to subtleties of most of the languages found in the data, especially the non-standard varieties spoken. Trudgill (1974a) wrote that “native competence certainly helps the fieldworker to reveal some of the minute linguistic details, particularly of non-standard language varieties”. Also, the writer can combine “the observation and the self-knowledge in order to plumb the depths and explore the
subtle interconnections of meanings in ways that the outsider could attain with
difficulty” (Saville-Troike, 1997: 128).

This also accounts for the problem of the observer’s paradox which is also
known as ‘experimenter effect’ (Labov, 1981b:3 ) or ‘the Hawthorne effect’ (Chambers,
1995:19, Murray, 1985). In sociolinguistic research, the particular problems are “that
the presence of a recorder and the researcher herself as well as the ascribed
characteristics and status of the researcher, such as her ethnicity, sex, age, social status
and educational background will affect the way the subjects speak” (Matsumoto, 2000).
As the writer knows one family well and often visits them, her presence among the
family is not too obtrusive. Hence, most of the time, the subjects usually became
oblivious of the recording after the first five to ten minutes. In the other family, a family
member acted as research assistant and did the recording, thus minimizing the
observer’s paradox. In addition, although subjects had given their permission to be
recorded, they were not always aware that recording was actually taking place when it
occurred.

Being a peranakan Chinese, and thus not a native speaker of the Chinese
dialects used by the subjects, the writer relied on her subjects, research assistants and
friends who are native speakers of the codes involved to help with transcriptions of
utterances in these languages. Finally, the preliminary data were collected from this site
between 1998-1999, when because of the political situation at that time, it was unsafe
for the writer to go beyond her home-town. Hence, the writer counted on acquaintances
she knew such as family friends, and their friends, acquaintances, and relatives etc. This
is one of the reasons why the family domain served as the site of data collection as is
described below.

4.1.2 Family domain as site of data collection
Although a number of studies of peranakan language use have appeared in the
literature, there has been little study done on real language use by totok people residing
in Java. Oetomo (1987b) studied language use among the peranakan Chinese in
Pasuruan, East Java, but presented some limited description of language use by totok
Chinese in Pasuruan. Apart from Oetomo, the other studies on languages used by totok
Chinese in Indonesia are either on the subjects’ competence in written or spoken
Indonesian, or on written aspects of their language. None of these studies have looked at
individual language use in everyday contexts, or on intergenerational interactions in the family domain.

Regarding domains and domain analysis in multilingual settings, Fishman (1969a) in Hoffman (1971:17) states that

"domains are institutionally relevant spheres of social interaction in which certain value clusters are behaviourally implemented. Domains are similar to the sociologist’s ‘institutions’, but take into account behaviour, as well as structure. Domain analysis in the multilingual setting provides a broadened understanding of language usage, because it involves the implementation of the rules of social behaviour which are derived from the value clusters of the society being studied, and allows us to make crucial connection between abstract value clusters and the more concrete social situations”

Trudgill (1992: 29) explains that the ‘domain’ is

“a concept employed particularly in studies of code-switching in multilingual contexts and in the study of other situations where different languages, dialects or styles are used in different social contexts. A domain is a combination of factors which are believed to influence choice of code (language, dialect or style) by speakers. Such factors might include participants (in a conversation), topic and location. For example ‘domestic domain’, which would probably produce an informal style of speech, might involve the home location, family participants and a day-to-day topic”.

Sociolinguistic studies have generally looked at code-switching from the perspectives of ‘languages in contact’ and ‘language choice’ and analysed it within the framework of domain theory (Fishman, 1972, Gardner-Chloros, 1991, Milroy and Muysken, 1995).

As previously mentioned, tolok Chinese are assumed to have been better able to maintain their culture and/or language than their peranakan counterparts. Thus, they are still believed to employ at least some level of Chinese language, their ancestral dialect or any other Chinese dialect in their in-group interactions. When the writer looked at their in-group interactions, it soon became clear that their language use showed an extreme multilingual complexity that warranted further investigation. Chinese elements, together with a wide variety of local vernacular features colour the interactions, especially between those who went to Chinese schools. However, it has been 40 years since the closing of all Chinese schools, so the school domain was not available as a venue for the study. The family domain was clearly the best domain to use to find the richest variety of codes, including Mandarin and other Chinese dialects. Furthermore, at the time this research was initiated, restrictions against the public use of Mandarin and other Chinese dialects by ethnic Chinese people in Indonesia were still in effect. Therefore, although language shift might be expected to have taken place in all domains of language use, the family domain was deemed most suitable for study. Hakka is used
as a home language in one of the families studied here and Foochow, together with Mandarin, is used in the other. Some other considerations behind the decision to base this study on observations of interactions within the family domain were:

1. The family is considered to be the most central unit for social interaction, especially amongst Chinese. The family can be seen as a haven for using discouraged or ‘forbidden’ languages, as has always been the case in situations involving minority group languages.

2. Fishman (1972:443) asserts that

   “in many studies of multilingual behavior, the family domain has proved to be a very crucial one. Multilingualism often begins in the family and depends upon it for encouragement if not for protection. In other cases, multilingualism withdraws into the family domain after it has been displaced from other domains in which it is previously encountered”.

This description suitably fits the situation in which the subjects in this study find themselves in relation to codes such as Mandarin Chinese, their ancestral Chinese dialects and Chinese Malay/Indonesian (hereafter, CMI). In the case of the subjects under study, the family domain has become a haven for the ‘stigmatized’ code such as CMI or the forbidden and displaced one like Mandarin and other Chinese dialects.

3. In addition, the family domain has been chosen for research on the use of ethnic languages in many other studies. Such studies have included German in a Yugoslavian family (Stoetling, 1975), Dutch German (Pauwels, 1986), Swedish (Garner, 1988), Greek (Tamis, 1991), Italian Australian (Bettoni and Rubino, 1996), Singaporean Chinese (Platt, 1980b), Puerto Rican Spanish (Torres, 1988), English-British Chinese (LiWei, 1994), and New Zealand Chinese (Ng and He, 2004) to mention just a few.

---

1 A negative opinion of Indonesians towards CMI is stated in Sudja'i et.al (1986:5): “Sikap orang Indonesia terhadap bahasa peranakan sangat negatif karena dialek itu dipandang sebagai bahasa gado-gado. Terlalu banyak unsur lain yang dimasukkan sehingga bahasa itu dianggap akan merusak bahasa Indonesia. Bahasa ini dianggap sebagai bahasa khas orang Cina peranakan dan sebagai pertanda ketidaksepian mereka untuk berbahasa dengan orang pribumi” (The attitude of Indonesians towards the peranakan language is very negative because the dialect is considered as salad language. As there are too many influences from other codes, it might ruin Bahasa Indonesia. The language is seen as typical Peranakan Chinese representing their unwillingness to assimilate and their continual attitude to degrade the native).
The concept of family in this study concerns not only the nuclear family as is implied in many western studies, but also includes extended family members to encompass the concept of family in Chinese and Javanese cultures.

Fishman (1971: 21) points out that two different approaches to language studies within the family domain can be identified in the literature:

“Braunshausen and Mackey, (1962;1965;1966) have merely specified family ‘members’: father, mother, child, domestic, governess and tutor, etc. Gross, on the other hand, has specified dyads within the family (1951): grandfather to grandmother, grandmother to grandfather, grandfather to father, grandmother to father, grandfather to mother, grandmother to mother, grandfather to child, grandmother to child, father to mother, mother to father, etc. The difference between these two approaches is quite considerable. Not only that the second approach recognizes that interacting members of a family (as well as the participants in most other domains of language behaviour) are hearers as well as speakers (i.e. that there may be a distinction between multilingual comprehension and multilingual production), but it also recognizes that their language behaviour may be more than merely a matter of individual preference or facility but also a matter of role relations. In certain societies particular behaviours (including language behaviours) are expected (if not required) of particular individuals vis-à-vis each other (Goodenough, 1965).”

This study adopts the second approach used by Gross. All family members are recognised as both speakers and interlocutors, or listeners in the course of the interactions. Given that the extended family has been adopted as the domain of study, sub-domains of smaller groups can be identified within the broader family domain.

4.1.3 Criteria for choosing the family

The subjects were chosen based on the social variables of age and socio-educational background as well as the composition of the family of origin. The chosen subjects are those who from their ancestors’ cultural orientation are grouped by others as totok and were brought up as such². As previously mentioned, for practical purposes I also refer to these families as totok (but see §3.1.3 for some caveats about the use of this term).

The selection of the subjects was determined by a number of criteria. First, apart from coming from family groups that were founded by immigrants, some of the subjects from each family had to have belonged to that group directly affected by the political changes that took place in 1965. For example, one of the generations in both families

---

² This practice seems to be less relevant with regard to the present generation totok as was discussed in chapter three.
had to have been at school during the transitional period between 1966-1968, and they had to have moved from Chinese schools to Indonesian schools. Second, the family had to consist of at least three generations. The first generation had to have come from China as immigrants and the second and later generations had to have been born in Indonesia. Third, the subjects had to have been living together in one house, which is very rare nowadays, or they had to have been meeting, seeing and talking to each other regularly. Fourth, they should have lived in Surabaya and its vicinity for at least 30 years. Lastly, at least some of the people in the family should have still been using either their ancestral dialect or Mandarin or both codes in at least some interactions with other family members. The exact ancestral dialect(s) spoken by the first immigrants to Indonesia was not a consideration.

4.1.4 The chosen subjects

Based on the requirements mentioned above I chose two families. One of these families, family A, consists of a first generation immigrant who came to Java and there married a totok Chinese woman. She was born in Indonesia from first generation immigrant parents. In a way she was 'culturally not as pure' as her husband (and thus more peranakan), but she was brought up in a totok way and was just as totok as the second generation of the family B which I refer to as totok. I made use of this fact and use the term totok-peranakan to refer to family A in order to differentiate the two families from each other. On the other hand, both members of the first generation of the second family came from China to East Java as immigrants. I refer to this family as totok or family B. The children in both families—the second generation\(^1\) at least—were brought up in a totok way.

There are three generations in family A and four generations in family B with all but those individuals already mentioned being immigrants born in Indonesia. Altogether 18 subjects were chosen. They are the family members who were present during recordings and who were interviewed. Eight come from family A and ten from family B. Only one subject belongs to the first generation immigrant of each family. In family A, four subjects belong to the second generation and the other three are from the third generation. From family B, four subjects are from the second generation, four from the

---

\(^1\) They are the first Indonesian born generation in this family but in this study they are referred to as the second generation in the family.
third, and one from the fourth generation\textsuperscript{4}.

All family members in both families participated as subjects. Some were recorded more often than others, depending on individual availability. However, all were interviewed and observed in some interactions at least. More details about the language repertoires and level of schooling of individual subjects are found in chapter six.

4.1.5 Comparing the two families

The preliminary observation and ‘interview’ revealed that there are some major differences between the families. The differences and similarities actually exist not only between these two families but also within each family itself as is described in the following sections.

4.1.5.1 Local origins and residences: past and present

Founders of the two families under study came from different parts of China, and thus the families have different dialectal backgrounds. After they arrived in Java they also resided in other parts of Java before finally coming to Surabaya.

In both families, all the subjects born after the first generation have resided all their lives in East Java. All now also live in the capital, Surabaya. However, only those of family A were born in the capital, whereas the second and two members of the third generation of family B were born and grew up in a smaller town, near the border with Central Java. In this area, the Javanese variety spoken is similar to that spoken in Central Java. Thus, there are differences in the Javanese spoken by different members of family B, especially in terms of preferred lexicon.

In Surabaya, family A used to reside in an area where there were other groups of ethnic Chinese, and in these neighbourhoods Mandarin was often employed as one of the languages of interaction. Family B resided in the area where more Ngókó Javanese Suroboyoan was used. At present both families reside in housing estates in Surabaya where people from different ethnic backgrounds live.

\textsuperscript{4} Actually the voices of three other members of the fourth generation were recorded when they came into the earshot of the microphone. All of them display the same characteristics and practices of language use and language choice as that of the member chosen as the subject in this study. However, these three members were not specifically interviewed. In addition, there are also the voices of other associates of the family who happened to speak near the microphones.
4.1.5.2 Linguistic background and behaviour

Due to their different origins, the two families speak different ancestral dialects. The ancestral dialect spoken by family A is Foochow while Hakka is spoken by family B. Unlike family B, the female member of the first generation of family A was born and educated in Indonesia, so in addition to the ancestral dialect and Mandarin, she also spoke a kind of Chinese Malay—learned at school—which she also used at home with her children.

Different members of each family have had quite different language experiences, especially in terms of the language of instruction that was used. Some members of the second and third generation in family A studied in countries where German and/or English are spoken. They went home having acquired these languages, and they used them in some of their recorded interactions, at least with their siblings who were also educated overseas. Similarly, in family B, some family members went to universities where English was the language of instruction and they employed this language in recorded interactions with their siblings.

Due to the subjects’ different language experiences and exposures, differences in terms of language behaviour and language use exist between generations and even within one generation in each family. These different linguistic experiences are reflected in each individual language repertoire and language behaviour that will be extensively discussed in chapter six and seven-eight respectively.

4.1.5.3 Educational background

The first generation members of both families only had the chance to experience several years of formal schooling. The second generation of family B went to Chinese schools up to year 6 or 8 when the Second World War broke out. The outbreak of war interfered with their schooling which they never resumed. In contrast, some of the second generation of family A born around 10-15 years later, were already in the upper levels of Chinese secondary schools before the schools were closed in 1965. This generation had the opportunity to go to Indonesian schools and also had formal exposure to Bahasa Indonesia. Some of them also studied up to tertiary level. The older siblings of the third generation in family B, on the other hand, were still in year 2 and 3 of the Chinese schools when they had to move to Indonesian schools. In terms of the level of education, all the third generation of both families studied up to tertiary level, thus
attaining the highest levels of education in the family. More discussion of the subjects' formative experiences is found in chapter six.

4.1.5.4 Self-identification of ethnicity

As previously mentioned, socio-culturally the subjects of this study are referred to as tokok by other Indonesians, especially by peranakan Chinese. However, the younger generation born in Indonesia consider this term to be no longer accurate. Similar sentiments were expressed by some of the subjects in this study especially those from the third generation onwards. To these people, the distinction between tokok and peranakan is no longer meaningful. Some would prefer to be thought of as ethnic Chinese, but others prefer to be thought of as just Indonesians. The second generation claimed that the term tokok is not accurate as they had been peranakanized or even Indonesianized. However, the first generation still consider they are Chinese who live in Indonesia, and each of them still identify themselves as either a Foochow or Hakka person, not just Chinese.

This self-identification of ethnicity might relate to their attitude towards the codes they speak. Regarding their children and grandchildren and the languages they speak, the first generation members have different opinions. The first generation member of family A was of the opinion that his younger children and all his grandchildren have become orang Melayu 'Malay people' because none of them speaks any Mandarin and/or ancestral dialects and they only use Malay codes in their interactions. Concerning this issue, the first generation of family B, commented that jaman suda laen, mesti omong Indonesia 'time has changed, (one) has to speak Indonesian' (see more of this in § 6.4.3.3.2).

4.1.6 Subject attribution

To ensure the subjects' anonymity, the writer changed the names of individuals, and places, as well as personal and private information that came up in the discussion and any other information that might uncover the subjects' identity. For this reason, and to allow easy identification of the subjects, the subjects are attributed with pseudonyms in the transcriptions and they are also given unique codes which indicate their generation, gender, whether marriage or blood relations, their ancestral origin and birth order within a generation. This code consists of numbers and letters and is assigned to each subject throughout this study. Thus, numbers 1, 2, 3 and 4 are used to show 'generation', while
‘F’ and ‘M’ indicate gender. Marriage or blood relation is shown by ‘C’ for consanguinial: relation by blood, and ‘A’ for affinal: relation by marriage. ‘T’ and ‘T-P’ stand for Totok and Totok-Peranakan respectively and are used to identify their ancestral origins. Finally, lowercase letters are used to identify their place within a generation: a=first, b=second, c=third child etc. Thus, 1MCT-P means that the subject is a first generation male who is consanguinially related to the family which is the Totok-Peranakan or family A. 2MATa represents a second generation male who has an affinal relationship to the Totok family. Further, he is married to the first born of this generation in the family. The subjects’ pseudonyms and codes are used to identify them and a complete listing of these can be found in the beginning of the thesis and the bookmark provided. These attributions are used to identify the subjects in the discussion of the conversational data in chapters 7 to 9.

4.2 The data collection methods, procedure, activities and tools

The following sections discuss the kind of data collected, the procedures adopted for data collection, and the instruments used for collecting the data. The discussion presented also covers the approaches and methods espoused in the study.

4.2.1 Data collection methods

4.2.1.1 Participating in and observing the speech situations

This study subscribes to an ethnographic approach and uses a participant-observation method in which the writer, as a member of one of the ethnic Chinese communities was active in observing and participating in the family activities. The advantage of using an ethnographic approach is that it provides the possibility of explaining linguistic behaviour (Labov, 1981b: 25) through the questions and information gathered. In the same vein, Trudgill (1998) acknowledges that ethnographic approaches can provide more personal/social background details of the speakers which help provide insightful information and explain their ‘unusual’ linguistic variety.

In his study of language use, Gumperz (1971c:226) suggests that participant observation is one of several important ethnographic methods in sociolinguistic studies (e.g., Labov, 1976, LiWei, 1994, Trudgill, 1975, Trudgill, 1995 etc.). This research technique serves as a useful tool to get access to ‘the natural occurring conversation in everyday life’ (Coupland and Jaworski, 1997: 69). Thus, this technique is used in
research which concerns the everyday language use of the subjects while they are doing a range of daily tasks, both in the private and public domains.

In participating, observing the subject’s activities and obtaining conversational data of family activities, the writer tried to be as unobtrusive and as discreet as possible. In this case very often, she was a passive participant having ‘the status of accepted bystanders, professional overhearsers or eavesdroppers’ (Duranti, 1997: 99, 101, Spradley, 1980: 59) while she positioned herself in the ‘least intrusive place’ (Duranti, 1997: 101, Spradley, 1980: 59) during her observation and recording.

4.2.1.2 Informal ethnographic questionnaire interview

In addition to participant observation, the informal ethnographic questionnaire interview is another method applied to the collection of data for this study, especially with regard to the background of individual subjects, and their attitudes towards the social/cultural and communicative norms of the community. What is meant by the informal ethnographic questionnaire interview in this study is that the subjects are asked a list of questions during the interview conducted by the writer and the research assistants. The in-depth ethnographic questionnaire-interview with different family members was conducted to elicit data, especially with regard to the subjects’ life and family histories. Information was collected on their education, language background, family relations, self-professed language choice preferences, and so on. The reasons and rules of etiquette underlying the particular code choice were also elicited in this interview, although not all subjects could give other reasons apart from stating that their code-choices and code preferences were just out of habit.

Both participant observation and ethnographic interviews are also employed by Gal (1979) and LiWei (1994) in their studies. As pointed out by Spradley (1979) and LiWei (1994), in ethnographic interviews, settings, timetables, participants, orders and ways of asking questions are flexible and based on contextual needs at that time. Therefore, this kind of interview can be conducted at any place, at any time, and for any length of time. Interruptions by unexpected events (the phone ringing, unexpected visitors) which take place while the interview is being conducted do not invalidate the recordings as the intended data is everyday natural language. These encounters, on the other hand, illustrate the subjects’ language behaviour in different contexts with different audiences (Matsumoto, 2000: 81) and this will reveal the language repertoire, code choices or change of speech styles which accompany changes of situation. In case
subjects do not understand the questions used/prepared in the questionnaire interview, they can also be translated into the language they know without lessening the value of information gathered.

Information gathered by means of the ethnographic questionnaire interview (see the full text of questionnaire in appendix 3) has been used to supplement the data acquired through participant observation. It also complements the recorded data of natural interactions.

In short, ethnographic interview questionnaires are used to collect data on the subjects’ background, language behaviour, language attitude etc. However, unlike the previously stated studies which observe a community as their subjects, this study only observes two extended families as subjects; hence, it is a case study in nature. So, the findings are family-specific and are not meant to serve as a generalization of any sort.

4.2.2 Data collection procedure and activities

4.2.2.1 Data collection activities and follow-ups

I spent about a year in the field collecting data. I started data collection on 19 December 2000 when I visited both families. At this time, the family members were gathering together for the coming Christmas celebrations. The New Year gathering of the totok family on New Year’s Eve and New Year’s Day 2001 was also a good time for recording their interactions, so the recording of the totok family was done from 31 December 2000 to 2 January 2001. However, the recording among the totok-peranakan family was done much later i.e. mid March 2001. The interviews for these two families were done in between those dates.

As a first step in my research, I called on a number of totok families and made some preliminary observations of their language and their living environments. I noticed that different members of the family interacted using different languages or codes, and that they also understand each other perfectly well in spite of these differences. However, I faced difficulties in gaining consent to make recordings, particularly from older members of the initial families I approached. Usually, the older generations were very wary and reluctant to be recorded. Therefore, I decided to turn to families that I knew and I made use of my own networks. I eventually found two families whose members were willing to be recorded and interviewed. Since I knew a member or two of each of these families, it was easier to get to know other family members, and gaining
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consent for recording was easier when there was already a greater degree of trust. After securing agreement for recording and interviewing, I began the actual recording and interviewing. As previously mentioned, one family is referred to as totok and the other as totok-peranakan.

Before beginning data collection, I briefed them on my identity, aims and motives, the significance of the study and the recording procedures I proposed to use. All of the participants expressed their willingness to give information in interviews about their social activities and allowed me to record their speech. I told them that I was interested in finding out about language use patterns that I suspected varied from generation to generation. I also told them that I was interested in seeking explanations for any changes that I observed, especially with respect to the different educational systems each generation had participated in. Since I have known some members of both families for a considerable time before the research itself began, the task was easier and faster than it might otherwise have been and it was not difficult to get their consent.

Then, I went to visit each family several more times, talked to each of them, and participated in some of their individual as well as family activities in order to get to know them better. During my fieldwork, I also accompanied some subjects to their work places, visited their children, grandchildren, or relatives, dined out with friends, or simply had lunch or dinner with some of them. As previously mentioned, I also organized a get-together dinner for my subjects. During these activities I had the chance to observe general interactions, living standards of the families, and a variety of other things. Getting to know the subjects better and observing them in this manner helped me to build up an understanding of the degree of ‘modernization’ each family was exposed to. This, in turn, helped account for the composition of different people’s language repertoires, what attitudes they had to the different codes they spoke, and why they chose to employ different codes in different situations or with different people.

During this time, I also began to record their interactions. In most of these activities, I had my tape recorder ready to record any conversations or interactions that occurred. On occasions where recording was not possible, I wrote down aspects of the conversations or other events worthy of note that were taking place such as what codes or how many codes the subjects used, to whom and which codes the interlocutors used to answer and so forth. I also took notes on other information not captured in the recording or other interactions when recording was simply not feasible. In addition,
there were some occasions when the interactions were worth recording but I was unfortunately not ready with the tape-recorder.

On a large number of occasions, the tape recorder was left with the subjects, who then recorded their own conversations at a time convenient for them. This was done especially with members of family B with whom the researcher was not as familiar as she was with those of family A. Otherwise, the researcher did the recording herself, and tried to be as discreet and unobtrusive as possible while the recording was taking place. In almost all of the recording sessions the subjects seemed to forget that they were being recorded, except for the first few minutes when the recording begun.

The ethnographic questionnaire interviews were carried out in between these social activities. Almost all the interview sessions were carried out by the researcher except those with some members of family B which were done by another member of family B who was helping as a research assistant.

Transcribing the recorded conversations was done together with the research assistants, who also happened to be my subjects. Transcription was done in between recording and interviewing the subjects, and the transcription was done with the help of my assistants who focused especially on the recordings that had Chinese elements (I was not a speaker of Chinese myself). The transcripts were then checked with the subjects to confirm that the meanings and pronunciation were accurate. Later, back in Canberra, I was able to clarify problematic Hakka, Foochow and Mandarin data with colleagues and informants who are native speakers of Hakka and Foochow respectively. Transcribing the rest of the data was done in Canberra. I did the rest of the transcriptions on my own, since being a Peranakan Chinese myself, I knew most of the other codes they were using in their interactions. I was also able to seek further clarification from the subjects themselves when I visited Surabaya in November 2002, December 2003, March 2004 and March 2005.

Since the main fieldwork time, I have maintained contact with one of the subjects from each family, and these contacts have served as my main informants since that time. They have helped to clarify some uncertainties in the data collected, answered my questions, and provided additional information as it was needed. Whenever I had problems in interpreting the interviews or the recorded conversations, I sought clarification from either the subject concerned or other family members who were participating in the study and knew the issues.
4.2.2.2 Other research-related activities

While in the field, besides collecting conversational data, I also collected related material and literature such as journal articles, theses, newspapers and magazines. In addition, I joined a seminar on 'Chinese in Indonesia, past, present and future'. This seminar enhanced my understanding of the social, political and economic changes that have occurred in Indonesia. Later, I was engaged in informal discussions with local experts on a variety of issues relating to ethnic Chinese in Indonesia. I also had the opportunity to meet a number of people who had lived through the transitional period (1965-1968) and was able to share their recollections of all the difficulties they experienced in having to move to Indonesian schools and/or get study permits from the Minister of Education.

4.2.2.3 Problems encountered in data collecting activities

One minor problem in the data collection was that one of the subjects from the totok family was always on the move and he could only be interviewed on 29 June 2001, in Denpasar, Bali. The writer flew to Bali to meet and interview him. Finally, the gathering with subjects from both the totok and totok-peranakan families took place on 8 November 2001 and this was the last data collection activity. In addition to the data recorded during the official fieldwork in 2001, however, another recording was made during family A’s reunion in August 2003. At this meeting, a few second generation family members were present who had not taken part in earlier recordings or interviews.

4.2.3 Data collection tools

The conversations were recorded using a Sony TCM-IC Repeat cassette recorder and another Sony tape-recorder. During the individual recording and interview, a microphone was usually used for recording the interactions that took place. When at places such as a big dining table, two microphones were placed in the places where the conversation could be captured clearly.

4.2.4 The kinds of data collected

The most important kind of data collected was informal natural conversation among family members of different age groups and different generations in both families. One of the times chosen to record such conversations was Christmas because at this time all

---

5 For detailed data collection activities, please refer to appendix 2.
members of the three generations were at home together for a special family dinner. On other occasions, lunch or dinner-time meetings were chosen. At these meetings, the conversations revolved around various topics such as family matters and experiences. Family dinner recordings were used to collect data on family interaction with all three generations present. On one occasion, the writer organized a dinner between a member from family A and a member from family B and recorded their interactions.

The recordings consist of both dyadic and group or multiparty interactions within and between generations. For dyadic interactions between generations e.g., first and second generation or second and third generation, or first and third generation, the recordings were done at whatever times were possible and convenient for the subjects. All these conversations were informal natural interactions tape-recorded with the subjects' consent. In some data there is only one code involved in the interactions; however, in others two or more codes are being used alternately or even mixed intrasententially as the interlocutors' mode of interaction. The employment of a variety of codes was mostly found among the members of the first and second generations in both families, and some members of the third generation of family B, especially those who went to Chinese schools. The writer will have much more to say about these matters in later chapters. In total, the complete recorded data corpus comprises a total of 33 hours of monolingual, bilingual and multilingual interactions.

In addition to interactions between family members, there are also conversations between family members and non-family members such as domestics, care-givers and drivers whose voices were unintentionally and inevitably recorded. These other people lived in the family house and were around at the time of the recording. The varied code choice behaviour of family members towards these non-family members is also worth mentioning.

Additional data were also obtained through recording interactions between members of the families and other people outside the family domain. These recordings involved a range of outsiders who came from both Chinese and non-Chinese backgrounds. This was carried out in order to find out what code(s) were used by family members in these domains. The interactions involved people from the workplace or guests as well as friends of family members. However, these kinds of data were gathered simply to supplement the information gathered for the main purposes of the study, which focuses on the family domain. The extra-familiar recordings were utilised
mostly for helping to determine the extent of different individuals' linguistic repertoires. Additional recording of conversations between some subjects and their siblings who did not partake in the original study were made after the main study period in order to confirm some suspected issues concerning the code choice pattern between siblings of family A. Some notes were also taken during the recording sessions, and some of these have helped to inform the study as well.

As previously mentioned, besides conversational data, other data were obtained through an in-depth ethnographic questionnaire-interview with different family members. Apart from the questions on the subjects' personal background, most of the questions in the interview are open-ended and as far as possible they are constantly kept free from sources of preconceptions and bias. All interviews were recorded.

Other data are notes taken during participant observation, short annual visits to the families, personal conversations and long distance correspondence with some subjects: emails, regular mails, and text messages.

4.3 Transcription methodology
The discourse transcription conventions used for the spoken data have been adapted from those proposed by Gardner (1994). These conventions are presented in the beginning of the thesis and on the ‘bookmark’ accompanying this thesis. Further specific conventions for showing which codes were being used are detailed in §5.2.

4.4 Data Analysis

4.4.1 Software used to structure the data
The writer used the NVivo software package for qualitative research to help structure the data. She used NVivo to structure the interviews and the family interactions by grouping different codes, different speakers of particular codes, and certain lexical items together, and she attached the subjects’ comments on certain pieces of dialogue etc. to these transcriptions. NVivo enables the researcher to go back to the transcription, to attach information about the speakers involved, the environment in which the codes were spoken, which code was adjacent to which other code. It is also possible to give comments on a particular piece of dialogue, etc. Thus, it is easy to find out which codes a particular speaker speaks and the nature of its occurrence—its form, its place, and its frequency. Later on, using this software, a particular code can always be recalled and
identified together with its surrounding words, phrases, clauses or sentences. In short, this software helped me to structure and tidy up the data to make it more manageable.

4.4.2 Aims of analysis

The aims of the analysis are

1. to identify the inter speaker and intra-speaker differences and similarities in terms of their language repertoire, language proficiency and the possibilities of language shifts across generations

2. to compare the code choice preferences of these multilingual speakers with a seemingly similar or different language repertoire and language proficiency

3. to examine how speakers as rational actors exploit their multilinguality by making use of code choice activities to attain communicative efficiency, to demonstrate their identity as a member of a multilingual family and to represent themselves with regard to the topics discussed and the ongoing interactions with other family members both between and within generations.

4. to account for the motivational factors behind the code choice practices by considering the language repertoire and proficiency and also both the sociolinguistic and socio-psychological factors of each individual.

4.4.3 Steps in the data analysis:

1. The data obtained through interviews, and recorded conversations, as well as observational data, are compared to determine the subjects’ language repertoires, language proficiency, code-choice patterns, and rationality. In the case of family B, another source of data was also used to help decide on what constituted the different subjects’ language repertoires. One of the members of family B, a foreign language teacher who was herself a subject of the study, performed a longitudinal observation of the subjects’ language repertoires and language proficiency for me. The results of her survey were later cross-checked and confirmed with interview data from the subjects who provided their own explanations for their linguistic repertoires and proficiency. No formal testing was administered for this purpose. In addition, the data has been used to examine the phenomena of language shift and clarify the subjects’ language behaviour.

2. All of the transcribed texts are coded as to which language is being used, who the speakers are, which generation the speakers belong to, and to whom they are
addressed. To make the data more manageable, the transcription is later
classified and structured using Nvivo. The analysis is done to determine whether
Chinese, western or host codes are still being employed in the family, both
between and within generations.

3. In cases where the codes occurring together are identifiable⁶, and depending on
the number of codes employed, the data were classified into bilingual or
multilingual code-switching at the conversational (interactional) level.

4. To analyse the data, I developed a methodology for discovering the subjects'
motivations for their complex code choices. I began the process by finding their
unmarked code choice preferences in dyadic interactions with every member of
the family (see §7.2.1). This code then serves as the 'norm' of their interaction.
Myers-Scotton (2002, 1998c) claims that unmarked choices can be identified on
the basis of frequency. As far as this study is concerned, I determine the
unmarked choice on the basis of both frequency and the results of the interviews
and participant observation. From these basic patterns, I was then able to
determine the markedness of codes in both dyadic and group interactions and
from there seek explanations for particular code choices in terms of the extended
Markedness Model, as will be discussed in chapters seven and eight.

5. The subject’s bilingual and multilingual code-choice activities—code-
mobility—were analyzed sequentially as advocated by Lawson-Sako and Sachev
(1996) and Bourhis (1985), whereas the various discourse functions the speakers
utilize in the family or generation interactions and the motivations behind the
code-choices/code-switching were analyzed socio-psychologically using Myers-
Scotton’s Markedness Model (see chapter 7 and 8). There are ten different codes
in the data; therefore, in order to differentiate one code from another in writing
different kind of fonts were assigned to each of the codes with the codes of the
same group being given similar font group. Discussion and examples are
provided in §5.2.

⁶ The unique identification of some codes with strong similarities to other codes is highly problematic and
will not be addressed in detail here. See chapter five for more extensive discussion of this issue.
4.4.4 The methods of analysis

4.4.4.1 Comparative method

A comparative method is used in Li Wei's study (1994) which compares the speakers' language behaviour within and across generations. This method is also applied in this study to find out the language repertoire and language ability possessed by different family members and to gauge the different discourse strategies whereby these multilingual subjects with different language ability and language repertoire handle conversational interaction in the family domain. Special emphasis was put on the interactions of different generations to assess how different socio-historical changes, especially in the educational systems have affected the subjects and are responsible for the evident variation that exist between speakers as well as within speakers. This method was also employed to compare the subjects' language use, to arrive at a normative pattern of their dyadic interactions and to prove that they are rational beings. Most importantly, this method facilitates the argument that under those circumstances, i.e. variation in multilinguality, an integrated model is needed to account for the social factors affecting language choice as well as the motivational drives behind the individual code choice behaviour, including the use of code-switching as a discourse mode.

4.4.4.2 Sequential method

In addition, the conversational data in this study have been analysed sequentially. This method depends on a turn-by-turn analysis in order to find out the relations between the codes chosen and the meanings behind the choices underlining a particular utterance (see Auier, 1995, Bourhis, 1985). Very often the embedded meaning can only be understood by considering the previous as well as the next utterances spoken by that particular speaker or other interlocutors in the interaction. Further discussion with regard to this method and its use is found in §2.6.2.2.

4.5 Summary

This chapter discusses the ethnographic approach and its suitability for the study. It also presents the process of choosing the subject and collecting the data. In addition, the kinds of data collected and the steps of data analysis are also presented.
Chapter 5

The Codes known by the Subjects

5.0 Introduction

As members of minority groups in multilingual Surabaya, it almost goes without saying that the subjects of this study have to be multilingual to get by. They have to be able to speak certain languages or language varieties properly and appropriately as they are spoken in society in general as well as in their own ‘micro-society’¹. Distinguishing between ‘language’, ‘dialect’ or ‘language variety’, etc. is fraught with difficulty and it can be almost impossible to use such labels informatively due to the ambiguities and obscurities attached to the terms (Haugen, 1972:92)². Therefore following Tanner’s (1972) and Romaine’s (1995) examples, in this study the term ‘code’ will be used to denote any form of speech recognized as different by its speakers. Thus, ‘code’ covers the distinction not just between languages, but also between varieties of a language. Based on this characterisation, the writer has identified ten codes employed in spoken interactions between the members of these two families. These codes can be classified as belonging to seven distinct languages: Hakka, Foochow, Mandarin⁴, Indonesian,

¹ The term ‘micro-society’ is used to refer to an individual’s own speech group community, which speaks certain Chinese dialects for totoks, and Malay/Indonesian and/or Javanese for peranakans. The label ‘macro-society’ is used to refer to society in general. Macro-society includes ethnic Chinese and non-ethnic Chinese alike.

² Haugen suggests that “it is impossible to identify precisely how many languages or dialects there are in the world due to the ambiguities and obscurities attached to the terms ‘language’ and ‘dialect’. In most usages, however, the term ‘language’ is always superordinate to ‘dialect’—‘language’ as the superordinate term can be used without reference to dialects, but ‘dialect’ is meaningless unless it is implied that there are other dialects and a language to which they can be said to ‘belong’. In a descriptive, synchronic sense ‘language’ can refer either to a single linguistic norm, or to a group of related forms. In a historical, diachronic sense ‘language’ can either be a common language on its way to dissolution, or a common language resulting from unification. A ‘dialect’ is then any one of the related norms comprised under the general name ‘language’, historically the result of either divergence or convergence. Dialect might later socially develop into a language if it has its written form and is chosen and considered as a language by its speakers”.

³ Romaine (1995:121) states "I will use the term ‘code’ here in a general sense to refer not only to different languages, but also to varieties of the same language as well as styles within a language”.

⁴ Although Hakka and Foochow are separate languages which belong to non-Mandarin dialect groups, due to political reasons in China they are conventionally called ‘dialects’ never ‘languages’ (Ramsey, 1987, Jordan, 2004).
Javanese, German, and English. Distinct varieties of some of these languages can be identified: East Java Indonesian, East Java Malay, East Javanese variety (Surabaya dialect), and Chinese Malay/Indonesian. They will be discussed later in the chapter. In the data there are also a few Hokkien and Jakarta Indonesian words which appear in the transcription, but they will not be given specific treatment.

This chapter commences by presenting the ten codes found in the interactional data. It also introduces some other codes claimed by the subjects as part of their language repertoire although they were not found to any notable extent in the recorded interactions. The discussion is followed by a presentation of the conventions used to differentiate one code from another in the examples. The problem of dealing with similar and sometimes indistinguishable codes is also addressed. Next comes a discussion of the language continua found where some codes have very similar morphosyntactic forms.

5.1 A general overview of the codes

5.1.1 The codes found in the data
Based on their origins, the codes found in the recorded interactions can be divided into three major groups. The first group is the ‘migrant’ codes. These are Mandarin, Hakka and Foochow. The second group is the ‘host’ codes which comprises varieties of Malay and varieties of Javanese. The varieties of Malay involved are Indonesian (standard and colloquial), East Java Malay and Chinese Malay/Indonesian. The varieties of Javanese found are Eastern Javanese and a specific variety spoken in Surabaya called Surabaya dialect or Suroboyoan. The third group of codes found in the data is the group of ‘western’ codes, i.e. English and German.

Although Chinese Malay/Indonesian is of a mixed nature and has Javanese, Malay and Indonesian features, it is labelled a variety of Malay as the lexicon found in it is predominantly Malay. A brief description of each code, with some information about who speaks it in each family, is presented in the following description.
5.1.1.1 The ‘Migrant’ Codes

The three codes associated with the subjects’ ancestral provenance are referred to as migrant codes, namely Mandarin, Hakka and Foochow. As for Hakka and Foochow, they will also be referred to as ‘ancestral dialects’, as seen below.

5.1.1.1.1 Mandarin

Mandarin is the official standard language or national language of the People’s Republic of China. The term ‘Mandarin’ is used here to cover terms such as ‘Mandarin’, ‘Chinese’ or ‘Mandarin Chinese’, all of which have been used by different researchers quoted in this study to refer to the same code. The regional names are utilized to refer to other Chinese ‘dialects’.

Historically Mandarin or Guānhuà, ‘the officials’ speech’ is a variety of the Bēijīng dialect which for centuries has been the language of government and which has been generally spoken by the Northern Chinese. This dialect has long served as an informal lingua franca throughout China. It was eventually chosen as the official national language and has been promoted under the names Guóyǔ ‘National Language’ and later Pǔtōnghuà ‘Common Language’ in the People’s Republic of China (Ramsey, 1987). In Singapore it is called ‘Chinese Speech’ Huáyǔ. This dialect is mostly spoken in north, central, and west China and is official throughout China. In terms of its basic typology, Mandarin is largely isolating and tonal. The English name ‘Mandarin’ comes from Portuguese ‘mandarim’ which originally is from Malay mantri or menteri meaning ‘minister of state’. Malay adopted the term menteri from Sanskrit mantrin ‘counselor’ that is ultimately derived from the Sanskrit root meaning ‘to think’ (Jordan, 2004). This language is usually taught under the name of ‘Chinese’ in schools outside China and is usually spoken by first generation overseas Chinese immigrants.

In Indonesia Mandarin is spoken especially by those people who went to Chinese schools, who were mostly of tolok background. These educated ethnic Chinese originated from different places in China and spoke different ancestral dialects, but they used Mandarin as a lingua franca in the interactions between themselves (Nio, 1961: 123)
Mandarin was associated with the values of modernity, Chinese nationality and high culture. For the majority of ethnic Chinese in Java, Mandarin was usually learned in Java and taught by local ethnic Chinese teachers, and therefore is inevitably influenced by the local vernacular, Javanese. One of the most striking results of this local influence is the use of Javanese intonation and Javanese phonology. In Surabaya, particularly in the Chinese-dominated business areas or in small Chinese-owned retail shops, the use of Mandarin (particularly its business terms) still prevails, especially where the prices of items are concerned.

Amongst the subjects of this study, the tones on most of their Mandarin words or sentences have either shifted or been flattened altogether. Oetomo (1984:81, 1987b) reported a similar situation in his study of ethnic Chinese in Pasuruan, a city in East Java, which is not far from Surabaya where my subjects live. Not only do the subjects speak Mandarin with Javanese intonation and phonology, but they also use a mixture of lexical items from Mandarin Chinese, Indonesian and the Ngókó level of East Javanese when they speak together. Many of the lexical items used by the subjects are considered to be 'archaic' Mandarin by contemporary speakers in China. The language has been encapsulated in the time frame in which it was learned by the original immigrants to Indonesia, and it has undergone localization.

In the data, Mandarin is spoken mostly by those who attended Chinese schools and Mandarin courses, those who were born before the 1960s. Short Mandarin phrases are also spoken by later generations who learned it through family exposure. If some of the young generation can still speak Mandarin Chinese, it is usually limited to a few words and expressions that their parents use with them in daily conversations. Their active command is usually very limited. Their Mandarin lexicon covers words relating to daily routine activities, clock time, numerals, money, food and so on. Even though one member of the third generation went to Chinese schools, her competence in this code is limited to isolated words, numerals, short phrases and formulaic expressions.

The attitude of the young generation in this study towards Mandarin is ambivalent. Some showed some reluctance to learn this code, while others feel the

---

5 Its written form has also served as a means of communication between ethnic Chinese speaking different ancestral dialects (Nio, 1961: 17). Different speakers of languages borrowing the Chinese characters as part of their written scripts have also taken advantage of the written form as their lingua
necessity to acquire and to be able to communicate in this code, especially for business matters. For some subjects particularly the older generations, Mandarin is still associated with business, family interactions and in-group identity, while the younger ones are non-commital. They just regard it as one of the foreign languages.

5.1.1.1.2 Hakka

Hakka is spoken in Hakka communities scattered from Sichuan to Taiwan and especially across Southern China—in the hillier parts of Guǎngdōng, Guangxi, and Southern Fùjiàn (Ramsey, 1987). Hakka is also sometimes known by terms referring to some of its variants ‘Kèjiāhuà’ (in Hanyu Pinyin) or ‘Khèk’ which is spoken in some parts of Guǎngdōng and Fùjiàn provinces. The Hakka people usually use the term ‘Kèhuà’ to refer to their dialect. The term Hakka derives from the Cantonese for ‘guest families’. It is the name given to these people by the locals when they first came to the Guǎngdōng and Fùjiàn provinces in the south after their migration from the north of China which began during the Qin dynasty (220-206 BC). The Hokkien equivalent for Hakka is Khè-lâng which also means ‘guest people’ (Jordan, 2004).

In this study, Hakka is the ancestral language of family B. As with Mandarin, the Hakka variety spoken by my subjects living in Surabaya, especially the second generation (the first generation born on Indonesian soil) is heavily influenced by the regional language the subjects speak. Again, all the tones are either flattened or they have shifted so that Hakka is spoken with largely Javanese intonation and phonology. In listening to the recording, my language assistants who are native Hakka speakers, sometimes experienced difficulties in understanding the Hakka expressions or sentences found in the interactions.

The subjects born from the 1960s and thereafter only have limited passive understanding of the code. They use only a few basic words, phrases, and formulaic expressions commonly found in their familylect. These are invariably uttered with Javanese or Indonesian intonation.
5.1.1.3 Foochow

Another Chinese ‘dialect’ found in the data is Foochow⁶, also known as Northern Min or Mǐnbēihūà from the Northern Fūjiān province. It is named after the main city of Fūzhōu, and it is the dialect of people living in Fūzhōu and its surrounding regions. It is also sometimes referred to as Hokchiu in the local dialect or Fūzhōuhuà in Chinese (Jordan, 2004). Foochow is part of the Eastern Min speech subgroup.

The Foochow dialect is the ancestral dialect of family A. With regard to its tone, its fate is no different from that of the Mandarin and Hakka spoken by the subjects. The first generation spoke the code with the right tones but the two family members from the second generation spoke this code with Javanese or Malay/Indonesian intonation and the original tones were flattened. In terms of its frequency in the family interactions, Foochow is neither spoken as much as nor as often as Hakka is used in the other family. This code is spoken by the members of the first generation and to a degree by the two older siblings of the second generation, although they admitted they are losing their competence in it. In spite of the efforts of their grandparents, none of the third generation in this family retains any words or phrases of Foochow.

5.1.1.2 The Host codes

From the perspective of the first generation who came to Indonesia as immigrants and for easy reference, the codes spoken in Indonesia, the host country and land, are to be referred to as ‘host’ codes. The ‘host’ codes comprise Malay and Javanese as well as their respective varieties.

5.1.1.2.1 Malay and its varieties

Malay is a language spoken across Southeast Asia and it has played an important role as a lingua franca in this region for many centuries. It functioned as the language of commerce, scholarship, diplomacy, and religion. It was also the major language spoken in daily multiethnic interactions. In its later developments, it is associated with modern, educated and elite lifestyles.

The area in which Malay is spoken is also home to hundreds of different indigenous languages that have typically been used in village life. Hence, Malay has

⁶ In other literature Foochow is written as Fūzhōu as is found in Ramsey’s (1987).
numerous varieties and different varieties have been influenced by both local/ regional languages, European and Oriental languages—Indian, Arabic, Sanskrit, Chinese etc. A variety known as *bazaar Malay* served as lingua franca for commercial purposes right across the area of British Malaya, the Dutch East Indies, and neighbouring regions (Collins, 1998). This variety is also known as Low Malay to distinguish it from its literary form, classical or High Malay (Sneddon, 2003a:42). In some areas, bazaar Malay had already become the first language of urban dwellers in colonial times. Another variety of Low Malay is known as ‘Baba Malay’ and this was spoken by Malay-speaking Chinese of Hokkien provenance who dwelled in the Malay peninsula especially in Penang, Malacca and Singapore. Baba Malay varies from region to region and is usually influenced by the regional vernacular spoken by the indigenous people in the area in which the Chinese live. ‘Peranakan Malay’ is another variety of Low Malay, generally spoken in Java.

Throughout its history, Malay has experienced pidginization and creolization as well as a variety of refinement and development processes, especially after its adoption as a national language in several Southeast Asian countries. After independence, both Indonesia and Malaysia chose Malay to be the ‘embryo’ of their own national languages. Malay is also one of four official languages in Singapore. Later Brunei Darussalam also followed Indonesia and Malaysia in adopting Malay as its national language. In Indonesia, Malay has acquired influences from many other Asian languages such as Sanskrit, Arabic, and Chinese to mention a few. European languages such as Dutch and Portuguese have also had a major impact, and local indigenous or regional dialects have also had their influence on Malay.

There are some variations involved in the kinds of Malay spoken by the subjects of this study and these are discussed in the following sections. While standard Indonesian is used for written communication, the other varieties, East Java Indonesian, East Java Malay and Chinese Malay/Indonesian are all mainly spoken languages. These varieties differ slightly from each other mainly in their choice of lexicon and in their influences from other languages. For Indonesian itself, there are varieties ranging from the standard or formal to colloquial Indonesian and a range of more or less colloquial or informal varieties in between which can be associated with semi informal/semi formal situations and thus can be identified as semi-formal forms (see Sneddon, 2003b).
Together with Javanese, the Malay varieties appear in a continuum of codes as further discussed in §5.3.

5.1.1.2.1.1 East Java Malay

As has been noted, Malay is spoken throughout the archipelago and is usually influenced by the regional language where it is spoken. In East Java, Malay is influenced by the variety of Javanese spoken there and thus this code is referred to as East Java Malay (see Oetomo, 1984, Oetomo, 1987b). This code is also spoken in Surabaya, the capital of East Java province. This variety is a Low Malay variety which is particularly spoken by the older generation of Chinese and non-Chinese (other foreign minorities as well as indigenous people) from urban areas. It is the lingua franca for inter-ethnic interactions. Its function is similar to that of Bazaar Malay in Singapore and Malaysia.

The older generations refer to the Malay variety they speak as Bahasa Melayoe ‘Malay language’ while the younger generations who are educated in Indonesian schools refer to their Malay variety as Bahasa Indonesia. In fact, both generations speak a mixture of Malay and Indonesian with the older generations’ variety having more non-standard Malay features while the younger generation variety has more Indonesian features. Although there are differences between what I call Malay and Indonesian, the borderline between them is not always clear since they form a continuum. The variety replete with Malay and Indonesian lexical items is spoken particularly by G1 and some of G2 members, or to be exact the 1910s, 1920s and 1930s age cohorts while the variety spoken by the age cohorts thereafter is slowly being influenced or partly taken over by East Java Indonesian.

---

7 East Java Malay has both spoken and written varieties and the written variety is used especially by the older generation born before independence. However, in this study East Java Malay refers solely to the oral variety spoken especially by first generation subjects. See Oetomo (1987:93-94 and 113) who also refers to the local Malay variety as East Java Malay and the variety of colloquial Indonesian spoken in East Java as informal East Java Indonesian which has developed since Indonesian independence. He attached ‘East Java’ to the Malay and Indonesian varieties spoken in Pasuruan due to the Javanese influences the codes have undergone. The subjects of this study speak very similar kinds of Malay and Indonesian to what is found in Oetomo’s studies of people from Pasuruan.

8 Bahasa is the Malay/Indonesian term for ‘language’, thus Bahasa Melayu (Melayoe) = ‘Malay language’ and Bahasa Indonesia = ‘Indonesian language’
5.1.2.1.2 Indonesian: its standard and colloquial varieties

5.1.2.1.2.1 Standard Indonesian (SI)

The major basis of the standard variety of Indonesian, the High variety, was actually classical (Riau) Malay, which was used in literary works and was imposed and decreed by the Dutch government at the end of the 19th century as the language of instruction at schools. It was later known as School Malay and this variety is considerably different from the spoken varieties found among the people in the Riau islands. Later, at the beginning of the 20th century a General Cultivated Indonesian emerged. This variety was based on a mixture of High (Riau) and Low Malay varieties which became the precursor of modern formal Indonesian (Sneddon, 2003a:98)\(^9\). Indonesian was officially declared the unifying language of the peoples of Indonesia at the Second National Youth Congress on 28 October 1928. From that time it was called ‘Bahasa Indonesia’ (Rafferty, 1984: 247, Sneddon, 2003a: 102)\(^11\). Over the course of its development it has been enriched by sources as diverse as Sanskrit, Chinese, Arabic, Javanese, Portuguese, Dutch, and lately English. (Of course, in Malaysia the local variety had already undergone extensive influence from English during colonial times). It was then refined, developed, and standardized. Hence, Indonesian was not a completely new language for Indonesians and its spoken variety is now easily and conveniently employed as a lingua franca in interactions between people from different ethnic and language backgrounds.

As the official standard language of Indonesia, it has its own official orthography as well as ‘standard references’ such as dictionaries and grammar etc regulated and issued by Pusat Bahasa. This process of standardization has earned the name for formal Indonesian as Bahasa Indonesia baku ‘standard Indonesian’

---

\(^9\) Since it was only after the Fifth Indonesian National Language Congress in 1988 that Pusat Pembinaan dan Pengembangan Bahasa ‘The Centre of Language Learning and Research’ (the institution responsible for designing and regulating the growth of the Indonesian language in Indonesia) publicized the new standard of Tata Bahasa Baku Bahasa Indonesia (Standard Grammar Of Indonesia) (Sneddon, 2003a:134), in the description of the subjects’ medium language of instruction in chapter 3, Indonesian is used to refer to the language of instruction prior to that time. Only later it is referred to as Standard Indonesian.

\(^10\) Malay speech levels are far more restricted than the Javanese. They involve only a small number of forms and are used far less frequently. The speech levels consist of a special court vocabulary similar to the sets of honorific forms found in Javanese. However, in Malay these forms are used only to refer to God, the King or other members of the royal family (Poodjosoedarmo 1982: 132).

\(^11\) The youth slogan was ‘one people: the Indonesians, one country: Indonesia, and one language: Indonesian’.
(henceforth, SI). To support the development of Indonesian, the government staged a nation-wide campaign in late 1970s to promote the use of ‘good and proper’ Indonesian ‘Bahasa Indonesia yang baik dan benar’ through the mass media, especially the government-owned TV station, TVRI Televisi Republik Indonesia. Special programs were broadcast weekly providing information and the teaching of standard Indonesian. Due to these campaigns, SI is encouraged in all national bureaucracy, educational institutions, and the mass media (television, radio, newspapers and magazines) throughout Indonesia. Thus, SI is widely used in various domains, especially for formal and official affairs in government offices, schools and other formal institutions. Therefore it earns its names as bahasa formal ‘formal language’ or bahasa resmi ‘official language’. Its nation-wide spread is seen by many as one of the great successes of the Indonesian nationalist agenda (Errington, 1998). Other terms referring to standard Indonesian are bahasa halus ‘refined language’, bahasa tinggi ‘high language’ and bahasa sekolah ‘school language’

Unlike other post-colonial societies, the colonial language Dutch is discouraged from use in Indonesia. Instead, SI serves as the only medium of instruction at all educational levels, especially since Mandarin was banned in 1967. SI is taught as one of the compulsory subjects in all educational institutions. Failing in this subject will result in a student’s being failed entirely from the class. Proficiency in this code indicates one’s level of education. Since then, SI has always been considered as the language of education, and the language of the educated. With its continual process of development and refinement, SI has become more prestigious and SI has moved up as the code used in high echelon society. The oral use of SI is generally restricted to formal situations including public speeches, lectures, meetings, conferences, schools, sermons etc.

Unlike other languages which develop naturally in their communities, SI is more a planned and engineered language that is still in the process of being developed. For example, so far the standardization of its orthography has been through three changes from those of Van Ophuijsen (1901) to those of Soewandi (1947) and again later in 1972. The government issued Pedoman Umum Ejaan Yang Disempurnakan or EYD ‘the

12.In the interview, some subjects identify SI as bahasa tinggi ‘high language’ or bahasa sekolah ‘school language’, so the names were attached to SI during the interview to help other subjects identify the code he or she was referring to.
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General Reference of the Refined Orthography’ in 1975 (Moeliono and Dardjowidjojo, 1993). Its lexicon is also still being enriched by the adoption of many foreign words at present especially from English. To a fair degree SI is more a literate variety promoted by the government than a spoken one used for daily routine activities. Thus, as suggested by Heryanto (1995: 5) "Even among the nation’s extremely small elite minority who have had access to the prestige and privilege of learning this national language, a very few are considered competent to use it correctly and appropriately". Similarly, Errington (1998) also states that it is mainly a school language, Bahasa Indonesia is not usually spoken in daily interactions. As an institutional language, both scholars claim that Indonesian is not a mother tongue to its speakers. Sneddon (2003a, 2003b) clarifies these mistaken assumptions about Indonesian stating that these scholars might only have considered standard Indonesian, the variety that is taught formally at school, and therefore excluded the other varieties of Indonesian, the daily spoken colloquial Indonesian, which is much more prevalent in society and is spoken as a home language by many, especially of the younger generations.

Despite the government’s efforts to promote good and correct Indonesian at all educational levels and through all kinds of mass media, the results are still far from fully successful. Many well-educated people who have considerable exposure to standard Indonesian at schools are still not competent speakers of formal Indonesian, and they may have difficulty in expressing themselves in good and correct written formal Indonesian. Some of the blame is attributed to the education system and the rigid teaching material which does not motivate people to develop their language skills in formal Indonesian\(^1\). Most people are usually content with the informal spoken variety which has sufficed for their communication needs.

In this study, the subjects’ competence in SI varies across generations with those having full Indonesian schooling being the most competent. The members of the second generation have varying degrees of competence in standard Indonesian, whereas none of the first generation members claim to have mastered what they see as ‘school language’. In the data, the occurrence of stretches of interactions in SI is very infrequent except for isolated chunks of phrases or clauses which appear in between other codes. Although
addressed in their regional languages, which they perceive as condescending\textsuperscript{15}.

5.1.1.2.1.2.1 East Java Indonesian

In a big city like Surabaya, CI has become a ‘lingua franca’ in any interaction between people from different ethnic and language backgrounds\textsuperscript{16}, among the educated as well as working classes especially those having had Indonesian schooling. CI spoken in Surabaya is coloured with the Javanese and/or Madurese intonation. Although to a lesser degree than that of East Java Malay, the variety of CI spoken in East Java also has a few Ngókó Javanese features in it. In this study the CI variety spoken in Surabaya, East Java is referred to as East Java Indonesian (hereafter EJI)

Among the subjects, EJI is found mostly in intergenerational interactions between the third and the fourth generation. Some members of the second generation of both families also employ the code in formal situations. They refer to this code as bahasa percakapan halus tapi bukan bahasa sekolah ‘refined conversational language but not school language’\textsuperscript{17}.

To interact with the third generation, the first generation also uses a few lexical items and structures from EJI mixed with their migrant codes. These varieties are also employed at workplaces in informal interactions by some of the second and third generations. The fourth generation uses EJI to talk to the first, second and third

\textsuperscript{15} Another indication of the spread of Indonesian to rural areas is language shift in the use of terms of address. About twenty to thirty years ago, in East Java the domestic, care-givers, drivers etc. would address and be addressed by their employers with the regional language, which in the case of East Java, was Javanese. These domestics were usually traditional rural women. They addressed their Chinese employers as Yok Li̇k, Yok De ‘Young Mister/Mistress’, ‘Old Mister/Mistress’ or attached the name of the employer Yok Sien ‘Mister/Mistress Sien’. Later the terms of address changed into Malay/Indonesian terms Tuan and Nyonya ‘Sir/Mister’ and ‘Madam/Mistress’ or Nya Muda ‘young Mistress’ for a young married woman. ‘Tuan’ was also used by Foreign Oriental (Vremsde Oosterlingen) males to address each other. Their employers, on the other hand, used to address them with the Javanese terms Ndük (from genduk), Yu (from Mbañya), Bik (from Bibik), Mboak and Le (from tole), or Man (from Paman) which mean ‘Girl, Sister, Auntie, Mother’ and ‘Boy or Uncle’ respectively. These workers addressed their Javanese employers as Ndoro Kakanăng and Ndoro Putri ‘Mister and Mistress’. Nowadays, however, the terms of address they use with all ethnic groups are the modern Indonesian terms Bapa and Ibu ‘Mister and Mistress’ and they are addressed using Javanese kin terms of Mbak, and Mas ‘Sister and Brother’ for the younger ones or Indonesian terms for the older persons viz., Bu and Pak ‘Mam and Sir’. Although the terms Mbak and Mas have their origins in Javanese, these days they are actually part of contemporary Indonesian. My observation revealed that most of these workers, especially the young educated ones are reluctant to be spoken to with in their regional language, Javanese, and prefer to be addressed in colloquial Indonesian. In other instances, especially those involving the older uneducated workers, though, the practices mentioned previously still prevail.

\textsuperscript{16} Very often the variety used as a lingua franca is the daily spoken Indonesian or the Colloquial Indonesian except in formal situations and encounters in which standard Indonesian is applied.

\textsuperscript{17} Sneddon (2003b) refers to mixtures between the informal CI and the formal SI as semi formal varieties.
generation in her family. This particular subject often uses a variety between the informal EJI and the formal SI, i.e. there are many lexical items and formal structures of SI used together with informal ones (EJI).

5.1.1.2.1.3 Chinese Malay/Indonesian

As the name indicates, Chinese Malay/Indonesian refers to a particular Malay variety spoken by ethnic Chinese\(^8\). This code is predominantly a mixture of Malay, Indonesian, Javanese (the Ngoko level) and other features from different sources depending on the speakers’ cultural group. Why this code is referred to as Chinese Malay/Indonesian is discussed in the following paragraphs.

A number of studies have been done on the codes spoken by ethnic Chinese in Central and East Java. In her study, Rafferty (1984) labels the Malay variety spoken by *peranakan* in Central and East Java as ‘Indonesianized-Javanese’ because of the Javanese morphology and syntax found in the language. Rafferty (1984) noted that the variety differed from region to region as it still does today. Similarly, Wolff and Poedjosoedarmo (1982), who did their research in Central Java, name it a dialect of Javanese since the strong influence of Javanese is found to be more prevalent in the *peranakan* Chinese language there. On the other hand, Dreyfuss and Oka (1979) who worked in East Java refer to the code spoken by Chinese as Chinese-Indonesian\(^9\). In her study on the language spoken by *peranakan* Chinese in Malang, East Java, Rafferty (1982) labels this variety as Chindo (abbreviation of Chinese Indonesian) while Kartomihardjo (1979:11) refers to the code spoken by *peranakan* Chinese in East Java as *Peranakan* Chinese Indonesian as he considers it a variety of Indonesian spoken by *peranakan* Chinese.

\(^8\) CMI does not refer to what used to be known as ‘Chinese Malay’ *Melayu Tonghoa, Melayu Cina* during the period before Indonesian independence. Chinese Malay is actually a Low Malay variety found in the *peranakan* literature written by *peranakan* writers before the 1930s, as well as European and other writers from different ethnic backgrounds. Thus, the use of the term ‘Chinese Malay’ to refer to this Low Malay variety employed by *peranakan* Chinese writers according to Salmon (1980, 1983) and Oetomo (1987) was inappropriate. This variety, CMI, is a kind of Baba Malay as spoken in Singapore and Malaysia.

\(^9\) Oetomo (1984, 1987) disagreed with the label ‘Indonesian’ attached to this Malay variety as there are grammatical and lexical differences between this dialect and that of Indonesian, even with the East Java Indonesian. I tend to agree with Oetomo.
Although the code discussed is a Malay-Javanese variety, it is different from the Malay-Javanese variety spoken by non-ethnic Chinese. Oetomo (1987b:143-4) postulates that the Malay variety spoken by ethnic Chinese has certain lexical items which are not found in varieties spoken by the non-ethnic Chinese and that ethnic Chinese use Malay/Indonesian in situations the Javanese or other non-ethnic Chinese do not. Kartomihardjo (1979:11) expresses a similar opinion when he states that the *peranakan* Chinese speak a variety of colloquial Indonesian which resembles that spoken by uneducated Javanese. The similarities are that both use the Javanese affixes, including stigmatized ones and Javanese loanwords. However, the variety spoken by the non-educated Javanese does not include Indonesianized Dutch loanwords and other non-standard forms adopted from various origins. This mixture is usually found in the variety spoken amongst older *peranakan* speakers, who also spoke Dutch and attended Dutch schools. Furthermore, there are some Hokkien and Mandarin lexical items in the mixture too. Hokkien and Mandarin items are found in the varieties spoken by both *peranakan* and *totok*, while Mandarin language elements are especially found in the speech of those attending Chinese schools.

Oetomo (1987b) in his study of Chinese in Pasuruan, East Java, covers the codes spoken by both *peranakan* and *totok*. He states that notwithstanding some existing differences, *totok* Chinese also speak this mixed Malay-Javanese code in certain circumstances, especially when speaking to *peranakan* Chinese. Although *totok* Chinese also speak a similar Malay/Indonesian variety to the one spoken by *peranakan*, there are slight differences. The variety spoken by the upper class *peranakan* Chinese has more

---

20 Due to its mixed nature this code spoken by ethnic Chinese is often disparaged by non Chinese as *bahasa capjai* 'chop suey language' (Oetomo, 1987) or *bahasa gado-gado* 'language salad'. *Gado-gado* is a Javanese dish of various vegetables—some lightly cooked and some raw—mixed together and covered with peanut sauce, while *bahasa* is an Indonesian word (adopted and adapted from Javanese *basa*) for language. The subjects of this study, especially the second generation, refer to a mixed usage of some languages as *bahasa campuran*, a 'mixed language'. In other sources, Oetomo as quoted by Saptaatmaja (2004) refers to this mixed code as *multilingualisme-blasteran* 'mixed multilingualism'. Errington (1998) uses the term *bahasa gadho-gado* in his accounts on 'mixed' bilingual Javanese and Indonesian usage often characterized by the use of mixed lexical items and syncretic discourse particles. Buchori (1994) wrote that the term 'bahasa gadho-gado' is usually used pejoratively to refer to a kind of 'hybrid language' which is an admixture of Dutch, English and Javanese or Bahasa Indonesia. Dreyfuss & Oka (1979) use the term 'hybrid language' or 'language hybrid' to refer to *Peranakan* Malay/Indonesian spoken by the *Peranakan* Chinese in Malang.

21 There are some Javanese affixes such as *-en*, *-noi*, and *-o* which are usually employed as imperative markers by *Peranakan* Chinese, illiterates and children out of ignorance but which are avoided by ethnic Javanese speakers as they violate the Javanese ethic of indirection. Some examples are *simpen-en duulu* 'please keep (it) first'; *bwaq-noi* 'please carry (it for me)' and *liaq-o situ lbó* 'please look over there, will you?' (see Kartomihardjo 1979: 99 for further discussion in this issue).
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Malay/Indonesian, and possibly some Dutch and Hokkien features, while that spoken by
the totok Chinese has more Javanese and Mandarin and/or Hokkien elements in it (see
traditionally the upper class peranakan Chinese in East Java use Malay/Indonesian in
their mixed Javanese-Malay variety as their home language. The totok Chinese, on the
other hand, use Javanese as their home language. In addition to Javanese, totok Chinese
also use their ancestral dialects and Mandarin, if they were educated in Chinese schools,
as home languages. If they have lost the use of their ancestral code, Javanese is the
major code spoken by the second generation (the first Indonesian-born Chinese who
were brought up as totok). Similar to totok Chinese, lower class peranakan also use
Javanese as their home language, but usually they do not speak Mandarin, unless they
attended Mandarin schools.

What is described by Oetomo (1984, 1987b) as the language behaviour of the
peranakan and totok Chinese then, has taken a different course now. Nowadays, the
younger generations of both totok and peranakan also use a mixed Malay-Javanese
variety spoken by peranakan as described in the previous studies above. However, this
new variety has more lexical items adapted from Indonesian in addition to the lexical
items of East Java Malay. It also has East Javanese phonology and lexical items as well
as certain amounts of Javanese syntax and morphology. Among the age cohorts who
went to Chinese schools, features of Mandarin and/or their ancestral dialect are also
found in their Malay/Indonesian variety. This mixture prevails mostly among the
generations who were directly or indirectly affected by what happened in 1965,
including inter alia, the closing of Chinese schools. The variety spoken by the younger
generations born after 1965 has more lexical items (as well as some affixes) taken from
Indonesian and these are gradually replacing the already existing elements of Malay and
Ngókó Javanese.

As predicted by Rafferty (1982:5), a result of the closing of Chinese schools has
been that certain age cohorts from both totok families in this study use this
Malay/Indonesian variety. Most of the subjects of this study, especially the young
generations born post-1965, who were also brought up as ‘totok’, speak this mixed
Malay-Javanese code as their home language, just as their peranakan counterparts do. Because the variety spoken by the subjects under study contains more Malay and Indonesian elements, and for easy reference, I refer to the code spoken by the subjects in this study as Chinese Malay/Indonesian (henceforth CMI). All the subjects of the younger generations use CMI as their home language. In the older generation, on the other hand, CMI is only one of their home languages because they also use Javanese and the Chinese (migrant) codes.

Referring to the data under study, this mixture of codes, or bahasa gado-gado or capjay ‘salad language’, is characterized not only by mixed lexical usage and discourse particles, but also personal as well as demonstrative pronouns and kin terms from different languages. In the conversations involving the 1930s and 1940s age cohorts, it seems that the functional elements such as determiners, affixes, and connectives, are mostly in Javanese or Indonesian, while the content words such as verbs and nouns are in either Mandarin (family A) or Hakka (family B). In the interactions among the younger generations, the languages involved might be CMI and Javanese, with some Mandarin or Hakka words.

With the government campaigns promoting ‘good and proper’ use of Indonesian, as well as the hostile attitude towards the ethnic Chinese, the young speakers under study feel discouraged from using CMI in public even when talking among themselves, since this code tends to either be associated with low prestige or seen as an ‘identity revealer’ by the wider host community. I observed that some siblings or ethnic Chinese friends from these families, spoke in CMI while at home or in private domains but then shifted to EJI when they were in the presence of other speakers from non-Chinese backgrounds. They admitted that they felt more confident using EJI in public, as it was considered to be more neutral and ‘safer’ and would not earn them disagreeable or ‘funny’ looks from outsiders. Hence, some of the young generation of

---

22 When the writer, a peranakan herself, got together with some younger members of both totok families, from the 1940s and late 1950s age cohorts, CMI was employed throughout the conversations. No Chinese words or expressions were used. As a CMI speaker, I also used CMI in my interactions and interviews with all members of both families. As a peranakan speaker, I experienced no difficulty using CMI with these subjects except for the Mandarin and/or Hakka/Foochow lexical items they used.

23 For a structural description of Chinese Malay/Indonesian as spoken in East Java see the works by Rafferty (1982), Dreyfuss and Oka (1979), Kartomihardjo (1979:79-124), and also Oetomo (1984, 1987b).
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the family under study refrain from using CMI in public, and thus the code remains useful for speaking at home only.

5.1.1.2.1.4 Comparing Malay varieties

The following example sentences are provided in order to illustrate some typical differences between the Malay varieties we have been discussing. Each example sentence below has the same basic meaning.

The first sentence is an example of Chinese Malay/Indonesian. This sentence has Javanese, Mandarin and Malay/Indonesian lexical items, as well as Javanese affixes, phonology, syntactic structure and other Javanisms.

**Chinese Malay/Indonesian**

1. Soal-é Bo to merasa Yèk Jen itu ruma-é, problem-DET Bobo DEM feel Jakarta DEM house-POSS

    wés ojoq di-peksa pigi Malang alright don’t PASS-force go Malang

(The problem is that Bobo feels Jakarta is her home, so please don’t force (her) to go to Malang)

In (1) above the Javanese affix /él/ is attached to Malay/Indonesian lexical items /soal/ and /ruma/. The Indonesian word /merasa/, Javanese words /ojoq/ and /wés/, the Mandarin name for Jakarta /Yèk Jen/ and the word /pigí/ of Hokkien origin also occur. The truncated Malay/Indonesian /itu/ has a similar function to the Javanese determiner /iku/ ‘that’. The Javanese word /di-peksa/ is Malaysized into /di-peksa/ meaning ‘be forced’ which is usually not spoken by Javanese speakers.

---

24 The word /pigí/ is also used in other Malay varieties in the archipelago e.g. Malay Kupang and Ambon Malay. Oetomo (1987:91) states that it is derived from the Hokkien verb /k’ī/ means /go/.
The second example sentence begins in East Java Indonesian and ends in East Java Malay.

**East Java Malay**

2. Soal-nya bobo itu merasa Jakarta itu ruma-nya.
   problem-DET Bobo DEM feel Jakarta DEM house-POSS

   suda ndaq bolé di-peksa pigi Malang
   alright don’t PASS-force go Malang

   (The problem is that Bobo feels Jakarta is her home, so please don’t force (her) to go to Malang)

In this sentence, the Javanese affix /él/ is replaced by Malay/Indonesian affix /nya/, the truncated form /itu/ is written in its full form /itu/ and the Malay/Indonesian /suda/ and /ndaq bolé/ replace the Javanese lexical item /wés/ and /ojoq/ respectively. The Indonesian name for Jakarta is also used in this second sentence.

In the third sentence although all the words are Indonesian, the syntactic structure is influenced by Javanese, hence the name East Java Indonesian.

**East Java Indonesian**

   problem-DET Bobo DEM feel Jakarta DEM house-POSS

   suda jangan di-paksa pergi Malang
   alright don’t PASS-force go Malang

   (The problem is that Bobo feels Jakarta is her home, so please don’t force (her) to go to Malang)

The Javanese /ojoq/ in the first sentence, and the Malay /ndaq bolé/ in the second sentence are replaced with the Indonesian /jangan/ in the third sentence. Similarly the word /dipeksa/ is replaced by the Indonesian word /dipaksu/ and Malay word /pigü/ is replaced by the Indonesian word /pergi/. Thus, practically all the words used in this third sentence are Indonesian lexical items.

### 5.1.1.2.2 Javanese and its varieties

#### 5.1.1.2.2.1 Javanese

Together with Indonesian (Malay) and other languages from western Indonesia and the Philippines, Javanese is a western Malayo-Polynesian language, from the Austronesian
language family. Javanese and Indonesian share many similar syntactic structures and much cognate vocabulary. Javanese is the vernacular language spoken by over 75 million ethnic Javanese people in Central and East Java. There are hundreds of varieties or dialects of Javanese spoken throughout the central and eastern parts of Java, including Surabaya which is traditionally a Javanese-speaking area. Javanese is spoken by the ethnic Javanese as well as by many other ethnic groups in Central and East Java.

Geographically Kartomihardjo (1979: 6-7) divides the Javanese into two major dialects—the standard Javanese dialect, which is spoken in Surakarta and Yogyakarta, and the East Javanese dialect which is spoken in East Java, including Surabaya. The dialect of the royal capital cities of Jogyakarta and Surakarta (in Central Java) is normally considered as standard Javanese (Poedjosoeardmo, 1968). Javanese spoken in Surabaya, on the other hand, is slightly different from ‘classic’ or standard Javanese spoken in Central Java. The variety of Javanese spoken is usually referred to as ‘Suroboyoan’ and it is used mostly as a sign of solidarity among its speakers. The major difference between Javanese in Central Java and East Java (in this case ‘Suroboyoan’) is basically lexical. Most of the lexicon of ‘Suroboyoan’ is largely seen by people from outside Surabaya as ‘kasar’ or rough (see the next section describing this variety).

Each dialect has some morphological, phonological, and lexical differences, as well as notable sociolinguistic differences. All varieties of Javanese are known for their system of speech levels—Krama, Madya and Ngókó (High, Medium and Low levels respectively). These three levels are the main levels in Javanese speech styles which express status and/or familiarity available to speakers in the language. Krama is the distant or formal level, Madya is the intermediate level and Ngókó is the informal level. Poedjosoeardmo (1982: 131) asserts that the choice of a particular level is determined by factors such as the relative social status of speaker and addressee, the relative ages of speaker and addressee, to what degree speaker and addressee are acquainted, and within families, the relative generations of speaker and addressee. There are certain lexical items—styles—employed in High and Low levels, never the Middle level, that are used as honorifics, ‘high honorifics’ for Krama and ‘low honorifics’ in Ngókó. The High forms are known as Krama Inggil and Krama Andap and they are used to address or refer to a respected person, his actions and his possessions. This fourth type of vocabulary differs somewhat from the other three. It does not in itself indicate any degree of formality. It may be used in conjunction with words of any of the other three
types to indicate high respect toward a highly respected third person. Geertz (1960: 248-253) explains that “it is nearly impossible to say anything without indicating the social relationship between the speaker and the listener in terms of status and familiarity”25. The following are examples illustrating the different speech levels in Javanese (Indopedia, 2007):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Krama: (Neutral)</th>
<th>Kula</th>
<th>badhé</th>
<th>nédha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(I want to)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Humble)</th>
<th>Dalém</th>
<th>badhé</th>
<th>nédha.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(I want to)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Madya:</th>
<th>Kula</th>
<th>ajéng</th>
<th>nédha.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(I want to)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ngókó:</th>
<th>Aku</th>
<th>arép</th>
<th>mangan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(I want to)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Honorific:</th>
<th>Bapak</th>
<th>kérsa</th>
<th>dhahar?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Do you want to)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>eat?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Concerning its speakers, some of the principal dialects of Javanese are found in the areas around Banyumas, Tegal, Cirebon, Banten, Jogjakarta, Surakarta and Surabaya. Kartomihardjo classifies the ethnic Javanese into two subgroups, i.e. the working and the educated, including the priyayi26. The former mostly uses Ngókó and Madya with a limited amount of Krama, while the latter always employs all speech levels properly as required and determined by the social setting and factors.

---

25 Status constitutes wealth, descent, education, occupation, age, kinship, and nationality, among others, but more importantly the choice of linguistic forms and speech styles are partly determined by the familiarity (relative status) between the speakers (Geertz 1960:248)

26 It is addressed to someone with a high(er) status. Literally it means: ‘Does father want to eat?’. The reply towards persons with lower status will be lya, aku kérsa dhahar ‘Yes, I want to eat’, and towards persons with lower status, when there is no need to express one’s superiority, lya, aku arép mangan. Towards persons with the same status it is inggit, kula badhé nédha.

27 Kartomihardjo defines priyayi ‘descendants of nobility’ while Oetomo (1987:93) characterizes them as ‘gentry’, following Geertz (1960:228). Oetomo explains further that priyayi are descendants of bureaucrats—who claimed to be descendants of Java’s kings—employed by the Dutch during the colonial era. As the bureaucracy expanded, commoners were also absorbed into this class.
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Javanese, along with other major regional languages of Indonesia, was the language of written literature from the 10th century. However, since 1945, Javanese in Indonesia has had the status of only a regional language and many of its former roles and functions have been taken over by Indonesian (Poedjosoedarmo et al., 1979, 1982:1). From 1968, Javanese has been taught as part of the primary and junior high school curriculum in Central and East Java province (Hadiatmaja et al., 1987:2) and also up to junior high school. All members of the third generations in both families learned reading and writing in Javanese using both Roman and Javanese scripts as one of their school subjects. However, the kind of Javanese taught as a school subject is more akin to Central Javanese rather than the variety of East Java used in their own area. Moreover, the material learned at school was not aimed at strictly practical language use. Therefore it is not surprising that none of the subjects acquired sufficient competency in the Javanese they learned at school to use it for daily communicative purposes.

5.1.1.2.2 Surabaya dialect of Javanese

Different researchers name the Surabaya dialect of Javanese differently. Some of the names given are Jawa-Gresik or Surabaya-Gresik28, Basa Surabaya29, Surabaya dialect30, Eastern coastal, peripheral dialect31, Jawa Suroboyoan32 or East Javanese dialect (spoken in Surabaya, Malang-Pasuruan)33. The people in Surabaya usually refer to this dialect as

---

28 Soetoko et al (1984:2) refer to the Javanese spoken in Surabaya as Jawa Gresik dialect because this dialect is spoken by the people in Surabaya regency that is now called Daerah Tingkat II Gresik according to the Government regulation no. 38, 1974. Further, Soetoko et. al mention that even though Gresik and Surabaya are under separate administrations, the dialect spoken in these two areas belong to the same variety which has its own characteristics distinct from standard Javanese. This dialect is even different from those of the surrounding areas such as Lamongan, Jombang Mojokerto and Sidoarjo. Soetoko et.al explain further that some people refer to this Javanese dialect as Surabaya-Gresik dialect or just Surabaya dialect as was also mentioned by Adipitoyo et.al (1999). Gresik is an area in the western part of Surabaya that also serves as one of the city gates to enter Surabaya city from the west. The good communication and transportation systems between the two cities enable the people to be more and move from one place to the other easily.

29 Mardjana (1933: 71-73) classifies Javanese spoken in Surabaya as Basa Soerabaja ‘Surabaya language’ which was spoken in Surabaya, Malang and Pasuruan. The intonation of the penultimate syllable is usually manteb ‘long and stressed’.

30 Some others refer to this Javanese variety as Surabaya dialect or East Javanese dialect (Adipitoyo et. al, 1999:1).

31 The languages or dialects spoken in north-coastal Java—where Surabaya is also located—are named the Temur Pasir ‘Eastern coastal, peripheral’ dialects. These dialects have been influenced by the Madurese who began to settle in the north eastern coast of Java in the era of the Majapahit Kingdom and who later spread further to the inner parts of Java. (Poensken 1897:1).

32 As mentioned by Saptaatmadja (2004)

33 Gordon (2005) or http://www.ethnologue.com/show_country.asp?name=IDJ
dialek Jawa Suroboyoan ‘Suroboyoan Javanese dialect’ or just Suroboyoan. Hutomo refers to this dialect spoken by the majority as bahasa rakyat ‘people’s language’ and names it bahasa Jawa dialek Surabaya ‘Surabaya dialect of Javanese’. Suroboyoan or Surabaya dialect of Javanese is the main dialect of Eastern Javanese. It is spoken by Javanese people living in most of East Java province except Madura island. This dialect has been influenced by Madurese.

As described by Kartomihardjo, the Javanese spoken in East Java also has the same speech levels as other dialects and these are still employed in much the same way as in Central Java where they prevail in the interactions between members of the educated elite. According to Kartomihardjo’s classification, the choice of polite forms used in Krama by the majority ‘working group’, have some deviations from the ‘classic’ Javanese spoken in Central Java (Hutomo, 1986: 351). This is portrayed in the following sentences given by Hutomo, where krama ‘high’ lexical items are indicated in italics.

1. Kula badhé saré
   [I am going to sleep]

2. Kula badhé tindak
   [I am going to go]

3. Kula badhé siram
   [I am going to take a shower]

4. Kula badhé dahar
   [I am going to eat]

In contrast in Central Java, and amongst educated East Javanese speakers people would say ‘Kula badhé tilem, Kula badhé kèsah, Kula badhé adus and Kula badhé nedha’ respectively (all ‘low’ forms) since it is not usually considered polite to use honorific krama terms in reference to oneself. In these examples ‘working’ East Javanese speakers use Krama lexical items to refer to themselves, a practice considered improper, uncouth or ridiculous by the educated Javanese. By using honorifics for themselves, the

---


35 In Central Java, the code is usually also spoken between the associates of the traditional Javanese royal court.

144
speakers of these utterances are raising their own status, something which would be unthinkable for the educated elite. This tradition is passed down to succeeding generations without their realizing that their language usage deviates from the accepted and standard forms. Hutomo explains further that syntactically and morphologically, the Surabaya dialect is not much different from its 'classic' version, but that some phonetic differences are found. Likewise, differences are found in the lexicons of each variety.

Another distinct difference concerns the intonation of the 'Surabaya dialect'. This is largely seen by most people from outside Surabaya as rough, coarse ‘kasar’ or even vulgar. Unlike the Javanese used in Central Java, Javanese in Surabaya has the intonation and the manner of speaking perceived by others as very down-to-earth, spirited, direct and very much influenced by the Madurese. Soetoko et.al (1984: 119) also observe that the intonation of the Surabaya dialect is different from that of standard Javanese but similar to that of Javanese spoken by Madurese speakers who are scattered throughout Surabaya and Gresik (see the dialect map 3.2 in chapter 3), thereby influencing the Javanese spoken in these regions. However, the Surabaya dialect is prevalent and is used as a sign of solidarity, friendship and close relationship among its speakers, especially among old friends.

With regard to the Chinese communities in Surabaya, the local language that has the strongest influence is Javanese. As the borrowed features are usually from the Ngókó level, the Javanese code spoken among the totok Chinese speakers, including the subjects of this study, is Ngókó Javanese. The Ngókó Javanese used by the totok speakers, including that of the subjects under study, is slightly different from the one used by the Javanese speakers themselves. The kind of Javanese spoken among the totok Chinese speakers in Surabaya is Surabaya dialect (East Javanese variety). My observation revealed, however, that the Javanese used by the totok speakers is slightly different from the one used by Javanese speakers themselves. Kartomihardjo (1979) notes that the variety used by non-Javanese speakers is usually “replete with ‘Javanized’

Sometimes, the speakers even make use of rude words as greetings while shaking hands among close friends, without having any intention of hurling any profanity or being impolite towards their interlocutors. Instead the use of this kind of greeting is regarded as proper in close-knit friendship. This practice is prevalent in Surabaya and is said to be one of the characteristics of people’s language (Hutomo, 1986:359).
forms including the stigmatised ones\textsuperscript{37}. Furthermore, the non-Chinese speakers consider the Javanese forms used by Chinese as the ‘wrong’ forms in the ‘wrong’ places (Oetomo, 1987b: 144). As non-Javanese speakers, the subjects also use the forms and lexicon which are generally avoided by Javanese speakers because the words signify ignorance, mannerisms or even taboos\textsuperscript{37}. Although some non-Javanese speakers might understand the Madya and Krama levels, they do not have active mastery of these two levels. They mostly employ the Ngókó level in their interactions either among themselves, or with Javanese people themselves.

As previously mentioned the Surabaya dialect is also spoken by the ethnic Chinese, especially those from the younger generation. It is used especially to indicate solidarity and close relationship among friends. Some of the crudest words of this dialect are also used as greetings by the young generation just as they are used by the ethnic Javanese youth living in Surabaya. Many ethnic Chinese in Surabaya also speak Madurese, especially in areas where there are major pockets of Madurese speakers. These regional languages are juxtaposed with the Chinese dialects spoken by each of the different speech groups as well as with the language of the majority—the national language of Indonesian or its daily spoken varieties, informal Indonesian.

In this study, the variety of Javanese spoken by most subjects is East Javanese. However, there are two members of the second generation in family B who use some lexical items from Central Javanese. All subjects in this study only use the Ngókó level. Thus, in this study the term Ngókó Javanese refers to the Ngókó level of the East Javanese or Suroboyoan variety. As mentioned earlier, the kind of Ngókó Javanese spoken by the subjects is to some extent different from that spoken by the Javanese ethnic group itself.

5.1.1.3 The ‘western codes’

Since English and German are two codes originating from the west, they are referred to as ‘western’ codes.

\textsuperscript{37} The ethnic Chinese who live in Central Java usually speak very good Javanese (Poedjossoedarmo, 1982) better than the other ethnic Chinese living in other parts of Java (Hutomo, 1982). In 1953, there a piece of Javanese literature called ‘Serat Tasawuf’ was written by Tan Ing Sun, a peranakan (Tan, 1953).
5.1.1.3.1 English
English is the world’s lingua franca, and it is spoken in many countries across the globe. Owing to its status as an international language of business as well as the official foreign language endorsed by the government, English has gained wide popularity especially among the educated in Indonesia. Mastering English might lead to better employment opportunities and learning English is considered not only a necessity but also a prestigious feat. There are also many technical English expressions and terms adopted and adapted to enrich Indonesian. Many English terms and expressions are also spoken for public use for example by masters of ceremonies and radio announcers in Surabaya, especially in programs intended for the young generations.

In the formal education system, English was decreed in 1994 to be the only official foreign language to be taught at all levels starting from year four. Prior to that year learning English was compulsory in formal educational levels only from year 7. Along with advancements in technology and communication, many English terms and expressions have become part of the Indonesian young generation’s vocabulary. They use Indonesian and insert English words and expressions here and there in their sentences.

In both families, all the younger generations, namely the third generations onwards, understand and speak English, partly because they learned it formally at school, but also because some of them went to universities with English as the language of instruction. Some subjects from the second generation in both families also have a command of English but the level varies from speaker to speaker. For those who speak English, this code can serve as a ‘secret’ language when older family members who do not speak the code are around. As is the case with the Chinese codes, English is also spoken using Eastern Javanese or Malay/Indonesian intonation.

5.1.1.3.2 German
German is a European language learnt by many people in Indonesia especially for academic purposes since Germany offered free tertiary education for all. Among those learning this code were the ethnic Chinese children mostly from totok background who still had alien status. After the 1965 turmoil, Germany was one of the optional foreign countries chosen by these children to further their studies at tertiary level. Most of them came back to Indonesia having acquired the code. This code is found only in the data of the second and third generations in family A.
5.1. 2 Other codes spoken by some subjects

The following sections contain a general description of the other codes spoken by some subjects. However, these codes were not frequently employed in the recorded interactions.

5.1.2.1 Hokkien

Hokkien is another Chinese ‘dialect’ spoken by some subjects. This Minnan or Hokkien language consists of a family of Chinese dialects spoken in southern Fujian province and among the overseas Chinese of Fujian origin. Another name used to refer to this dialect is Fukienese.

Hokkien is spoken by some ethnic Chinese in Indonesia. Hokkien loan words and phrases usually cover things such as money matters, numerical terms, role-relationships, objects, concepts, certain practices related to Chinese culture and some limited expressions such as leave-taking and thanking others. Hokkien numerical words and money terms are usually used in the process of bargaining between ethnic Chinese sellers and buyers who understand this code. This practice evidently reflects the historical facts that the earliest settlers who came to the archipelago (i.e. the peranakan) were of Hokkien extraction, and these Hokkien-flavoured influences continued to permeate the host codes spoken by ethnic Chinese Indonesians for some time.

Hokkien is mostly spoken and understood by subjects born before the 1970s, i.e. the first and second generation of both families as well as the third generation of family B. However, their understanding and use are limited to numerals, greetings and business terms. There are only a few words of Hokkien found in the data. So, this code is not extensively explored. Hokkien is a code still employed for business use by some subjects. Like Mandarin and other Chinese codes, it is usually associated not only with business but also family relations and in-group identity.

5.1.2.2 Jakarta Indonesian

Another variety of colloquial Indonesian, found in the conversational data of family B, is known as Jakarta Indonesian. Jakarta Indonesian is a variety of Malay spoken in Jakarta—the capital city of Indonesia. In former times, when Jakarta was called Batavia, the variety spoken there was a mixture of Malay, Javanese and Chinese elements known as Betawi Malay or Jakarta Malay (Sneddon, 2003a: 154). Some elements of Javanese, Balinese, Sundanese and Chinese are also found in Jakarta Malay (Collins, 1998,
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Sneddon, 2003a). After Indonesian independence, Batavia was named Jakarta. Along with its populous growth, Jakarta has become the centre of all national activities. A colloquial variety of Indonesian, which is also influenced by Jakarta Malay, has emerged, and is spoken among the Jakarta metropolis especially among the youth.

Jakarta as a capital and metropolitan city, serves as the centre of everything, especially the distribution of news and films etc. through the mass media, which play an important role in portraying a prestigious way of life presented in Jakarta Indonesian (Oetomo, 1996: 199). Since Jakarta Indonesian is the code spoken by youth in films and television, the younger generations in other urban cities outside Jakarta, consider Jakarta Indonesian as a prestigious variety. It is predominantly utilized as an identity-marker by the young generation. Thus, this code provides a distinctive marker for television or radio programs devised for young listeners and audiences.

In my study some particles and interjections from this dialect were used by the first generation of family B and one member of the third generation of family A in their interactions with a visiting relative from Jakarta. Based on my observation of their interactions with their peers, and confirmed by interview, this code is found in the repertoire of other young members of the third generation in family A, the siblings of the subjects who were not part of the study but who were unintentionally recorded using it. However, Jakarta Indonesian will not be discussed further in this study since the data constitute less than 5 interjections and particles used by only a few people.

5.1.2.3 Madurese

Madurese is another local language spoken widely in Surabaya. This code is spoken not only by the Madurese themselves, but also by people from other ethnic groups with whom these Madurese have contact, including ethnic Javanese and Chinese. There are many pockets of Madurese speakers especially in the northern and central part of Surabaya where Madurese is the predominant language spoken. Many Madurese speakers emigrate to or simply work in Surabaya and they still have constant contact with their relatives on the island of Madura, which helps them maintain their Madurese heritage. In addition, communication and transportation facilities between Surabaya and Madura island are very good and will soon be even better with the building of the Suramadu bridge. To communicate with other ethnic groups, Madurese speakers may use either Javanese or (especially amongst younger Madurese) colloquial Indonesian,
often with Madurese accents. Madurese has influenced the Javanese spoken in Surabaya ever since the Majapahit kingdom in the thirteenth century (Poensen, 1897: 1). The blend has resulted in the Javanese variety spoken in Surabaya now, especially in terms of its intonation as has been mentioned above. Some subjects of this study claim to speak Madurese although it is not found in the recorded data. The code serves as ‘another’ code they speak with people outside family circles or outside the families under study. The subjects usually speak Madurese with the Madurese speakers they know or have business relations with.

5.2 Assigned font for each code

As discussed in the previous section, there are many codes involved in the data. Thus, for easy reference and identification, different kinds of fonts are attributed to each code found in the examples accompanying each discussion. To distinguish various codes of the same variety, various styles of the same font are employed. Thus, all Comic Sans Ms represent the migrant codes, Times New Roman the host codes, Javanese, Malay and its varieties, and Eurostar is used for the codes of European provenance, the western codes. As there are some words of Hokkien and Jakarta Indonesian, some fonts are also assigned to these two codes. The following are the fonts used to represent the codes found in the examples presented in the following sections.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Typeface used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td>ALL CAPS BOLD (COMIC SANS MS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hakka</td>
<td>ALL CAPS ITALICS (COMIC SANS MS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foochow</td>
<td>ALL CAPS UNDERLINED (COMIC SANS MS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hokkien</td>
<td>ALL CAPS BOLD ITALICS (COMIC SANS MS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Indonesian</td>
<td>ALL CAPS BOLD (TIMES NEW ROMAN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Java Malay</td>
<td>lower case italics (times new roman)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Java Indonesian</td>
<td>lower case bold underlined (times new roman)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Malay/Indonesian</td>
<td>lower case bold (times new roman)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jakarta Indonesian</td>
<td>lower case (times new roman)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Javanese dialect</td>
<td>ALL CAPS ITALICS (TIMES NEW ROMAN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>ALL CAPS (EUROSTAR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>ALL CAPS BOLD (EUROSTAR)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3 A continuum of codes: problems of differentiation

As mentioned above, some of the codes found in the data have similar morphosyntactic structures, and are found in a continuum of codes. Those codes are the host codes i.e. East Java Indonesian, East Java Malay and Chinese Malay/Indonesian which are all varieties of Malay spoken in East Java, and which are distinguished in part because they have differences in lexicon. In addition, these codes share some features with the East Javanese dialect which often makes it difficult to tell them apart.

As previously mentioned, these codes have been in close contact for some time and thus, all of the varieties share some features with each other. Very often it is difficult to link a particular piece of dialogue with a particular variety, given the interrelated nature of each variety. The situation with respect to the codes discussed in this study is very similar to that reported by Oetomo (1987b:72) about Malay and Indonesian in East Java:

"Structurally speaking, one finds at one extreme a variety with Javanese and Malay lexical items and Javanese grammatical item, then one with much fewer Javanese lexical items and many more Malay lexical items, but still with Javanese grammatical..."
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items, then one with few Javanese lexical items and Malay lexical and grammatical items, and finally at the other extreme, a variety with Indonesian lexical items and grammatical items”.

In this study a similar continuum is particularly obvious among the Indonesian born subjects. Although most subjects are able to move back and forth along this continuum to a certain degree, the extreme end with Javanese and Malay lexical items and Javanese grammatical items is mostly found among the 1930s age cohort. The 1950s cohort from family B use far fewer Javanese lexical items and many more Malay lexical items, but still use some Javanese grammatical items, and the 1940s and 1950s cohort from family A and the 1960s cohort from both families use few Javanese lexical items and more Malay lexical and grammatical items. An additional variety in the continuum found in this study, not mentioned by Oetomo (1987b), is one with few Javanese lexical items, many Malay lexical and grammatical items and a great many Indonesian lexical items. This mixture is especially spoken by the 1970s-1980s age cohort. Finally at the other extreme, is a variety with Indonesian lexical and grammatical items spoken by the 1990s age cohort.

The continuum found in the younger generations born in the 1970s and thereafter seems to consist of Malay varieties only, ranging from CMI, EJI and then SI. Functionally, these three codes serve in much the same way as the speech levels of Javanese, being Low (informal), Mid (semi-formal) and High (formal) codes respectively. Each of these codes has its own societal domains in each individual subject’s language repertoire. Together with Javanese varieties, these Malay varieties perform polyglossic functions in this generation of ethnic Chinese. The nature of these polyglossic functions is discussed in more detail in chapters six and nine.

Given the nature of the continuum just discussed it is often difficult to identify precisely which code is being used in a given utterance. To help identify the standard and spoken varieties of Indonesian, i.e. SI, EJI and CMI, the writer referred to textbooks on SI structures and dictionaries, and she also used her knowledge and experience as a speaker of Indonesian. To identify East Java Indonesian and Chinese Malay/Indonesian the writer took advantage of her innate knowledge as a speaker of EJI and CMI. Due to the high similarities of the Chinese Malay/Indonesian spoken in the three cities—Surabaya, Malang and Pasuruan34 which received influences from the same variety of

---

34 Malang is about 90 km south of Surabaya while Pasuruan lies in between the Malang-Surabaya.
Javanese spoken in East Java, the writer also referred to the description offered by studies on Malay/Indonesian spoken by ethnic Chinese in Pasuruan (Oetomo, 1987b), Peranakan in Malang (Dreyfuss and Oka, 1979, Rafferty, 1982) and Peranakan in East Java (Kartomihardjo, 1979).

In other cases the identification can be problematic due to the interrelated nature of these varieties. Very often it is difficult to link a particular piece of dialogue with a particular language variety/code. In some cases the choice of lexical items in the dialogue helps determine which particular code is employed by a certain speaker. However, the task becomes difficult or even impossible when individual lexical items are shared by all the different codes. It means that a piece of dialogue could be in any of the codes sharing those particular items.

Therefore, to help determine whether a stretch of utterance consisting of two or more codes with shared cognates belong to a certain code, I have proposed some guidelines, such as (a) looking for distinct characteristics of the codes, e.g., the use of such particles as bog 'don’t', along with Malay/Indonesian words and Javanese affixes that may reveal that the code is CMI (b) by following the ‘speech economy’ (Hymes, 1962:21) of the family concerned, i.e. to study the codes in the subjects’ repertoire and their use (function) in interactions (speech events), the patterns and mechanisms of their allocation and distribution as well as their value in family interactions. This approach relates speech behaviour to the extra-linguistic environment in which the codes operate, thus it may provide insight into the relationship between social factors and language use (Gumperz, 1971b:208). In this study the extra-linguistic factors comprise not only the social factors, i.e. subjects’ background/life histories (education, language, and family) and the social norms embraced, but also the socio-psychological factors, i.e. social motivations and attitude that determine or influence the subjects’ code choice behaviour (see further discussion in chapters 7 to 9).

5.4 An example of a multilingual dialogue

The following is an interaction between the siblings Mimi (2FCT-Pa) and Titi (2FCT-Pb). They are talking about another friend who had been looking for a Singaporean surgeon. In this interaction, their father was present. The main code used is CMI with some Mandarin, Fuzhou and English words inserted or borrowed. However, the Mandarin used is only a formulaic expression and the Foochow word employed is one
of the words belonging to their family repertoire. The English word used is also one that is widely accepted among modern Peranakan Chinese people. The Mandarin expression in line 5 is uttered by Grandpa/Kong (1MCT-P), while Foochow words are only found in line (4) uttered by the second daughter, Titi (2FCT-Pb). She says that she used to be able to communicate better in Foochow when she was younger.

1. 2FCT-Pa : he. suda taqêqi
   [he, (I) have given (them)]
2. 2FCT-Pb: oh ya, gitu tu LU\u043d\u0441\u0436\u0430 narêq?—
   [oh ya, like that did YOU ask (them) to pay?—]
3. 2FCT-Pa :-gagq, mèk, mèk JING WEN\u03cb\u03cb soq koq
   [no, only, only MAY I ASK PLEASE, just that]
4. 2FCT-Pb: oh... NGONG NYANGI
   [oh... STUPID]
5. 1MCT-P: nèq NA-KÔ, SIN-CIA-PÓ NA-KÔ BI-CIAU pinten
   [if that, THAT, THAT SINGAPOREAN IS RATHER clever]
6. 2FCT-Pa : iya—
   [yes—]
7. 2FCT-Pb: :-ya dokter Singgapor—
   [yes, that Singaporean doctor—]
8. 2FCT-Pa :-itu wes taq tèêxpno sóster, anu-ê, NAME CARD-ê
   [—that, (I) have given the NAME CARD to the nurse]
9. (4.0)

5.5 Summary and conclusions

Oetomo (1996) writes that language not only serves as a means of communication but also reflects social, political and economic realities. This was observed among the subjects under study. Throughout history, different codes from migrant, host and western realms have found their way into the speech of the totok as well as the peranakan while Indonesian and English, as the codes used in technology, have flourished among those born from the 1970s onwards.

As the subjects are of various ages with different socio-historical experiences, a variety of codes are involved in the discussions. Due to their history of contact linguistically, some of the codes discussed above share morpho-syntactic features and lexical items. This means that in some instances they are not easily distinguishable one from another. Therefore it can be concluded that they might not be readily identifiable as borrowing or code-switching phenomena when similar varieties are involved together in one conversational event as presented and discussed in later chapters.
6.0 Introduction

Hamers and Blanc (2000:33-43) suggest a number of ways of judging ‘bilinguality’. These include relative competence in each language or proficiency, cognitive organization,¹ self-evaluations of proficiency, attitudes towards languages and their speakers, motivation to learn or speak the language, confidence in the use of language, social cultural status or how a language is valued, and bilingual cultural identity or how far a person identifies with each speech community. In addition, they suggest that language biographies which provide information on the age and context of acquisition including simultaneous and consecutive acquisition can be used.

In this chapter, I present a discussion of the state of multilinguality of the subjects of the study, drawing on many of the criteria mentioned by Hamers and Blanc (2000). Judgements of the subjects' language repertoire and self-assessments of proficiency are presented. These judgements are based on things such as the subjects’ language biographies and other socio-psychological factors such as age, language attitudes, motivation to learn or speak the language, confidence in speaking languages and multilingual cultural identity. The major focus of the chapter will be a detailed presentation of each individual subject’s language repertoires and language proficiency, reported alongside those of other members of the same cohort.

Although the overall focus of the study is language choice in the family domain, it is necessary to address the subjects’ total repertoire to better explain how language use in the family domain might be constrained by overall linguistic competence. Changes that have taken place in the subjects' language repertoires over the course of their lives

¹ 'Cognitive organisation' refers to Ervin and Osgood's notion of compound vs coordinate bilingualism. 'Compound bilinguals' are those who have unequal competence in two languages which they employ in the same social context, and 'Coordinate bilinguals', are those who have near-native ability in two languages which they employ in distinct social settings.
are also presented. The last part of the chapter discusses some conclusions about the subjects’ language repertoire, proficiency and the shifts that have taken place between generations. However, before all of these are discussed, I will first present a discussion of how the subjects are grouped into cohorts which represent different age groups with varying educational and other experiences.

6.1 Generation and age cohorts

Based on the criteria discussed in §4.1.3 of chapter four, the subjects of this study: the members of Foochow and Hakka families, are grouped into age cohorts. In table 6.1 below, I provide a list of all the cohorts that have been established. For each cohort, I also give an indication of generational affiliation as well as notes on educational experiences and other remarks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort number</th>
<th>Decade of Birth</th>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Language of instruction in primary /until secondary</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
<th>No. of speakers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1910s</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Local dialect: Hakka</td>
<td>Born in China</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1920s</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Local dialect: Foochow</td>
<td>Born in China</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1930s</td>
<td>Second</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1940s</td>
<td>Second</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Mandarin and Standard Indonesian</td>
<td>‘transitional generation’²</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>early 1950s</td>
<td>Second</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Mandarin and Standard Indonesian</td>
<td>‘transitional generation’³</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b</td>
<td>Late 1950s</td>
<td>Second</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Standard Indonesian</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4c</td>
<td>Late 1950s</td>
<td>Third</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Mandarin and Standard Indonesian</td>
<td>‘transitional generation’</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>early 1960s</td>
<td>Third</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Standard Indonesian</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Late 1970s-early 1980s</td>
<td>Third</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Standard Indonesian</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>early 1990s</td>
<td>Fourth</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Standard Indonesian</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cohort one consists of a single member of each family. Both of these people were born in China and they were both at least 80 when the recording was done.

² As discussed in chapter three, the term ‘transitional generation’ has been used to refer to the people in the cohort who started their schooling in Chinese schools, but were forced to complete it in Indonesian schools.
The first Indonesian born generation is referred to as the second generation (hereafter, G2). G2 from family A and G2 from B are assigned to separate cohorts. Cohort two were born in the 1930s and they belong to family B. They were mostly in their 60s when the data were collected. The older siblings of G2 from family A form cohort three. The members of this group were born in the 1940s. Thus, they were born about 10 to 15 years later than G2 of family B. There are two subjects in this group. These two individuals were more directly affected by what happened during the transitional period in 1965-1968 than were their older counterparts in family B.

Cohort four consists of those born in the 1950s, when Chinese and Indonesian schools existed along side each other. This cohort consists of two younger siblings of G2 in family A and two older siblings of G3 in family B. As seen in the table, the subjects went to different kinds of schools. Due to their different language contacts and experiences, they are listed in different sub-cohorts. The different educational experiences of these subjects and those of cohort three illustrate the existence of dual educational systems in Indonesian schools before 1965, as discussed in chapter three.

Cohort five consists of subjects from both families who went solely to Indonesian schools with Standard Indonesian (SI) as the medium language of instruction. They were born from the late 1960s onwards—after Chinese schools had closed. They were aged between their 20s and 40s at the time of data collection. Most of this group come from the third generation of both families. A further member from the fourth generation of family B is also assigned to this cohort. She was under ten years of age when the recording was carried out. Altogether, there are six subjects in cohort five.

Altogether 18 subjects were assigned to various cohorts. The following sections provide a discussion of each individual’s language repertoire and the domains within which they use each of their languages.

6.2. Outlining the subjects’ language repertoires
Before describing each individual’s language repertoire in detail, we need to review some of our discussion of the language domains. As discussed in chapter two, I have

3 Unlike members of cohorts 3 and 4c, she was ‘forced’ to move to an Indonesian school after the 1958 decree because she had Indonesian citizenship (see §3.2.2 and §6.2.4.1).
distinguished a total of nine domains that will be referred to when discussing linguistic competence and language use. These are:

- home
- work
- neighbourhood
- education: (language(s) of instruction and language(s) of recess/entertainment
- officialdom (and government bureaucracy)
- religion
- voluntary organisations
- friendship
- economic/business transactions

Each person's repertoire is mapped into the different domains, both public and private domains, in which they use particular languages to particular speakers, either Chinese or non-Chinese speakers, either strangers or family members or circles of friends. The description of each individual subject's repertoire is accompanied with an explanation of how and why his or her repertoire is different from other subjects. After that comes a discussion of the role of 'active' and 'passive' knowledge of the languages in each subject's repertoire, focussing particularly on the codes all family members share. 'Active' knowledge of a code occurs when a subject can successfully produce that code, at least in a given domain. Passive knowledge occurs when a subject successfully understands a code even though (s)he may not be able to produce it.

The discussion will be presented in cohort order: from oldest to youngest. Summaries of individual repertoires by cohort will be given in tables and also in diagrams for each cohort. The tables (6.2 to 6.11) give basic information about linguistic repertoire and other relevant information for each of the individuals in both families. It is possible that people have different home languages at different times of their life. For example, when a certain subject was young he may have used a different home language with his parents and his siblings from that used with his wife and

---

4 As discussed in chapter two, these domains have been adopted from Hoffman's (1971) suggestions. I have added the domains of friendship and economic/business transactions to Hoffman's list of seven domains.
children when he was older. To the extent that it is possible, the codes are arranged on the tables in the order of their use in the history of the relevant subject(s)' life.

In the tables, the column 'language repertoire' divides the codes possessed by the subjects into active and passive categories. However, unlike the principles used in the column for home languages, the order of the codes presented in the language repertoire columns gives a rough indication of the frequency of that code's use or how well a particular subject speaks the code. The first mentioned in the active column is the most frequently used, while the first mentioned in the passive column is the least frequently used.

Javanese and Malay varieties are mostly listed as just Javanese or Malay. The Javanese variety spoken by all subjects is Ngókó Javanese, specifically the Eastern Javanese variety (Surabaya dialect of Javanese). Unless otherwise indicated, when the label Javanese is used in this study\(^5\), it refers to this particular variety. Although the Javanese variety spoken by two members of the second generation in family B has traits of the Central Javanese dialect, the differences involved only really concern the choices made with respect to a few lexical items. The term 'Malay' refers to all Malay varieties, namely, Chinese Malay/Indonesian (CMI), East Java Malay (EJM), which G1 members refer to as *Melayoe Tionghoa* 'the Chinese Malay', East Java Indonesian (EJI), and Standard Indonesian (SI) unless otherwise indicated. Further details on exactly which varieties of Malay may be used by particular subjects are given in the text which accompanies each table.

Some abbreviations and other conventions used in the tables need to be explained. 'Gen' refers to generation. 'Pri', 'Sec' and 'Ter' refer to Primary, Secondary and Tertiary level of education respectively. 'Ju' and 'Se' are short forms of 'Junior High School' (which comprises years 7-9), and 'Senior High School' (years 10-12) respectively. The 'others' column lists codes used as a language of instruction in non-formal educational institutions an individual may have attended such as night schools, home education, etc. The parentheses around languages, as for example '{Hokkien}', indicates that an individual only makes limited use of the code (e.g. related to daily routines, school matters and especially numerical and/or transactional functions for

\(^5\) Javanese is used in both diagrams and tables found in this study.
buying things in shops/markets). Much more extensive lists of codes employed in
domains other than the family or education are given in tabular form in appendix 4.

To summarize, abbreviations and symbols used in the tables are:
CMI: Chinese Malay/Indonesian
EJI: East Java Indonesian
EJM/I: East Java Malay/Indonesian is a code having mostly Malay lexical items
and some Indonesian lexical items spoken by the 1910s, 1920s age cohorts and to
some extent 1930s age cohort
EJM: East Java Malay
Gen: Generation
Ju: Junior
Pri: Primary
Sec: Secondary
Se: Senior
SFI: Semi Formal Indonesian
SI: Standard Indonesian
Ter: Tertiary
*Malay varieties consist of EJM, EJI, CMI and Jakarta Indonesian
** Malay varieties limited to East Java Malay (Bahasa Melayu) and East Java
Indonesian
***Malay varieties consist of EJM, CMI and EJI
**** Malay varieties consist of CMI, EJI, Jakarta Indonesian
$ Malay varieties consist of Chinese Malay/Indonesian and East Java Indonesian
#All Malay varieties including Jakarta Indonesian

\{ } \} limited use of the code

The diagrams (figure 6.1 to 6.10) represent codes with shapes of different sizes.
Similar shapes are used for similar codes, but the size of any shape is not significant.
Rectangular shapes are used to represent Malay and its varieties; an oval represents
Javanese. Triangles are used for the codes from China; a diamond represents Madurese.
Finally, hexagons and octagons are used for European codes. Sometimes, different
shapes are drawn overlapping each other because of the inter-relatedness of the codes
represented by those shapes. This particularly affects Malay and all of its varieties. How
much the shapes overlap each other serves as a rough indication of the extent of
linguistic overlap between the codes, in the case of the speaker(s) being modelled. The diagrams also give a rough approximation of how active or passive each code is for each cohort. A long dotted line serves as an imaginary border that separates one’s language repertoire into active and passive parts. Where the dotted line cuts across the shape representing a certain code, this indicates that the speakers’ knowledge of the code might not be easily assigned to active or passive categories. In some cases, this might be because a code serves as part of one’s active repertoire in some domains, but only as passive in others. In other cases, there may be variable proficiency between different individuals from within a cohort.

In short, the diagrams present a rough picture of the intricate and complex relationship existing between the codes found in the family repertoire for each cohort.

**6.2.1 The 1910s and the 1920s cohort**

This group has two members. Grandma/Bobo (1FCT) was born in the 1910s and belongs to G1 of family B. Grandpa/Kong (1MCT-P) was born in the 1920s and belongs to G1 of family A. Both of them underwent primary education in China. Grandma’s language of instruction was Hakka and Grandpa’s language of instruction was Foochow. Neither had any formal schooling in Indonesia. Only after arriving in Java did they learn other codes, including Mandarin, which was used as a lingua franca between immigrant Chinese in Indonesia. Language learning was mostly done informally through interactions with Indonesians or other immigrant Chinese, but Grandpa did take Mandarin classes in Indonesia.

During her childhood, Grandma/Bobo’s (1FCT) only home language was Hakka. She went to a Hakka language primary school until year two. Hakka was the only language she spoke until she arrived in Indonesia, with the husband she had already married in China. After arriving in Indonesia, her linguistic repertoire became much richer. Since her husband, a Hakka speaker himself, insisted that all the children speak only Hakka, their ancestral dialect, at home, her home language in the early Indonesian days was Hakka. At the same time, the family owned a shop in a small village in Java and she needed to communicate in Javanese and Malay to help run the shop. Grandma
began learning Javanese and Malay from her husband⁶. Her communication with the locals was quite intensive and the practice helped her master the local languages. Her children went to Chinese schools where Mandarin was the language of instruction, so they introduced some Mandarin expressions at home, but Hakka remained predominant. Only later did she start learning Standard Indonesian (SI) from a variety of sources: her grandchildren (who went to Indonesian schools), her neighbours, and from the media (e.g. television). Her SI is largely passive but she has more or less active mastery of all her other codes. At home today, she mostly uses broken and ungrammatical CMI and/or EJI with her grandchildren and great-grandchildren. With her children, she tends to use Hakka. She acquired some Jakarta Indonesian when she lived in the vicinity of Jakarta and also uses that variety in some of her family interactions. Outside the family domain, Grandma uses Hakka, EJM, and EJI with the ladies at church. Since she goes to churches with both Hakka and Indonesian services, which language she uses depends to some degree on which church she happens to be attending. She tends to use Javanese with servants and caregivers. At the market Grandma mostly employs Ngóko Javanese, but also some Malay.

Table 6.2 Grandma’s language repertoire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and Code of Subject</th>
<th>Gen</th>
<th>Year of Birth</th>
<th>Language of instruction</th>
<th>Home language</th>
<th>other domain</th>
<th>Language repertoire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grandma/Bobo 1FC3T</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>early 1910s</td>
<td>Hakka</td>
<td>Hakka, Javanese, Malay *</td>
<td>Hakka, Mandarin Javanese, Malay *</td>
<td>Hakka, Mandarin Javanese, Standard Indonesian</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
*Malay varieties consist of EJM, EJI, CMI and Jakarta Indonesian

#All Malay varieties including Jakarta Indonesian

Despite her limitations in terms of correct grammar, pronunciation and sometimes inappropriate lexical choice, my own observations and those of her fellow family members confirm that Grandma does use all of the codes shown in the following diagram. In many of her interactions, Grandma is an active code-switcher, and this behaviour will be discussed in later chapters. Grandma’s linguistic repertoire is

---

⁶ Her husband had lived in Java for some time before he went back to China to marry his bride and bring her to Java. He was also from a Hakka family. According to Grandma her husband spoke Malay, Javanese and Dutch as well as his migrant codes.

⁷ See the list of abbreviations and conventions in the beginning of the thesis and on the ‘bookmark’ accompanying this thesis.
represented diagrammatically in figure 6.1 below.

![Diagram of language repertoire](image)

**Active repertoire**

**Passive repertoire**

Figure 6.1 Language repertoire of Grandma born in the 1910s

Grandpa/Kong (1MCT-P) only spoke Foochow and a little Mandarin prior to his migration to Indonesia. He went to primary school in China where the language of instruction was Foochow. He spoke Foochow with his parents, siblings and friends. He migrated to Java in the 1930s. At that time there was already a stable *totok* society in Java, so he came directly into the *totok* community and married a woman from the first Indonesian-born generation of a migrant *totok* Chinese family. He was exposed to many different codes after his arrival in Java. He joined night classes where he learned both Mandarin and Malay in the late 1930s. This was prior to the emergence of SI. His own variety of Indonesian is influenced by a preponderance of lexical items taken from East Java Malay as it was spoken by ethnic Chinese prior to Indonesian Independence. Since then, he has learned some standard Indonesian informally, but he neither reads nor listens to any Indonesian mass media. Instead, he reads Mandarin Chinese newspapers and listens to Chinese TV programs broadcast via satellite. Grandpa never learned Javanese. As Hokkien words and expressions prevailed among the ethnic Chinese when he first arrived in Indonesia, especially in business circles, he also acquired some
practical knowledge of, and ability to use this code. At home he used to speak Foochow with his wife and older children but today he seldom uses any Foochow at home except for the few odd routine words and expressions that are part of his familylect. He does continue to use Foochow with others from the Foochow community, and Mandarin with other ethnic Chinese. He also speaks Mandarin with the older children with whom he lives. In addition, he speaks Malay and/or EJI with peranakan Chinese speakers as well as with the domestics. In the past, Grandpa also used to speak Mandarin, Hokkien and Foochow at work, but gradually changed to Malay and Indonesian as the number of speakers of these migrant codes diminished. He uses Indonesian in his interactions with non-ethnic Chinese such as friends, neighbours, acquaintances, business associates, customers and government officials. He goes to a Confucian temple where worship is conducted in a mixture of Mandarin and Indonesian. At the time of recording, Grandpa is a retiree. In his younger days, he used to own a retail shop.

SI serves as part of Grandpa’s passive repertoire since he is not able to speak more than a few standard phrases of it. When he does speak Indonesian, it is usually in an incorrect and ungrammatical way. Of all the (older) subjects involved in this study, Grandpa is the only one that speaks no Javanese of any kind. These observations are confirmed by both his interview and the data\textsuperscript{8}. My observation reveals, however, that he does understand some Ngókó Javanese and also has some passive knowledge of CMI. Grandpa’s repertoire can be seen in the following table 6.3 and diagram 6.2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and Code of Subject</th>
<th>Gen</th>
<th>Year of Birth</th>
<th>Language of instruction</th>
<th>Home language</th>
<th>other domains\textsuperscript{a}</th>
<th>Language repertoire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grandpa/Kong 1MCT-P</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>early 1920s</td>
<td>Foochow</td>
<td>Mandarin, Malay\textsuperscript{**}</td>
<td>Foochow, Mandarin, Malay\textsuperscript{**} (Hokkien)</td>
<td>Foochow, Mandarin, Malay\textsuperscript{**} (Hokkien), Chinese, Malay/Indonesian</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

\textsuperscript{**} Malay varieties limited to East Java Malay (Bahasa Melayu) and East Java Indonesian

\textsuperscript{8} I assume this is because none of his circles of friends speak this code and he feels able to cope adequately with all the other codes he has acquired and speaks.
The following diagram shows Grandpa's language repertoire after living in Java for more than 60 years. Similar to Grandma, the line dividing active from passive codes runs through the middle of the symbols for some of the local codes. Although he employs these codes actively, he does so with some limitations as discussed above.

**Active repertoire**

![Diagram of language repertoire]

**Passive repertoire**

Figure 6.2 Language repertoire of Grandpa born in the 1920s

To sum up, the migrant codes Hakka and Foochow are active codes for the 1910s and 1920s age cohorts respectively. While Grandma has more active ability in Javanese, Grandpa seems to function better with Malay varieties than Javanese.

### 6.2.2 The 1930s cohort

As seen in table 6.4 below, four subjects are members of this group. They belong to G2 of family B. The group consists of two married couples. Lisa (2FCTa) and Ani (2FCTb) are sisters and their husbands make up the foursome. When they were young, the predominant home language of the sisters was Hakka. However, since they lived in a village in Java where the local language was Javanese, they learned Ngókó Javanese from interaction with people in the area and from their peers. Their father insisted that they use Hakka at home and they did almost exclusively use Hakka with him, but they used Hakka plus Javanese with their mother and siblings. Among the siblings the
interaction was predominantly carried out in Javanese. Since the village they grew up in lies on the border between East Java and Central Java, there are traces of Central Javanese lexicon in their Javanese. Lisa then married Filip (2MATa) and Ani married Jon (2MATb). Both Filip and Jon were also from Hakka families, so Hakka is part of the couples’ shared repertoire, in addition to Javanese, Malay and some Mandarin.

This cohort went to Chinese schools where they learned Mandarin Chinese as the language of instruction in both primary and secondary schools. At school, they tended to use Javanese – the dominant language of their village – in the playground with their schoolmates. They grew up during Dutch colonial times and the Japanese occupation. They also witnessed Indonesian Independence in 1945. Their schooling was interrupted by the Second World War and the Japanese Occupation, after which they did not return to school, having reached years 7, 8, and 9 respectively.

![Table 6.4 Individual repertoire of the 1930s cohort](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and Code of Subject</th>
<th>Gen</th>
<th>Year of Birth</th>
<th>Language of instruction</th>
<th>Home language</th>
<th>other domain(s)</th>
<th>Language repertoire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pri</td>
<td>Sec</td>
<td>Ter</td>
<td>Others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ju</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filip 2MATa</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>early 1930s</td>
<td>Mandarin Mandarin</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Hakka, Javanese,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mandarin, Malay***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hakka, Javanese,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mandarin, Malay***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hakka, Javanese,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mandarin, (Hokkien)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mandarin, Madurese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hakka, Javanese,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Malay***, (Hokkien)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mandarin, Madurese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa 2FCTa</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Late 1930s</td>
<td>Mandarin Mandarin</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Hakka, Javanese,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mandarin, Malay***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hakka, Javanese,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mandarin, (Hokkien)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hakka, Javanese,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mandarin, Madurese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hakka, Javanese,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Malay***, (Hokkien)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mandarin, Madurese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon 2MATb</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Late 1930s</td>
<td>Mandarin Mandarin</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Hakka, Javanese,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mandarin, Malay***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hakka, Javanese,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mandarin, (Hokkien)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mandarin, Madurese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hakka, Javanese,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Malay***, (Hokkien)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mandarin, Madurese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ani 2FCTb</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Late 1930s</td>
<td>Mandarin Mandarin</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Hakka, Javanese,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mandarin, Malay***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hakka, Javanese,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mandarin, (Hokkien)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mandarin, Madurese</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

***Malay varieties consist of EJM, CMI and EJI

When Lisa and Filip moved to Surabaya they began mingling with peranakan Chinese so they were exposed to CMI, and started to use CMI with their peranakan friends. They also mainly used CMI to communicate with their younger children who were born in Surabaya, but continued to use Ngökó Javanese with the older children, so their family had two different home languages which were used in the family at the same time. Nowadays, they use EJI in their interactions with their grandchildren. Lisa is
a housewife, and Filip runs their retail shop not far from where they live.

Ani and Jon, on the other hand, moved to another town outside Surabaya but frequently go to Surabaya to visit their children and relatives. They employ Ngoko Javanese and CMI with their children and EJI with their grandchildren. In the family, the few Mandarin loan words are used, especially with the children. The family also utilizes some Hakka loan words to refer to particular things the family knows together. Besides his task as a religious minister, Jon, assisted by Ani, runs his family business from home.

With their friends from the Hakka community, Lisa, Filip, Ani and Jon use Hakka and Javanese. Javanese is also used with their domestic at home, and with merchants at the market, while Mandarin or Hokkien numbers are employed in transactions with ethnic Chinese merchants. Active knowledge of Hokkien is limited to numbers, greetings and other formulaic routines.

At church, all four of them, in addition to EJI, employ some CMI to communicate with the peranakan Chinese speakers, and EJI to communicate to others. When communicating with some of the elderly church pastors, they still use Hakka, especially for greetings and leave-takings. In these circumstances, a few Mandarin loanwords may also be used. They used to attend a Hakka church but at present they go to a church where the service is given in Indonesian.

On formal occasions, such as meetings of neighbourhood associations, at government offices, and in encounters with non-ethnic Chinese speakers, all four subjects in this cohort use EJI. Since Jon and Filip are more likely to take part in these activities, this particularly affects them. Standard Indonesian is part of the passive repertoire for this group, since although they may take part in activities in which it is used, they do not use it themselves.

There are some differences between Filip and Jon, especially with regard to the codes they use at work. Filip employs Javanese, CMI, EJM, EJI, and even Madurese at work, depending on his clients. As for Jon, he used to employ Hakka, and some Mandarin at his workplace, but nowadays, he uses more Indonesian. Jon has greater Mandarin proficiency than the others in this group, at least partly because he reads many Mandarin books and corresponds in Mandarin for his work. Jon also states that he
knows some English but seldom gets the chance to use it. Thus, English is part of his passive repertoire. He also speaks Madurese in his encounters with Madurese speakers in his neighborhood.

In conclusion, all four subjects have Hakka, Malay varieties, Javanese, and Mandarin in their active repertoire, while knowledge of SI is more passive. In the family domain, Hakka and Javanese prevail, but occasional snippets of Mandarin are found and some CMI is used.

The codes found in the 1930s age cohort are summarized in figure 6.3 below. Note that although Madurese is listed in this diagram, it is spoken actively only by two subjects. Thus, it overlaps the active and passive regions of the diagram.

![Diagram of language repertoire]

**Active repertoire**

![Diagram of language repertoire]

**Passive repertoire**

Figure 6.3 Language repertoire of 1930s cohort

Notes:
The shapes with dotted lines indicate that only some of the members of that particular cohort share the code concerned

6.2.3 *The 1940s cohort: generation in transition from family A*

This section discusses two older siblings from the second generation of family A, who
were forced to move from Chinese to Indonesian schools after 1966, and who are thus labelled the 'transitional generation'. An overview of their language repertoires is given in table 6.5 below.

### Table 6.5 Individual repertoire of 1940s cohort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and Code of Subject</th>
<th>Gen</th>
<th>Year of Birth</th>
<th>Language of instruction</th>
<th>Home language</th>
<th>other domains#</th>
<th>Language repertoire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pri</td>
<td>Sec</td>
<td>Ter</td>
<td>Others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ju</td>
<td>Se</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mimi 2FCI-Pa</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Late 1940s</td>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td>Mandarin, Standard Indonesian</td>
<td>German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titi 2FCI-Pb</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Late 1940s</td>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td>Mandarin, Standard Indonesian</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

***Malay varieties consist of EJM, CMI and EJI***

This cohort had more variety in their languages of instruction than did the second generation of family B. Until senior high school, Mimi and Titi went to Chinese schools and had Mandarin Chinese as the language of instruction. Mandarin was also the dominant language they used with peers outside the class. When the Chinese schools were closed down in 1966, Mimi was in year 11 and Titi was in year 10. When they continued their education at Indonesian schools, SI was the language of instruction. Although they entered Indonesian schools, Mandarin mixed with Javanese was still used as the language of informal interaction outside the school grounds with their friends from Chinese schools. Inside the school grounds, they used Javanese and CMI in addition to EJI. Mimi and Titi usually employ Mandarin mixed with CMI or Javanese to speak to former school friends, as well as to other friends and acquaintances who went to both Chinese and Indonesian schools. Of these two sisters, only Mimi continued her study to tertiary level where German was the language of tertiary instruction. Later, she also learned enough English to master a reasonable level of spoken proficiency.

When they were young, the home languages of both Mimi and Titi, were Mandarin, Foochow and CMI or a mixture of all three. Foochow was limited to daily routines and formulaic expressions. At present, they seldom use Foochow and they admit they are losing their competence in that code. They all learned Ngókó Javanese from people around them: neighbours, friends and also peers in the school grounds in Indonesian schools, but they seldom used this code at home, at least not with the other family
members in this study. Later on, CMI became the main language used at home with their children, nieces and nephews. Today, Mandarin only serves as a language of interaction with their spouses, siblings and parents. Occasionally, it is used as a 'secret language' with these people.

As a professional scientist working in a private company, Mimi uses all the Malay/Indonesian varieties: CMI, EJI, and SI, as well as Ngökó Javanese and Mandarin or a mixture of all of these, depending on the addressees or interlocutors as well as the topics and situations she is engaged in. CMI is employed with interlocutors of peranakan descent or with the younger generation of ethnic Chinese. With clients of totok descent, and others with the appropriate linguistic knowledge, Mimi tends to use Mandarin or a mixture of CMI, or EJI with Mandarin words and phrases. She uses German and English actively with native speakers of these codes and also with her friends and acquaintances who speak these codes. These two western codes are also shared with some of her family members. She uses SI on formal occasions such as meetings, seminars, conferences and so on, either at work or outside her workplace.

Titi also speaks Mandarin, CMI and EJI or a mixture of them with her friends and acquaintances who share these codes. She uses just Mandarin with other friends as well as her husband’s relatives from Singapore, Taiwan and China. Given that she did not spend very long at Indonesian schools and has never been part of the workforce in which Indonesian language proficiency is usually a requirement, it is not surprising that she says she does not speak standard Indonesian very well. As the data collected concerns only the family domain, there is no data to confirm her claims.

Both Mimi and Titi employ Ngökó Javanese to speak with their domestics and sellers at the marketplaces and CMI, Mandarin and/or Hokkien with traditional shop owners from ethnic Chinese backgrounds. Most of their knowledge and understanding of Hokkien is limited to the same formulaic bits and pieces that many others from their families know and Hokkien is more a passive than an active code. At church, they both use CMI or EJI with other churchgoers, while SI is the code used for the church

---

9 Although in some interactions with younger siblings (who are not part of the study), Titi uses some Javanese.

10 Most of these interactions with non-family members except those with domestics and some family friends are not found in the recorded data. The discussion above is based on the interview and the writer’s unrecorded observations.
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services. EJI is also the code they tend to speak with the national bureaucracy. EJI or EJM is usually the code employed in neighbourhood meetings, as well as that spoken with many of their neighbours.

To conclude, Mimi and Titi have the most varied language repertoire in family A. Of these two, it is Mimi who has a richer repertoire. The following diagram represents the codes found in the language repertoire of Mimi and Titi, the members of the 1940s age cohort.

![Active repertoire diagram]

![Passive repertoire diagram]

Figure 6.4 Language repertoire of 1940s cohort

Notes:
The shapes with dotted lines indicate that only some of the members of that particular cohort share the code concerned

6.2.4 The 1950s cohorts

6.2.4.1 The early 1950s cohort

This cohort consists of just one member: Indah (2FAT-Pd), who is an in-law who came from a peranakan family and who lives at family A’s house. As shown in table 6.6 below, she had Javanese and CMI as her home languages when she was young. At present, she mainly uses CMI with her children. During her first two years of primary schooling the language of instruction was Mandarin. Being an Indonesian citizen,
Chapter 6

Indonesian became her language of instruction from year three, after the 1958 decree forcing all Indonesian citizens to attend Indonesian schools. Outside the classroom, Ngókó Javanese and CMI were the codes used with friends and classmates. Although she began school with Mandarin as her language of instruction, today her knowledge of Mandarin is limited to daily routines, formulaic expressions, numbers and business terms. Similar to other family members of her generation, her Hokkien is also limited to numbers and business terms. She neither speaks nor has any knowledge of Foochow.

As a shop owner in a traditional market, Indah usually uses Madurese and Javanese for bargaining purposes, greetings, counting, numbers etc when speaking to her customers from Madurese and Javanese ethnic groups. Otherwise, she uses CMI mixed with a few Mandarin loan words to converse with ethnic Chinese. With others, she uses East Java Malay/Indonesian. Ngókó Javanese is employed with domestics, workers, and sellers at the traditional markets. CMI and Javanese are used with some friends and relatives, while Indonesian is spoken at government offices on official matters, with non-ethnic Chinese neighbours and friends. Although she does not speak Mandarin actively, she is of the opinion that it is a prestigious code, while Indonesian is more a code to show politeness to non-ethnic Chinese. She goes to a church where SI is used for the service. Indah’s language repertoire is shown in table 6.6 below and her knowledge of these codes is mapped in figure 6.5.

Table 6.6 Individual repertoire of the early 1950s cohort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and Code of Subject</th>
<th>Gen</th>
<th>Year of Birth</th>
<th>Language of instruction</th>
<th>Home language</th>
<th>other domains</th>
<th>Language repertoire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pri Sec Ter Others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Active Passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indah 2PAT-Pd</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>early 1950s</td>
<td>Mandarin, Standard Indonesian, Standard Indonesian</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Javanese, CMI</td>
<td>Malay*** Malay*** Malay*** Malay***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

***Malay varieties consist of EJM, CMI and EJI
Active repertoire

Passive repertoire

Figure 6.5 Language repertoire of the early 1950s cohort

6.2.4.2 The late 1950s cohort

Jade, an extended family member from family A is the only member of this cohort. She is a cousin who used to live with family A, and who continues to visit them since she married. The codes found in her repertoire are shown in table 6.7 below.

Table 6.7 Individual repertoire of the late 1950s cohort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and Code of Subject</th>
<th>Gen</th>
<th>Year of Birth</th>
<th>Language of instruction</th>
<th>Home language</th>
<th>other domains#</th>
<th>Language repertoire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pri</td>
<td>Sec</td>
<td>Ter</td>
<td>Others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jade 2FCT-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Late 1950s</td>
<td>Standard Indonesian</td>
<td>Standard Indonesian</td>
<td>Standard Indonesian</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
**** Malay varieties consist of CMI, EJI, Jakarta Indonesian

Being an Indonesian citizen born in the late 1950s, Jade never had the chance to attend a Chinese school, since the decree forcing Indonesian citizens to attend Indonesian schools had come into effect before she began school. Jade had SI as her language of instruction from primary to secondary, using Javanese and CMI in the school grounds. Later she learned English as the language of instruction for her tertiary education. Her home language was originally CMI, then a mixture of EJI and now she also uses some English with her children.
Chapter 6

At home, she uses Ngókó Javanese with the domestics, but Malay/Indonesian (East Java Malay/Indonesian) with drivers and other workers. With neighbours and churchgoers, Jade uses mostly EJI, although for church services, SI is the code employed. Ngókó Javanese, CMI, and JI are spoken with some friends and relatives who – with Jade – also speak the codes actively. In formal organizations and meetings EJI is used.

Although Jade did not go to a Chinese school, she learned some Mandarin Chinese from her circle of friends and business associates who know and speak Mandarin, but Mandarin is only really part of her passive repertoire. Along with some formulaic expressions in Mandarin, she also uses a few Hokkien loanwords related to numbers and business terms at her shop which she runs together with her husband. On the other hand, she has fairly active control of standard Indonesian, which she uses on formal occasions or in interaction with bureaucrats. She uses a variety of codes such as EJI, CMI, Mandarin, Hokkien and Javanese when making business transactions/deals, depending on the interlocutors involved in the transactions. She often uses CMI or EJI interspersed with Javanese or Mandarin words/phrases in a single conversational event.

Jade speaks similar codes to other members of G2 in family A. However, unlike the other members of this group, she is the only one who speaks Jakarta Indonesian actively\(^{11}\). All of the codes shown in figure 6.6 except Mandarin and Hokkien are part of her active repertoire. Figure 6.6 summarises the codes spoken by Jade.

---

\(^{11}\)She is married to a man from Jakarta and speaks Jakarta Indonesian with him.
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Figure 6.6 Language repertoire of the late 1950s cohort

6.2.4.3 The late 1950s cohort: generation in transition from family B

There are two subjects in this group and they belong to the third generation of family B: Tania (3FCTa) and Tom (3MATa). They are the only members of this generation in family B who went to a Chinese school. As shown in table 6.8 below, different codes were used as languages of instruction at different times in their schooling.

Table 6.8 Individual repertoire of generation in transition in family B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and Code of Subject</th>
<th>Gen</th>
<th>Year of Birth</th>
<th>Language of instruction</th>
<th>Home language</th>
<th>other domains*</th>
<th>Language repertoire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pri</td>
<td>Se</td>
<td>Ter</td>
<td>Others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tania 3FCTa</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Late 1950s</td>
<td>Mandarin, Standard Indonesian</td>
<td>Standard Indonesian</td>
<td>Standard Indonesian</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mandarin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom 3MATa</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Late 1950s</td>
<td>Mandarin, Standard Indonesian</td>
<td>Standard Indonesian</td>
<td>Standard Indonesian</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mandarin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

$ Malay varieties consist of Chinese Malay/Indonesian and East Java Indonesian

While Tania and Tom were in year two of primary school, the decree to close Chinese schools was issued. Thus, they had to move to Indonesian schools where they continued until year twelve. In the school grounds, they still used Mandarin words and
phrases (especially those referring to school matters) with ethnic Chinese friends, in addition to Ngókó Javanese. Tania went to a university where English was the language of instruction, whereas Tom went to a university with standard Indonesian as the language of instruction. Both of them learned Krama Javanese as a school subject in their primary and secondary years but never really came to use the code actively.

At home Tania speaks Ngókó Javanese with her parents and older siblings and CMI with her younger siblings. She is able to understand intergenerational interactions held in a mixture of Hakka, Mandarin, Javanese and all Malay/Indonesian varieties although she employs neither Hakka nor Mandarin actively herself except for a few loan words. English is sometimes used in her interactions among siblings, especially in order to exclude others. On the other hand, Tom, who comes from a totok-peranakan family uses CMI with his parents. Both Tania and Tom communicate between themselves in CMI and Javanese, but in Indonesian (EJI) with their daughter. They use Ngókó Javanese with the domestics at home, merchants at the marketplace, and becak\(^{12}\) drivers on the streets, and they use CMI or EJI mixed with Mandarin words/phrases and sometimes Hokkien numbers with merchants from an ethnic Chinese background. However, they admitted that the opportunity to use Hokkien is decreasing nowadays.

Tania is an English teacher and as such she is required to speak English and/or Indonesian with her colleagues and students. Tom is an accountant working in a private company and he uses Ngókó Javanese and EJI with colleagues, and EJI with clients at his workplace. He understands but does not speak Hakka, and he uses CMI with all his in-laws. Both Tania and Tom use CMI and Javanese with friends from an ethnic Chinese background. They employ EJI when they are in government offices and on other occasions with non-Chinese ethnic groups. At church, and at the neighbourhood meetings and the organizations they both belong to, they usually employ Indonesian (EJI) on formal occasions and CMI at other non-formal gatherings. They both go to church where the service is held in SI. In their interactions with family members they usually use two or three codes together: Javanese, CMI and some Mandarin words which are interspersed between the first two codes.

The following diagram displays the codes found in Tania and Tom’s repertoires.

\(^{12}\) A traditional local three-wheeled cart similar to the Singaporean rickshaw.
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Figure 6.7 Language repertoire of generation in transition

Notes:
The shapes with dotted lines indicate that only some of the members of that particular cohort share the code concerned see note on this above.

All varieties of Malay/Indonesian and Javanese are part of this cohort’s active repertoire, but the Chinese codes (Mandarin, Hakka and Hokkien) are only known passively. The foreign code (English) is part of the active repertoire of only one subject. Javanese and Malay/Indonesian varieties overlap since they influence each other and are often employed interchangeably. Starting from this cohort, the variety of CMI spoken has more elements from Indonesian and less from Javanese. Thus, for this cohort and also for the subsequent ones, the shape representing CMI increasingly overlaps with shapes of EJI and SI more than that of Javanese.

6.2.5 The early 1960s cohort

This cohort comprises the two younger G3 siblings from family B: Jenny (3FCTb) and Gugun (3MCTc). They both had SI as the sole language of instruction from primary school up to tertiary level. They also learned ‘Krama Javanese’ as Bahasa Daerah (lit. local language) as one of the subjects taught at secondary school, but never got to use the code outside the classroom. Outside the classrooms they employed Ngókó Javanese and CMI with peers and classmates. They used EJI with their teachers. All three of them
learned intensive English outside school as well as covering it as one of the compulsory classes at school, so they can speak it fairly well.

Table 6.9 Individual repertoire of the early 1960s age-cohort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and Code of Subject</th>
<th>Gen (Year of Birth)</th>
<th>Language of instruction</th>
<th>Home language</th>
<th>other domains$</th>
<th>Language repertoire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pri Ju</td>
<td>Sec Se</td>
<td>Ter</td>
<td>Others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenny 3FCTb</td>
<td>3 Early 1960s</td>
<td>Standard Indonesian</td>
<td>Standard Indonesian</td>
<td>Standard Indonesian</td>
<td>Standard Indonesian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gugun 3MCTc</td>
<td>3 Early 1960s</td>
<td>Standard Indonesian</td>
<td>Standard Indonesian</td>
<td>Standard Indonesian</td>
<td>Standard Indonesian</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
$ Malay varieties consist of Chinese Malay/Indonesian and East Java Indonesian

As shown in table 6.9 above, Javanese and CMI were the original home languages of this cohort. Jenny (3FCTb) speaks Javanese with her parents and older siblings as their home language. However, when addressing her younger sibling Gugun, Jenny uses CMI or a mixture of CMI and Ngókó Javanese. Both Jenny and Gugun use Indonesian (EJI) with their children at home. Hakka and Mandarin Chinese are part of the passive repertoire of this cohort. While they understand most of the family conversation held in those languages, their own production of Mandarin is confined to a few isolated words and expressions. Production of Hakka is limited to a few words that are used within their familylect. They also sometimes use English as a ‘secret’ code in their interactions with their siblings.

Jenny is an accountant at a foreign company, so she often has to use English and EJI, while Gugun, as an office worker has to employ EJI. At church, government offices, neighbourhood associations, and other organizations both subjects employ EJI. They use Indonesian with friends and peers from some ethnic backgrounds and/or EJI and Javanese with Javanese speakers. CMI, and often also Javanese, are used only in interactions with other speakers from an ethnic Chinese background. They use Ngókó Javanese at home with their domestics, with becak drivers and with merchants at the marketplaces. In business transactions, with ethnic Chinese, Jenny basically uses CMI or EJI but intersperses this with the use of Mandarin numbers. Gugun usually resorts to using CMI or EJI with next to no Mandarin.

---

13 Tania from the previous age cohort, the late 1950s, also uses CMI to speak to Gugun.
The following diagram shows the repertoire of the 1960s age cohort.
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Figure 6.8 Language repertoire of the early 1960s cohort

Figure 6.8 above shows that the members of this cohort, all the local codes including varieties of Malay/Indonesian and Javanese as well as English are part of their active repertoire. All the Chinese codes such as Mandarin and Hakka are only in their passive repertoire. Both of them understand some Hokkien numbers but never use them. The Javanese and Malay varieties overlap since they influence each other and are often employed together in switches and mixes.

**6.2.6 The late 1970s up to early 1980s cohort**

Three cousins from family A make up the late 1970’s and early 1980’s cohort. All of them went to Indonesian language medium schools from primary to secondary level, except for Denny, who had both Indonesian and English as languages of instruction. At Junior High, the subjects in this age group also learned Krama Javanese as the official ‘Bahasa Daerah’ at school, but they never use it. In the school grounds, they employed CMI with friends and Indonesian with teachers. They entered universities with either German or English as the language of instruction, so German and/or English are used actively by this group when they interact with other German and/or English speakers.
Denny and Amanda learnt German and studied in German-speaking countries, while Cindy studied in an English-speaking country. Both Denny and Cindy have a good command of English. They all go to churches where the services are held in Standard Indonesian. The three of them were still university students at the time of recording.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and Code of Subject</th>
<th>Gen</th>
<th>Year of Birth</th>
<th>Language of instruction</th>
<th>Home Language</th>
<th>other domains</th>
<th>Language repertoire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pri</td>
<td>Sec</td>
<td>Ter</td>
<td>Others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denny 3MCT-Pc</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Late 1970s</td>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cindy 3FCT-Pb</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>early 1980s</td>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanda 3FCT-Pd</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>early 1980s</td>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

#All Malay varieties including Jakarta Indonesian

Table 6.10 shows that this age-cohort uses CMI to communicate with their parents and siblings at home, and with their cousins at their grandparents’ home. They learned Javanese either from people living and working nearby, their peers at school, or from other circles of friends, and they profess to use Javanese as the language of interaction among themselves. Nevertheless, Javanese was not observed to be the language of interaction among any of them at home. Only very rarely did Javanese come up in short phrases during the interactions between these peers. With their domesticities and their drivers at home, this generation used CMI. Similarly they use CMI and/or EJI to communicate with friends both from ethnic Chinese and non-Chinese backgrounds coming to their homes.

As already noted, despite the government’s ambitiously rigorous nation-wide campaign to promote Standard Indonesian, it is not Standard Indonesian but colloquial Indonesian which prevails as the public vehicle of communication among the younger generations of Indonesians, including the members of this cohort. Cindy was observed to use Jakarta Indonesian with her friends who were not necessarily from Jakarta. This code serves as a prestigious code and was employed throughout their interactions. With other friends Cindy employs CMI and EJI. Cindy is also the only subject in this generation who claimed to understand a little Mandarin, but Mandarin is only part of her passive repertoire and none of the group was observed using it. All subjects employ
EJI in the neighbourhood vicinity. Business transactions in the markets are usually
carried out in either EJI or East Ngótó Javanese. Put into another diagram, the subjects’
language repertoire is as seen in figure 6.9.
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Figure 6.9 Language repertoire of the 1970s-1980s cohort

Notes:
The shapes with dotted lines indicate that only some of the members of that particular
cohort share the code concerned.

### 6.2.7 The early 1990s cohort

As seen in table 6.11, there is only one subject in this cohort. She is Rina (4FCTa) and
she belongs to the fourth generation of family B. She goes to an Indonesian school and
was still in year two of primary school at the time of recording. At school, she used EJI
and a semi formal Indonesian (SFI)\(^{14}\) with her classmates and her teachers. Her language
of instruction is Standard Indonesian.

Table 6.11 Individual repertoire of the 1990s age-cohort

---

\(^{14}\) Rina’s mother, Tania, said that it is not school Indonesian but a bit more formal than daily Indonesian.
At home, Rina and her parents communicate with each other using Indonesian (EJI). She also uses (EJI) with her playmates at home. She occasionally uses a few CMI expressions in her discourse when communicating with her parents, but not many. The interactions she has with her aunts, uncles, grandparents and great grandmother are in EJI too. When speaking to domestics, becak drivers, and the shopkeepers near her house, she also uses EJI. English is part of Rina’s passive repertoire since she takes an English course and her mother very often addresses her in English. In addition, she has recently taken up Mandarin lessons and Mandarin is also becoming part of her passive repertoire, as depicted in the diagram below. I assume that when she gets older, English and Mandarin Chinese might also become part of her active repertoire. So far, there is still no trace of Javanese in her active language repertoire. However, that might not remain so as her daily exposure to the local host codes spoken in her surroundings such as CMI and Javanese is quite intense, and she seems to understand the conversations conducted in these two codes well. The diagram of Rina’s language repertoire is shown in figure 6.10 below.

During my last visit in March 2005, I noticed that Rina speaks more CMI than she did on my earlier visits, and her mother informed me that Rina could also apply more of her Mandarin and English knowledge in their interaction. She also seems to be more confident in using English with others who addressed her in this code.
6.3 Changes in language repertoire across the generations

As can be seen and concluded from the discussion above, significant changes in language repertoire have occurred between the generations in each of the families. Table 6.12 below presents a summary of the codes typically used by members of different cohorts in different domains. As can be seen in table 6.12, there are notable differences in the language used in different domains by subjects from different age cohorts. The migrant codes are found in the language repertoire of the older age cohorts, but not in general amongst the younger cohorts, who tend to be stronger speakers of host codes. Most of the abbreviations and symbols used in table 6.12 are described earlier (cf. page 159) except for two additional ones:

NO: Non Office
O: Office

Sometimes more than one code is listed for a particular cohort and domain. This might mean that different codes are used on different occasions (e.g. depending on the interlocutor or the locale), or it might mean that code switching or mixing typically takes place. The code in bold is usually the first preferred code. Codes listed in brackets (...) are not used by all members of that particular age cohort while the parentheses {...} around Hokkien and Mandarin indicate only limited use with the kind of limited
vocabulary already discussed in previous sections. With Madurese, parentheses indicate that only greetings, and other formulaic (especially transactional) uses are involved.
Table 6.12 Code-domain relations for all 10 age cohorts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1910s</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hakka</td>
<td>Hakka, Javanese, Malay*</td>
<td>Hakka</td>
<td>EJIM/I, Javanese, JI</td>
<td>Hakka, Mandarin JI, EJIM/I</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Hakka, Indonesian</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Javanese Mandarin EJIM/I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920s</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Foochow</td>
<td>Foochow</td>
<td>Foochow</td>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td>Foochow Mandarin, EJIM</td>
<td>(NO) Mandarin EJIM/I</td>
<td>Mandarin Indonesian</td>
<td>EJIM/I</td>
<td>Foochow, Mandarin</td>
<td>Mandarin (Hokkien), EJIM/I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930s</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td>Hakka, Javanese Malay***</td>
<td>Javanese Mandarin</td>
<td>Javanese EJIM/I (Madurese)</td>
<td>Hakka, Javanese Mandarin EJIM (Madurese)</td>
<td>(NO) Mandarin EJIM/I (Madurese)</td>
<td>Indonesian Mandarin Hakka</td>
<td>EJIM/I</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>EJIM/I Javanese Mandarin, (Hokkien) (Hakka) (Madurese)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940s</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mandarin, Indonesian (German)</td>
<td>Mandarin, Foochow, CMI Javanese</td>
<td>Mandarin, Javanese, CMI EJ, Mandarin Javanese</td>
<td>Mandarin, CMI, EJ (Javanese) (German) (English)</td>
<td>Mandarin, EJ, CMI, Javanese</td>
<td>(NO) Mandarin, EJ, CMI, Javanese</td>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>EJ</td>
<td>EJ (German) (English)</td>
<td>Mandarin CMI Javanese (Hokkien)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

15 Home Language includes the codes spoken to non-family members such as domestics, care-givers and drivers who work and stay with the family.

16 The school grounds are actually part of the school domain postulated by Schmidt-Roehr (1932). Even though SI serves as the language of instruction at all educational levels, the use of SI outside the classroom is not strictly enforced. Thus, besides SI, the language of instruction, there are other regional codes that might be the codes spoken among the peers either in the play or school grounds. Hence, it is stimulating to find out what codes are found in the school domain, both inside and outside the classroom.

17 This only covers places such as traditional markets, small retail shops and other business deals the subjects perform outside places such as modern shopping centres, malls and banks. Transactions in these last mentioned places all apparently involved the use of Indonesian or in this case, East Java Indonesian.

18 Since it was only after the Fifth Indonesian National Language Congress in 1988 that Putat Bahasa publicised the new standard of Tata Bahasa Baku Bahasa Indonesia (Standard Grammar Of Indonesia) (Sneddon, 2003:134), the term ‘Indonesian’ is used to refer to the language of instruction. Only later is it referred to as Standard Indonesian. However, the published Tata Bahasa Baku Bahasa Indonesia did not really have a direct practical effect on classroom teaching. My personal observation is that even years later, teachers of Bahasa Indonesia still did not use it as a reference for ‘good and correct grammar’ of Indonesian in their teaching.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>early 1950s</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mandarin, SI</td>
<td>Javanese CMI</td>
<td>Javanese, CMI</td>
<td>EJI, Javanese</td>
<td>EJI, CMI Javanese</td>
<td>(NO) EJI CMI Javanese, (Mandarin), (Mandarin)</td>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>EJI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>EJI, CMI Javanese, (Hokkien), (Mandarin), (Mandarin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>late 1950s</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>SI, English</td>
<td>Malay**** English</td>
<td>Javanese, EJI</td>
<td>EJI</td>
<td>CMI JI Javanese</td>
<td>(NO) EJI, JI (Mandarin) (Hokkien)</td>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>EJI</td>
<td>EJI</td>
<td>EJI, CMI (Mandarin) (Hokkien)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>late 1950s (transition)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mandarin, SI</td>
<td>Malay $</td>
<td>Javanese, EJI, CMI (Mandarin)</td>
<td>EJI (Javanese)</td>
<td>Javanese, CMI EJI</td>
<td>(O) EJ, (SFI) (English)</td>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>EJI</td>
<td>EJI</td>
<td>EJI, CMI, Javanese, (Mandarin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>early 1960s</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Malay $ Javanese</td>
<td>EJI, CMI</td>
<td>EJI, Javanese</td>
<td>Javanese CMI EJI</td>
<td>(O) SFI, EJI (English)</td>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>EJI</td>
<td>EJI</td>
<td>EJI, CMI, Javanese, (Mandarin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>late 1970s to early 1980s</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>SI, (English) (German)</td>
<td>CMI</td>
<td>EJI</td>
<td>EJI</td>
<td>CMI EJI Javanese (Mandarin)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>EJI</td>
<td>EJI (Mandarin)</td>
<td>EJI, CMI, Javanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>early 1990s</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>EJI SFI</td>
<td>EJI, SFI</td>
<td>EJI SFI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.3.1 Changes in various domains

Table 6.12 illustrates that there have been substantial changes in the languages used by each age cohort in most domains.

The 1910s and 1920s age cohorts use migrant codes as their home languages, while the host codes: Javanese and Malay/Indonesian varieties mixed with migrant codes are spoken among the 1930s and 1940s age cohorts. Then Javanese and CMI are the home languages among the 1950s and 1960s age cohorts. For the 1970s-1980s age cohorts CMI is the only home language they speak and, finally, Indonesian (EJI) is the only home language spoken by the single 1990s age cohort representative.

Changes are also seen in the codes employed in the school playgrounds. The 1930s age cohort employed Javanese and Mandarin, then the 1940s age cohort used Mandarin, Javanese and other Malay/Indonesian varieties. Among the 1950s and 1960s age cohorts, Javanese and Malay/Indonesian varieties were spoken. Only later among the 1970s, 1980s and 1990s age cohorts Indonesian was employed.

Other changes have occurred in neighbourhood, friendship, work, and organizational activity domains. In all of these domains Indonesian is gaining in importance, while migrant codes are losing ground with the younger age cohorts. The generations born in the late 1950s and thereafter have had no experience of learning Mandarin and were neither formally nor informally exposed to the language. Apparently, in these domains, no Chinese codes are employed as the dominant language by the generations born after the 1960s. Instead, varieties of Indonesian permeate all the conversations of the generations after that time.

However, in the domain of business transactions that take place in markets, and in small businesses, a variety of codes is still being used by the older subjects. In addition to Malay/Indonesian and Javanese varieties, a smattering of Mandarin and Hokkien is still being employed by the 1960s age cohort, especially with business transactions involving those sellers or shop-owners who are ethnic Chinese. The migrant codes seem to still have a role as codes for business and transactions, if only to show solidarity or ‘in-group’ identity and thus to get a cheaper price. On the other hand, although there are also changes in the formal domain, such as in government offices, the code utilized with these national bureaucrats is mostly colloquial Indonesian but not the ‘school language’. 
None of the subjects reported use of the ‘school language’, although Standard Indonesian is often seen as the most appropriate code for this domain.

6.3.2 Changes within an individual's life time

In addition to changes in various domains there are also notable changes for individuals within their lifetime. Some individuals have had different preferred codes for some domains at different stages of their life. Naturally enough, such changes have mostly affected older people. One domain in which changes have taken place is the family domain. Almost all age cohorts have more than one code which they can use as a home language. Many of the older people from the 1910s to 1940s cohorts used only immigrant codes as home languages in the earlier parts of their life, but now use host codes. The early 1950s to early 1960s age cohorts tended to use Javanese and/or CMI as home languages in the earlier stages of their life, but these are today being supplemented with more Indonesian (EJI), especially in interactions with the youngest age cohort.

Members of the 1940s and late 1950s cohorts also switched their major languages for the school playground during their education, since they were subjects most directly affected by the government decree to close Chinese schools. Mandarin and Javanese were the codes they employed before they had to move to the Indonesian schools. After moving to Indonesian schools, CMI and EJI were also used.

Similar changes involving these age cohorts are noticeable in other domains such as friendship, work and neighbourhood. Although the migrant codes are part of the 1910s to 1940s cohorts’ repertoires, their frequency of use depends on the interlocutors and the occasions to use them. Given that fewer people understand them, they are naturally enough being replaced by codes such as CMI or EJI in most public domains, where use of Chinese dialects can also be viewed unfavourably.

As foreshadowed in the introduction, the next sections are devoted to a more detailed discussion of the degree of proficiency each of the subjects has in the codes within their repertoire.
6.4 Subjects’ language proficiency

This section provides an account of the subjects’ proficiency in each of the codes they have in their individual repertoires. In earlier sections of this chapter, the notion of language proficiency has only been addressed in very broad terms, and individuals have been labelled as having either an active, passive or no knowledge of the languages that are spoken around them. Of course, language proficiency is not, in reality, as simple as this. An individual’s proficiency in a language can be judged in much finer terms, and in this section I attempt to make a more detailed classification of language proficiency. Given the claims made by people like Giles and Coupland (1991), that linguistic competence is an important factor governing language choice, this is an important step to take. In fact, I would suggest that linguistic competence not only governs language choice, but in some cases it can also constrain choice by not making some codes available at all.

Canale and Swain (1980, 1984) claim that there are four components of communicative competence: grammatical, sociolinguistic, discourse and strategic competence. According to them, grammatical competence and sociolinguistic competence are the major components of communicative competence. Grammatical competence refers to the mastery of the linguistic code. This includes knowledge of vocabulary, rules of word formation, rules of sentence formation, semantics and phonology (Canale and Swain, 1980: 29). Sociolinguistic competence refers to the ability to understand and produce language that is appropriate depending on the topic, the purpose of communication, the setting, and the social relationship between the participants (Savignon, 1983, Swain, 1984: 9-10). Discourse competence is defined as the ability to connect sentences in stretches of discourse and to form a meaningful whole out of a series of utterances, whereas strategic competence refers to “the verbal and nonverbal communication strategies that may be called into action to compensate for breakdowns in communication due to performance variables or due to insufficient competence” (Canale and Swain, 1980: 30). In a similar vein, Saville-Troike (1996: 357) explains that “a speaker’s communicative competence includes knowing the alternatives and the rules for appropriate choice from among the alternatives or for switching between them”.

In assessing the language proficiency of subjects in this study, both grammatical
and sociolinguistic competencies are considered, although special focus is given to sociolinguistic competence. Without wanting to minimise the importance of lexico-grammatical competence in communication, I would argue that having sociolinguistic competence will help an individual interact effectively with others in any speech situation.

In this chapter, one’s level of proficiency in a certain language or language variety is measured against other members of the speech community who use that code and also against native speakers of the code. Despite some limitations in their sociolinguistic proficiency with certain codes, subjects could on most occasions communicate with members of their own micro society (speech community) with general ease using their active codes. However, the effectiveness of communication in some codes seems to decline when the addressees are native speakers of the codes concerned. For example, one might speak in Ngökó Javanese with a family member, since one’s sociolinguistic competence in the code is sufficient to use it within the family domain. However, one might avoid using Javanese with a native speaker of Javanese, since it may be felt that one’s sociolinguistic competence (and ability to use speech levels other than Ngökó) may not be sufficient for using it in another domain. In such cases, subjects may decide to use EJI when he/she feels she may not be able to achieve a satisfactory level of politeness in Javanese.

The detailed accounts of the subjects’ language proficiency are based on several sources of information. All family members were interviewed on their perceptions of their own proficiency in the codes in their repertoire. Participant observation by the researcher was also an important source of information, especially when the researcher was able to observe subjects in domains other than the family one in which data were recorded. The data gathered on family B was then reinforced by information provided by a member of the third generation of that family. She is a professional foreign/second language teacher as well as an educator and based her accounts on her professional knowledge as well as her observation of each of the family members. Similarly, the data on family A were supplemented by information provided by a member of the second generation. These accounts and observations, together with the recorded interactions

19 Refer to the proficiency scale below especially rating 5 and 6 respectively.
among family members at home, and in the workplace, in the neighbourhood and at organisations (for some members), were used to cross-check and complement data acquired from the interview.

6.4.1 The rating scale

Based on all the kinds of information just mentioned above, a proficiency scale was developed. This measures the subject's performance in a range of daily communicative tasks. As the foremost concern of this study is informal natural interactions, only the subjects' spoken proficiency is assessed. The scale is adopted and adapted from the ISLPR (International Second Language Proficiency Ratings) for Indonesian developed by Wylie and Ingram (2002b)\(^{20}\). It has also been inspired by LiWei's (1994) rating scale for Mandarin proficiency among British-born Chinese in Tyneside, England. In addition to their primary purpose of assessing adolescent and adult second language proficiency by formal testing, Wylie and Ingram (2002b) claim that the simplified version of ISLPR sub-scales are also applicable for self-assessment with no tests required. This assessment can be done by external raters in natural situations based on non-intrusive observation of real-life interactions, and it is in this way that they have been used here.

The scale for assessment is a seven-point scale. The scale is designed to indicate each individual's approximate level of language proficiency or ability to produce (as well as to comprehend) the language in practical daily interactions. In part, the ratings are designed to reflect how well speakers manage using a code with respect to speech community norms. Thus, the scales serve as indicators of both the subjects' sociolinguistic and grammatical competence. The following are the conditions of the scales:

0: no knowledge of the language
1: can understand singly occurring words for daily routines such as greetings, leave-takings, showing gratitude, simple questions and statements related to numbers, names of the days, weather, shopping matters etc
2: can ask and answer questions using own stretches of simple phrases/clauses/sentences and formulaic forms for basic daily needs and social transactional needs.

\(^{20}\) Ingram and Wylie changed ASLPR (Australian Second Language Proficiency Rating) into ISLPR (International Second Language Proficiency Ratings) in 1997 because of the growing international use of the scales.
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3: can engage in almost all social and community conversations in family gatherings, chatting with friends etc on familiar daily topics that are linguistically undemanding

4: can understand news on radio and television, films, lectures, speeches, sermons and so forth and perform effectively using more advanced vocabulary

5: can perform very effectively in all daily social and communal situational contexts related to commerce, recreation and own vocational fields

6: can perform very effectively in all formal and informal social and communal situations with the equivalent proficiency and sensitivity of a native speaker of the language speech community (same socio-cultural variety).

Goodenough (1965) considers that interacting members in the family are both speakers as well as hearers. Thus, when a subject can perform a certain task or fulfil a condition at a certain level, it follows that he has some comprehension of the code as well, and therefore he functions as a hearer too. This applies to all conditions in the scale but condition 1 which only refers to passive understanding and not to production.

In summary, a zero rating indicates no knowledge of the code, while 1 and 2 ratings indicate that the speaker is able to comprehend and use the code for a basic level of communication. A 3 rating shows an average non-native ability with the code, whereas a 4 rating serves as an indicator of above average non-native ability. The level of knowledge specified here is especially relevant in the assessment of codes that have formal orthography, grammar etc, and that are accessible through mass media such as TV, radio, newspapers, etc. Amongst the codes discussed in this study, Mandarin, Standard Indonesian, German, English and Hakka are of relevance. A 5 rating is used to indicate a speaker’s near native ability while condition 6 indicates the speaker has full native ability.

In the tables below, the assessed codes are arranged in groups of migrant, host and western codes. For Malay varieties, only CMI, EJI and SI are assessed. Although the subjects move back and forth along a continuum between these varieties, in informal situations (which are the focus of this study), SI—as the standard variety—is seldom found\(^{21}\). Nevertheless, proficiency in SI is assessed in the following tables.

---

\(^{21}\)In domains other than the family domain (friendship and especially work), some subjects were observed to glide along a continuum of codes (host codes or even migrant and host codes) in order to explore the interlocutors’ language repertoire and then to match the interlocutors’ competence on the chosen code.
### 6.4.2 The assessed codes in each family

The following tables display the proficiency of members of both families. As there are differences in the codes spoken by each family, the family members are grouped and assessed within their own family\(^{22}\).

#### Table 6.13 Family A's spoken proficiency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decade of Birth</th>
<th>Gen</th>
<th>Subject's name and code</th>
<th>Migrant codes</th>
<th>Host codes</th>
<th>Western codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td>Foochow</td>
<td>CMI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early 1920s</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Grandpa/Kong 1MCT-P</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late 1940s</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mimi 2FCT-Pa</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late 1940s</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Titi 2FCT-Pb</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early 1950s</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Indah 2FAT-Pd</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late 1950s</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Jade 2FCT-Pe</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late 1970s</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Denny 3MCT-Pc</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early 1980s</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Cindy 3FCT-Pb</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early 1980s</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Amanda 3FCT-Pd</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^{22}\) For the 1910s, 1920s and 1930s age cohorts, ‘East Java Indonesian’ is to be read as ‘East Java Malay/Indonesian’ as their code is mixed between East Java Malay and East Java Indonesian.
Table 6.14 Family B’s spoken proficiency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decade of Birth</th>
<th>Gen</th>
<th>Subject’s name and code</th>
<th>Migrant codes</th>
<th>Host codes</th>
<th>Western code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>CMI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910s</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Grandma/Bobo 1FCT</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early 1930s</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Filip 2MATa</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late 1930s</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lisa 2FCTa</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late 1930s</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Jon23 2MATb</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late 1930s</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ani 2FCTb</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late 1950s</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tania 3FCTa</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late 1950s</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tom 3MATa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early 1960s</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Jenny 3FCTb</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early 1960s</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Gugun 3MCTc</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early 1990s</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Rina 4FCTa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
NJ: Ngökó Javanese
CMI: Chinese Malay/Indonesian
EJI: East Java Indonesian
SI: Standard Indonesian

6.4.3 Variation in language proficiency

The tables show the subjects in both families differ both in the range of codes they speak and in how well they speak them. Some subjects have some knowledge of all the codes found in the family repertoire, but the majority of subjects have substantial proficiency in some codes but none at all in others. Most fascinatingly, some of the subjects in family B lack full native proficiency (as would be marked by a rating of 6) in any of the codes in their repertoires.

6.4.3.1 Range of codes spoken by subjects

Quite a wide range of proficiency levels in different languages are seen in tables 6.13 and 6.14. Five people have some degree of proficiency in all the languages from within their family repertoires. They come from the first generations born in Indonesia. Except

23 Jon and Ani’s Javanese is sometimes mixed with Madurese.
for these five subjects, all of the others have a rating of zero in at least one code, meaning they have no knowledge at all of that code. In general, members of the 1970s-1980s cohorts lack any knowledge of any of the migrant codes, while members of the 1910s and 1920s cohort, as well as most of the 1930s cohort lack any knowledge of the western codes. All of the subjects except the single members of the 1920s and 1990s cohorts have some kind of ability to speak all of the host codes. Their ability in these codes ranges from average to that of native ability.

One member of family A has some degree of proficiency in all the codes: Mimi (2FCT-Pa). She is from the transitional generation and she studied overseas. Mimi has an ISLPR score of at least 2 for all of the codes in the family repertoire so she is at least able to ask and answer questions using her own sentences for basic daily needs and social transactional needs in all of the codes.

Four members of family B also have a score of at least 1 in all codes found in the family repertoire. This indicates that they have some knowledge and understanding of singly occurring words for daily routines, numbers etc. These members are Jon (2MATa), Tania (3FCTa), Jenny (3FCTb) and Gugun (3MCTc). Furthermore, all the members of the 1930s cohort, who were the first Indonesian-born generation from family B, have significantly high proficiency in both migrant and host codes. These people are like others seen in studies of immigrants to different parts of the world (Clyne, 1967, LiWei, 1994, 1998a), where it is seen that the first generations of children born in the new country tend to have the best command of both migrant and host codes. In family A, however, this phenomenon is found only among the older siblings of the second generation (the first Indonesian born generation) who went to Chinese schools, i.e. the 1940s age cohort. Compared with family B, family A shows a wider range in proficiency, with the lowest proficiency in Foochow (only 2 points) and Javanese (3 points). The proficiency in other host codes ranges between 5 and 6 points. I argue that the differences are due to the different language experiences they have had. The older siblings of the first Indonesian-born generation from family A are younger than their counterparts in family B, and they went to both Chinese and Indonesian schools. Thus, these subjects had more exposure to Indonesian in both formal and informal situations but less exposure to informal learning of Chinese dialects.

Members of family A have higher overall proficiency in CMI, but lower
proficiency in Ngókó Javanese than members of family B. This might be due to the fact that the female member of G1 in family A was Indonesian born herself, and in addition to Mandarin and Foochow (to the older children especially), she spoke CMI with her children at home, while those of family B were both China-born, and used no host codes at home to begin with. Use of CMI in family B started only in the third generation. Another factor that probably played a role is the fact that family A has always been in urban Surabaya where speaking CMI was common, while family B started out in a more rural Javanese speaking area.

6.4.3.2 Lack of native-speaker competence/proficiency

Before addressing the issue of the lack of full native speaker competence in any single language by some of the subjects, it is worth asking the following question ‘What is a ‘native speaker’? A native speaker is defined in The Oxford Companion to the English Language (McArthur, 1992) as ‘a person who has spoken a certain language since early childhood’. The definition does not specify whether the language is one’s first, second or third etc. Bloomfield (1933:43) postulates that “the first language a human being learns to speak is his native language; he is a native speaker of this language”. Turner (2004) suggests that the term ‘native’ itself is no more straightforward than other troublesome terms such as 'language’ and ‘dialect’, all having many different shades of meaning. He suggests that a specific characterisation of ‘native’ be given each time it is discussed, and that the term be defined based on the field of discourse being discussed.

The characterisation of native speaker that I will develop has its roots in the ethnography of communication. Saville-Troike (1989: 16) states that “since the focus of ethnography of communication is on the speech community, and on the way communication is patterned and organized within that unit, clearly its definition is of central importance”. Being a member of a speech community is defined as “sharing the same language, sharing rules of speaking and interpretation of speech performance, sharing socio-cultural understandings and presuppositions with regard to speech. The focus is on shared rules for contextually appropriate use and interpretation of language” (Saville-Troike, 1996:356). Thus, for the purpose of this study, ‘native speaker competence’ is defined as “one’s ability to conform to, and interpret, the set of linguistic and sociolinguistic norms accepted in the speech community of the language, and to use the language with appropriate social meanings in different communicative situations”. Hence, in this study, the focus is on the subject’s full-fledged sociolinguistic
competence or proficiency in the codes concerned. Saville-Troike (1996: 357) explains further that

"individuals may belong to several speech communities (which may be discrete or overlapping), just as they may participate in a variety of social settings.... Individuals can orient themselves with the repertoire of any speech community at any given time and identify themselves with the associated norms and forms of expression as is common in bilingual and bicultural society...." However, "in a complex community it is very unlikely for any individual to produce the full range of the community's repertoire"

Many codes are spoken by the subjects of this study, and each of these codes has its own speech community. For the migrant codes, Hakka, and Foochow, the speech communities are the communities of Hakka and Foochow speakers found within the subjects' speech group communities. The speech community of Mandarin speakers is the community of ethnic Chinese Indonesians in Surabaya who speak Mandarin. The western codes, German and English, have their native speech communities in Germany, the United States and Australia (depending on where the subjects studied). The relevant speech communities for the local codes are the speech communities found in East Java or Surabaya where the subjects reside. For EJI and CMI, the speech communities are the EJI and CMI speakers in East Java24. For Javanese, in this study, the subjects were assessed against the native speakers of the wider Javanese language speech community in East Java.

Therefore, based on the above-mentioned definition of native speaker competence, it is understandable why most of the subjects claim that they lack native ability or competence in some or even all of the codes found in their repertoire. Their claims are based on a number of factors. With regard to standard Indonesian, all subjects, even those having the longest exposure to this 'school code', admit that they do not know the 'good and correct' grammar of SI, and they explain that they never use this variety in their informal daily interactions. The ever increasing prestige and importance of SI, together with the government's campaigns since 1974 to promote the use of 'good and correct' Bahasa Indonesia in all kinds of communication (Hooker, 1993), does not seem to have helped boost the subjects' proficiency to native competency in this SI. In daily

---

24 Errington (1998) states that Indonesian, which is in itself a growing and developing language is actually a non-native language. I agree with Sneddon (2003a, 2003b) who argues that it was a mistaken perception to consider that Indonesian has no native speakers. Errington, and some others, must have been thinking of Standard Indonesian and not colloquial Indonesian and its varieties. Thus, codes such as EJI and CMI also have native speakers.
interactions, East Java Indonesian is more likely to be used, leaving SI as a literate code. For the migrant codes, the younger generations said they can only use routine, daily lexical items or formulaic expressions found in the family repertoire and used in informal situations. Thus, they are not really confident in those codes. For codes such as Javanese, German and English, those concerned feel that they have not really mastered all the sociolinguistic varieties of the codes used by native speakers. They might have adopted many features of the culture of the codes but still have no full-fledged sociolinguistic command in those codes.

So, only for CMI and EJI, do any of the subjects think they speak the code well enough to be considered native speakers. These subjects are those having Indonesian as their language of instruction and using CMI actively, i.e. all subjects except G1 of both families, G2 and G4 from family B. This revelation seems to confirm Weldon’s (1974) findings that Chinese in four cities including Surabaya were more fluent and literate in Indonesian than were indigenous Indonesians. On the other hand, indigenous Indonesians were seen to have greater competence in regional languages which they used more often. It is not clear, however, whether Weldon referred to colloquial Indonesian or Standard Indonesian. None of G2 from family B, however, feels confident that they have the real competence of a native speaker in any of the codes in their repertoire.

Davies (2003) suggests that being a native speaker has something to do with the ‘confidence necessary for membership’ of the relevant group, especially for adult non-first language speakers. Membership of the same cultural groups means “an assumption of behaviour from other members as well as knowledge how to behave oneself in the normal range of situations in daily life” (Davies, 2003: 99). It also means “an acceptance of and an agreement to use certain norms of behaviour” (Davies, 2003: 203), ‘proper behaviour’: cultural and linguistic (Davies, 2003: 99). This kind of situation applies especially to G1 but also to G2 and G3 to a certain extent. The members of G2 and G3 ‘are hesitant’ to claim that they are members of the Javanese speech community. Janicki (1985) points out that non-native speakers tend to make errors in three types of sociolinguistic deviance (1) forms which do not exist in the target language; (2) forms which are inappropriate to the situation; and (3) forms ‘reserved’ for native speakers such as the use of slang, obscenities, informal pronunciation. With special regard to Javanese, I observe that the subjects of this study, from G1 to G3, also use non-Javanese
‘forms’ similar to those spoken by their peranakan counterparts as was reported by Kartomihardjo (1979) and Oetomo (1984, 1987b). As Gumperz (1971a:207) said that “multilingual societies tend to create their own norms which are often quite different from those prevailing in the respective monolingual societies”. The subjects of this study, like their fellow Chinese Indonesians speak Javanese which deviates from the norms current among native Javanese speakers themselves. This might be the reason why none claim to have native proficiency in Javanese (see §6.4.3.3.2 for further discussion).

6.4.3.3 Factors affecting proficiency in individual codes

Saville-Troike (1996:359) suggests that one’s degree of identification with and participation in a second language speech community might

“vary greatly depending on many factors such as the age of entry, the attitudes and the expectations of extant community members towards assimilation, and educational and employment opportunities or limitations. Thus, to function effectively within a speech community depends on many factors, not just language”.

How well the original migrants from China managed to integrate with the host community was no doubt a factor in determining the degree of linguistic competence these people achieved, but what Saville-Troike claims here cannot help to explain the competence in host codes developed by those who were born in Indonesia. Some of the likely factors at work for the Indonesian born are identified and addressed in the following sections.

6.4.3.3.1 Age, duration and intensity of exposure

The age at which one began to learn a language is an important factor in accounting for one’s proficiency. This can indicate not just how long one has been using a language, but also whether the language learner started to learn it before the ‘critical age’ after which language learning becomes more difficult (see e.g. Cook, 1995b, Ekstrand, 1976, Krashen et al., 1982, Singleton, 1989, Singleton and Lengyel, 1995). Thus, it stands to reason that the younger generations are more proficient in host codes than migrant codes as they were born in the country and grew up speaking some of these codes from

25 From the author’s observation, the subjects’ Ngókó Javanese is different from that of the native Javanese speakers, and is closer to the situation reported in Kartomihardjo (1979) and Oetomo (1984, 1987b). They wrote that the Chinese Indonesians make use of the ‘stigmatized forms’ avoided by the native Javanese speakers themselves and they use a lot of Javanized Malay lexical items instead, e.g. /kerjo/ from the Malay/Indonesian word /kerja/ ‘work’ for Javanese /nyambót ga'/ etc or Malaynized Javanese, i.e. /apaq-ə/ ‘why’ from Javanese /opoq-ə/, /peksə/ ‘to force’ from Javanese /pekso/.
a young age. On the other hand, the older generation are not surprisingly more adept at the migrant codes which they learned first.

The duration and intensity of exposure to the language, the language of instruction that one was exposed to at school, and the language of the workplace seem to be of critical importance for the subjects of this study. Those who have near native to native ability in Mandarin and Indonesian are those who have had substantial exposure to the codes through education, profession/work or both. Various differences of proficiency in Mandarin and Indonesian emerge across generations. The younger generations are less proficient in Mandarin but more proficient in SI, including its colloquial varieties, as one might expect from the history of their schooling. Those who attended Indonesian language schools show near native ability, 5 points, in SI. On the other hand, the earlier generations who attended Chinese schools have at least some basic communicative skills in Mandarin. Most importantly, their proficiency in this code varies according to the length of Mandarin education. The 1940s age cohort who spent the longest time in Chinese schools, attending right up to year 10 or 11, have near native ability, with 5 points. Similarly, two members of the 1930s cohort went to Chinese school until year 8 or 9, and they also have near native ability in Mandarin. All of these subjects have also employed Mandarin in their workplaces, thus reinforcing their knowledge of the language. On the other hand, members of the 1950 cohort who only studied in Chinese schools for two or three years attained only a score of 2 for Mandarin, but 5 in SI. None of these have had much opportunity to use Mandarin regularly since their school days. Duration of language use and intensity of exposure do help to explain proficiency (and confidence) in the codes.

Bobo (grandma) and Kong (Grandpa) provide a further illustration of the importance of duration and intensity of exposure to a language. The host codes at which they are most proficient are those they used most intensively in their work. Bobo was a regular user of Ngókó Javanese in her ‘retail shop business’ in the village and she shows more proficiency in this code than Kong. On the other hand, Kong is more proficient in East Java Malay/Indonesian than Ngókó because he used it to conduct some of his business deals. Kong is also more proficient in Mandarin than Bobo. As described in the previous chapter, although he learned Mandarin after his arrival in Indonesia, he has since then had constant exposure to the language through work, newspapers and television. It is this depth of exposure that accounts for his native ability in Mandarin.
On the other hand, he neither reads nor watches Indonesian television and thus has less exposure to SI, which explains his lower ratings of 2 points for SI and 3 points for EJI.

6.4.3.3.2 Language attitude, self-identification and self-confidence

As has been uncovered in the interviews, the subjects’ attitude towards the codes in their repertoire varies from generation to generation, and from code to code. The main issue is whether they identify themselves with the codes and whether they feel confident in using the codes. This issue is evident through their comments when they have to self-evaluate themselves (or others) on their proficiency in particular codes and through other questions put forward during the interviews. Some subjects suggest some reasons for their language attitude while some others just have no idea why. I summarize their answers and also offer some suggestions for this attitude in the paragraphs below.

As has been recognized by many scholars (Ferguson, 1959, 1968, 1970, Haugen, 1966), the kind of attitude a speaker has towards a second language helps to determine his or her proficiency in it. This idea is related to Gumperz’ suggestions about group identity. In his attempt to link language use (in this case code-switching) with group identity, Gumperz (1982: 66) introduces the notions of the ‘we-code’ and the ‘they-code’ and states:

“The tendency is for the ethnically specific, minority language to be regarded as the ‘we-code’ and become associated with in-group and informal activities, and for the majority language to serve as the ‘they code’ associated with the more formal, stiffer and less personal out-group relations.”

Gumperz stresses, though, that these kinds of relations between communicative styles and group-identity are more symbolic than they are predictive of actual usage. Reflecting what Gumperz states about the ‘we-code’, the older subjects of this study, and especially those born outside Indonesia along with some of the first generation born in Indonesia identified themselves most with either Hakka or Foochow and Mandarin as their ‘we-codes’ marking their in-group identity. Not only did they identify with their ‘we-code(s)’ most strongly they also felt most confident in using their ancestral dialects. All of these older people have either substantial ability or near native ability in the migrant codes and they continue to use the codes at home and in other domains with their in-group members. Although the Indonesian government may have outlawed the public use of Chinese, they were not able to force the speakers to abandon their home language overnight. These subjects may have begun using CMI with their offspring, and Ngókó Javanese, and Indonesian with others outside their immediate environment, but
they have continued to use the Chinese codes with which they identify themselves with others who know them and who speak the codes.

Attitudes towards a migrant code by later generations can also clearly affect the maintenance of that code in a new environment, as shown by Gardner-Chloros et. al (2005) on Greek-Cypriot in London, Pong (1991) on British-born Chinese children, and many others. A more positive attitude towards one’s ethnic culture, language and identity is manifested in the ability to maintain and speak a migrant language better than would be the case for people who are either ignorant or opposed to, the traditional values reflected in their ethnic culture and language. Interviews revealed that the third and fourth generations in these families do not identify themselves with migrant codes anymore, and this is reflected in their proficiency: none of the young generations have much proficiency in Hakka, Foochow or Mandarin.

Government policy and societal attitudes appear to have transformed the attitudes of the younger people in this study towards Mandarin as the language of their parents and Indonesian as the language of education, modernity and better employment prospects. When the interview was administered virtually none of these young family members showed any interest in learning any of the migrant codes. A powerful disincentive against using or abandoning a language is that some people feel ashamed of it or may have seen or experienced speakers being discriminated against (Trudgill, 1995: 177-8). This might be the case with these young generations who therefore identify themselves more with the host codes in which they tend to be more proficient. The older ones from this group tend to identify themselves with CMI while the younger ones seem to prefer EJ. They also identify these codes as their ‘we-codes’. Of all the local codes, CMI is the code all subjects, except the 1920s and 1990s age cohorts, felt most confident with. Therefore they identify themselves with it. They also felt it was

26 East Java Indonesian is also a code that is mastered to different degrees by members of all age cohorts. Those born from the 1950s on have greater proficiency than those born before them. All family members, except the 1910s and 1920s age cohorts, reported that they perform effectively and confidently in using this code both linguistically and sociolinguistically. All subjects from the 1940s to the 1990s age cohorts award themselves 6 points (native ability) for this code and identify themselves as native speakers of EJ.

27 CMI is the code usually identified with the ethnic Chinese from the peranakan community. Since CMI is discouraged from use in public and is considered as a ‘stigmatized’ code, these subjects prefer to use it within the family domain, among close friends, friends of similar backgrounds and sometimes to their school teachers who are also from an ethnic Chinese background. The third generation’s claim to have competence in CMI and use it as their home language is an issue worthy of note since CMI is not their ancestors’ or parents’ home language.
more convenient to use this code for their interaction with each other and with other ethnic Chinese. As seen in the tables 6.13 and 6.14 most subjects assessed themselves as having either near native or native ability.

None of the speakers of German or English identify with these codes but they reported feeling more confident employing these codes than their ancestral dialects or Mandarin which are all ‘foreign’ to them. I suspected that they may have identified and assimilated themselves with the speakers of these languages while they stayed and studied in those countries. The younger generations seem to be reluctant to learn either Mandarin or their ancestral dialects in spite of the older generation’s wishes to use the codes with them in their interactions. Hence, they have no proficiency at all in the migrant codes, not even the retained knowledge of a few routine words. This may be due to societal pressures on the ethnic Chinese, and discouragement from speaking Mandarin by the government and the wider community. This kind of discouragement is probably a factor that accelerates the process of language shift from migrant codes to other codes.

An intriguing question that arises is why CMI is singled out as the host code to be used at home, and the code which most of the older subjects rate themselves as native speakers of. In my opinion, it is first because CMI is a code that by its mixed nature has elements of three codes with which they are familiar: Ngókó Javanese, East Java Malay, and East Java Indonesian. Second, CMI is also the code they use in their in-group interactions with other ethnic Chinese, the peranakans, in spite of the discouragement or sometimes ridicule they receive from non-Chinese people. Third, as the government has waged a long campaign for Indonesian to be used as the only language of education, and mass media, Indonesian has gained considerable prestige. Speaking Indonesian is seen as part of the modern and prestigious mainstream and the vernacular language, Ngókó Javanese spoken by their parents, on the other hand, is seen to be less ‘modern’ thus ‘less prestigious’28. In spite of the prestige of Standard Indonesian, though, by its nature it is the language associated with schools, teaching and formal occasions. It is not appropriate in informal intergenerational interactions, where its use could lead speakers to be accused of ‘acting like strangers’ (Gumperz, 1970). Fourth, the older generations

---

28 There seems to be a corresponding shift from Javanese to EJI amongst the ethnic Javanese speakers in Surabaya as well.
do not really speak much EJI or feel very confident about using it, let alone SI, in their family interactions. One of the reasons for this is their lack of competency in it: the closest they can get to any form of ‘Indonesian’ is to use a code of a mixed nature that is less standard. Thus the nearest possible version to be chosen as a home language in the family domain is CMI and the version spoken by the young generation has more Indonesian lexical items in it. This explains why in both families Chinese Malay/Indonesian is the code they use and the one in which they claim to have a native ability.

As explained by Saville-Troike (1996:357) in §6.4.3.2 “individuals may belong to several speech communities (which may be discrete or overlapping)... and that each member of a community has a repertoire of social identities...and that each identity in a given context is associated with a number of appropriate verbal and nonverbal forms of expression”. Among the Indonesian-born generation in family B, another code they consider in some way as their ‘we-code’ is Ngókó Javanese, although among themselves, there is a diversity of opinion about calling this code their ‘we-code’. All subjects seem competent in this code in their interactions among themselves and with friends of the same ethnic background, close friends from Javanese background and to workers, drivers, and domestics. Although almost all subjects have a substantial level of proficiency in Ngókó Javanese, and are able to use this level in most social and community conversations with general ease and native-like ability, they are not necessarily adept at using all the Javanese speech levels (see the last paragraph of §6.4.3.2). For this reason, although G2 and G3 members learned Javanese during their childhood, and have spoken it since then, none claim to possess native speaker proficiency. None of them feel confident enough to claim ‘they are members of the speech community’ or identify themselves as native speakers of Javanese because their ability does not cover all the socio-cultural levels and values subscribed by the ethnic Javanese speakers. Most of them acknowledge that they feel confident in using Ngókó Javanese only within their own groups and community, but it is not necessarily the case when they communicate with the indigenous Javanese speakers with whom they prefer to use Malay/Indonesian instead (except in very informal situations to people they know very well, when they might resort to Ngókó Javanese).

Even though some members of the third generation (the late 1950s age cohorts onwards), had lessons in Javanese during their school years, the lessons used a more
literate version of Javanese which is not readily applicable for communicative purposes. Moreover, the variety taught is Central Javanese which is not common in East Java. Therefore, the lessons they learned at school are of little practical use (see chapter 5) and do not seem to boost their ability or their confidence in using the code with native indigenous Javanese speakers. Besides, some of them report that, employing Ngoko Javanese is sufficient for their communicative purposes without having to acquire the other higher levels.

6.5 Changes in Language Proficiency

Along with the changes in overall language repertoire that have already been discussed, there are also changes in the degree of language proficiency across age cohorts/generation, as is implied in the earlier discussion of variation in language proficiency. The older age cohorts are more proficient in migrant codes while the younger ones are more proficient in host codes. Although the younger age cohorts show a higher level of ability in the host codes, none has reported to have native competency in any of these codes except Chinese Malay/Indonesian. Some members of the younger age cohorts have also developed ability in western codes which is lacking amongst members of the older age cohorts.

However, there are some age cohorts, i.e. the 1930s (G2 of family B), 1940s (G2 of family A), and the 1950s age cohort (G3 of family B: the transitional generation) who have the benefit of being proficient in most codes, migrant, host and some even in western codes. Among them are Mimi (1940s age cohort) and Tania (1950s age cohort) who might be called ‘educational transients’. They do not experience language shift and they are the most stable multilinguals within the family, in the sense that the domains of using different languages in their repertoires are clearly defined and code-switching is mainly for peer groups, although also for older/younger age cohorts/generation.

6.6 Summary and Conclusions

There are discrepancies in the language repertoires of both families across age cohorts. Family members who lived through the transitional period in the Indonesian educational system – the older siblings of G2 in family A, and the older siblings of G3 in family B – seem to be the most multilingually proficient: they speak not only the codes shared exclusively by the younger generations but also the languages of the older generations:
Mandarin and their ancestral dialects. Older generations tend to be more proficient in the migrant codes while the younger generations are more proficient in the host codes.

The following sections present some general conclusions drawn from the above discussion of language repertoire and language proficiency. These cover the similarities and differences in language use between the two families, language shift, identity shift, and what might be labelled 'multilingual shift', as well as the state of the subject's multilinguality or 'multi-competence'.

6.6.1 Similarities and differences in the codes used between the two families

It is obvious that some codes are shared by virtually all members of both families. The most strongly shared codes across both families are Malay and its varieties, as well as Javanese. Mandarin is shared by members of the older generations, while English is shared by the younger ones. In addition, some members of both families also speak Madurese and many also know a few Hokkien loan words. Due to these shared codes, all of the members of each family are able to interact with each other satisfactorily. CMI is the code of interaction between the young generations\(^\text{29}\). In general CMI is part of the language repertoire of all age cohorts in both families except those born in the 1920s in family A and in the 1990s age cohort in family B.

In spite of these similarities, there are differences in the codes used in the home domain. CMI is the dominant home language of the 1950s age cohorts and the younger cohorts in family A. In family B, however, it serves as the dominant home language for the youngest member of the 1960s age cohort only. The age cohorts born before that, (in the 1930s and 1950s), speak more Javanese at home instead. Mandarin is spoken as a dominant home language among the 1920s and 1940s age cohorts in family A, while in family B, only a few Mandarin words/phrases/expressions are found in family interactions with the bulk of this found in the 1930s age cohort.

6.6.2 Shifts in language use

'Language shift' is a term used to described the process in which members of a minority group switch from their mother tongue to another language in everyday use (Fishman, 1972b:107, Trudgill, 1995:175). Labov (1976) has shown that changes in linguistic

\(^{29}\) Once I invited the young members of both families (one member of the 1940s and one of the late 1950s age cohorts from family A and B respectively) to get together and they communicated using CMI.
behaviour and age can be taken as indicative of language shift over time. This situation is paralleled in families A and B.

Many studies illustrate the loss of language and shift in different migrant communities such as Teochew in Singapore (LiWei et al., 1997), various migrant languages in Australia (Clyne, 1997), various varieties of Chinese dialects in Singapore (Gupta and Siew, 1995), Punjabi Sikh in Malaysia (David et al., 2003), Telugu in New Zealand (Kuncha and Bathula, 2004), and many others. As is typical with immigrant groups, a gradual weakening of the position of the immigrants' first languages and/or dialects takes place, and greater use of the languages of the majority population is found amongst subsequent generations (Boyd, 1986, Gonzo and Saltarelli, 1983, Pauwels, 1985, Stevens, 1985). These things are observed among the subjects, too. However, another factor is at play with the subjects of this study. It is true that the strength of migrant codes weakens in any migrant community, but I would argue that this weakening was accelerated in the subjects' cases by the closing down of Chinese schools in 1966 and the displacement of Mandarin in school domains. It seems that the prohibition on Mandarin Chinese as a language of education and as a language for public use is one of the obvious causes in its gradual disappearance in all domains. On the other hand, Hakka always predominantly a home language rather than a public one, was not as threatened by governmental policy and has therefore been able to survive longer.

As has been previously illustrated in each family, the migrant codes used by the subjects of this study survived until different generations after immigration. Host codes started to replace migrant codes in the generations born from the 1960s onwards in each family: with the younger siblings of the second Indonesian born generation in family B, but the younger siblings of the first locally born generation in family A. In general language shift is commonly found to happen within three generations (Boyd, 1986, Gonzo and Saltarelli, 1983, Pauwels, 1985, Stadler, 1983, Stevens, 1985). The fact that Hakka survived until the third generation in family B was probably also due to its use as a home language at the insistence of the initial male migrant. Clyne (1997: 452) also notes that intergenerational language transmission depends heavily on the home language use.
To conclude, what was reported by Tan for the ethnic Chinese in Indonesia especially in Java is equally applicable to the subjects of this study.

"Other changes are taking place in the social and cultural lives of ethnic Chinese especially among the younger generation. For instance, changing patterns of education have led to generational differences in language use at home and among members of the ethnic Chinese community, especially in Java. Whereas among the older generation some still speak good Mandarin or a mixture of Mandarin, Malay-Indonesian, and Javanese; and a very few speak fluent Dutch or a mixture of Malay-Indonesian with Dutch loan-words, the younger generation speaks only Indonesian or a mixture of Malay-Indonesian". (Tan, 1991:122).

It is probably safe to say that in these respects at least, the subjects of this study are reasonably representative of the totok Chinese in East Java more generally, and thus the kind of language shift seen in this study has probably taken place more generally among the ethnic Chinese from totok descent.

6.6.3 Shifts in identity
Along with the language shift that is taking place, there seems to be a shift in identity across generations as well.

Davies (2003: 11) states that “being a native speaker is a social construct, a choice of identity and a membership determined as much by attitude and symbolically as by language ability and knowledge”. As illustrated in the tables there are differences in the subjects’ language ability across generations. Moreover, as was uncovered through the interview with the subjects, the subjects have different attitudes towards different codes: migrant, host and western. Also, as was mentioned briefly in chapter 4 (see §4.1.5.4) and in §6.4.3.3.2 when attitude and self-identification are discussed, different generations identify themselves differently. For example, when asked why Kong/Grandpa maintains the use of Mandarin with his elder children, Kong asserted that it is their habit and adds that as Chinese they have to be able to speak Mandarin, or at least he feels they have to. All members of the second generation, especially the 1930s and the 1940s age cohorts, acknowledge that they are of Chinese origin and that they are Chinese Indonesians who speak Chinese, Javanese and Indonesian. This second generation (the first-Indonesian born ones) also identify themselves as peranakan. Most of the third generations, on the other hand, especially those born after 1965 simply say they are Indonesians, while some others cannot really say ‘who they are’ or simply say they are ‘mixed’. They comment further that they speak no migrant codes and they speak only Indonesian. As has been stated earlier, when the interview was carried out,
no one was interested in learning Mandarin or their ancestral dialects\(^{30}\). This shows that language ability goes along with the speakers' attitude, membership and self-identification.

Language shift is usually assumed to be accompanied by shifts in cultural or ethnic identity, and this situation is believed to be a common feature of the immigrant experience across the world.\(^{31}\) This certainly applies to the subjects of this study. It can be concluded therefore, that an identity shift is taking place across generations, be it ethnic identity, linguistic, cultural or political identity. This issue is beyond the scope of this present study and I will not explore it further.

### 6.6.4 Shifts in multilingualism

As we have already noted elsewhere, almost all of the subjects of this study are multilingual. Thus, the kinds of language shift discussed here are in effect shifts in multilinguality and multilingualism.

In family A, there is a rise in multilinguality from the first to the second generation but then a decline again from the second to the third. In family B, increased multilinguality occurs in generations two and three, and a drop in multilinguality occurs after that. Typically, this means that the first generation speaks the migrant codes and some of the host codes, the intermediate generation(s) speak a wide variety of migrant codes and host codes and sometimes western codes as well, and the younger generations generally speak only host codes and perhaps western codes. The intermediate generations, the transitionals and those in the aftermath, speak more languages than do members of other generations. This situation is similar to the situations of other multilingual immigrant communities reported in Asia, (Detaramani and Lock, 2003) in which there is a decline in multilingualism, or as in Israel where there has been a change in the patterns of multilingualism (Spolsky, 1996).

A summary of the language shifts or changes that have occurred in both families is

\(^{30}\) However, at present the single member of the fourth generation of family B (the 1990s age cohort) is taking Mandarin lessons. See §6.2.7 for more details.

\(^{31}\) Some studies suggest, however, that the language—cultural identity link is not consistent across groups. In some groups, language is intrinsically linked to ethnicity and the loss of language is associated with a similar loss of identity (see e.g Lewis, 1994). In other groups, however, strong cultural identity is maintained even in the face of the loss of native language. (see e.g. House, 2002, Khemlani-David, 1998)
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given in the following figures. The first layer, layer A represents the host codes spoken by the subjects. Layer B represents the most widely spoken migrant code, Mandarin, whereas layer C illustrates the migrant code of the speech group or language group in the totok community, either the Foochow or Hakka community. Layer D represents the codes spoken in the family domain. Layer E represents western codes found with one member of the 1930s and 1940s cohorts and then with most members of the 1950s, 1960s cohorts and all the 1970s, 1980s and 1990s age cohorts.

In figure 6.11 below, a depiction of the situation of the 1910s and 1920s age cohorts is given. These cohorts started learning the host codes (layer A) when they arrived in Java but are not native speakers of these codes. They speak the migrant code Mandarin (layer B) spoken among the ethnic Chinese community, their respective ancestral dialect (layer C) in their speech community and have native sociolinguistic competence in these codes. They also speak the mixed codes they use at home with family members (layer D). These age cohorts have good or near native proficiency in all of the migrant codes but not the host codes. Thus, the host codes are represented within a dotted circle.

![Diagram]

**Figure 6.11** The 1910s-1920s age cohorts’ state of multilingualism
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The following figure 6.12 illustrates the 1930s age cohort which was the first Indonesian-born generation in family B. They speak the codes spoken in the host society (layer A) and they tend to have native or near native sociolinguistic competence in these codes. They also speak Mandarin (layer B) with the ethnic Chinese, and their ancestral dialect (layer C) within their own speech community. They speak these codes with near native competence. They also speak the mixed languages spoken in the family domain (layer D). One member of this cohort speaks some English, the western code (layer E) so this layer is put in a dotted circle.

![Diagram of multilingualism layers]

- **Layer E**: Western code(s): English and/or German
- **Layer A**: Host codes
- **Layer B**: Migrant code: Mandarin
- **Layer C**: Migrant code (the ancestral dialect: either Hakka or Foochow)
- **Layer D**: All codes (mixed/not) spoken within family domain

Figure 6.12 The 1930s age cohort’s state of multilingualism

Figure 6.13 below illustrates the 1940s age cohorts. They speak the host codes (layer A), and the migrant code, Mandarin (layer B), within their micro society of ethnic Chinese with native or near native sociolinguistic competence. They have some knowledge of their ancestral dialect (layer C) and can make limited use of it, but have no significant proficiency in their ancestral dialect. Thus, layer C is shown in a dotted circle in this diagram. They also speak the mixed codes found in the family domain.
One member speaks German, the migrant code (E) and some English. Thus, the migrant code is also put in a dotted circle. However, as this member speaks German better than her ancestral dialect, Foochow, the dotted circle in layer E is thicker and darker than that of layer C.

![Diagram](image)

**Figure 6.13** The 1940s age cohort’s state of multilingualism

The figure below (6.14) illustrates the 1950s and the 1960s age cohorts. They speak the host codes with near native or native ability (layer A). They still know some Mandarin and use it to some extent, typically for business and family matters but they have no significant sociolinguistic competence in this code. Its frequency of use is limited too, so layer B comes in a dotted circle. Layer C, on the other hand, is gone from their repertoire as their spoken competence of their ancestral dialect, Hakka, is limited to a few words only. All speakers use the mixed codes in the family domain (D). All members speak English, the migrant code (layer E).
The last diagram (figure 6.15) illustrates the 1970s, 1980s and 1990s age cohorts. They speak the host codes with native or near native sociolinguistic competence and they also tend to speak the mixed codes spoken in the family domain. They have next to no knowledge of, or sociolinguistic competence in the migrant codes. Thus, levels B and C representing Mandarin and their respective ancestral dialects are gone. Instead there is layer E (Western codes) as all members speak either German or English reasonably well.
It can be concluded that a shift in multilingualism is taking place. The dominating migrant codes among the oldest cohorts are slowly disappearing and being replaced with the host codes and western codes in the youngest cohorts.

6.6.5 Multicompetence and multilinguality

As discussed earlier in this chapter, most of the subjects of this study never acquired full native mastery of all the codes they possess. Instead, each subject has a range of spoken ability in different codes (migrant, host and western) and tends to employ mixtures of codes in his or her interactions. Different individuals taking part in the same conversations will bring to the conversations different levels of competence in the codes they have in common. This is especially the case when intergenerational interactions are taking place (as discussed in chapters 7 and 8).

Saville-Troike (1996) notes that in a complex community, it is very unlikely ‘that any single individual can produce the full range of the community’s repertoire’. This explains the subjects’ various levels of proficiency in the codes in their repertoire, which are also found in the community. It is not too much to say that most of the
subjects of this study have 'multi-competence', through which they exercise their full native competence by combining the codes they have in their repertoire to sufficiently meet their communicative needs. When they are unable to use one code in a certain context, another code which they do have mastery of for that purpose can always be adopted. Thus, instead of having full native proficiency or full competence of all codes in their repertoire, these subjects possess what Cook (1992, 1995, 1996) calls 'multi-competence' in a number of codes. Some other scholars name this kind of competence differently: polylectal competence (Bickerton, 1975), varilingualism (Carrington, 1993, Youssef, 1996).

Cook (1992, 1996) characterises 'multi-competence' as the knowledge of two or more languages in the same mind. Cook's (1996) findings indicate that multi-competence is not the same thing as having several monolingual native language competencies put together. A variety of psycholinguistic studies (Beauvillain and Grainger, 1987, Caramazza and Broncs, 1979) has shown that multi-competent speakers think differently from monolinguals, at least in some areas of linguistic awareness. Often mentioned is the fact that the multi-competent lexicon in particular seems to be a merged system of two lexical systems that are still related to each other. Cook provides further evidence for 'holistic multi-competence' which includes the phenomenon of code-switching. In order for the language users to code-switch readily from one language to another, tight mental interconnections between the two languages are required. 'The very naturalness, smoothness, and comprehensibility of code-switching is evidence in favour of holistic multi-competence' (Cook, 1992:570).

Ervin and Osgood (1954) distinguish between 'compound bilinguals' who have unequal competence of two languages which they employ in the same social context, and 'coordinate bilinguals', who have near-native ability in two languages which they employ in distinct social settings. Their evidence shows that coordinate bilingualism is more stable. In the multilingual situation where my subjects live, multilingualism is a normal integral component of social interaction and in order to be able to participate fully in the community life, one has to be multilingual. Following from Ervin and Osgood' views it seems some of the subjects of this study are real 'coordinate multilinguals', having near native ability in a number of codes which they employ in distinct social settings. These subjects are (a) the 1930s and the 1940s age cohorts who have near native ability in migrant codes as well as in some of the host codes; and (b)
members of the late 1950s, 1960s, 1970s and 1980s cohorts who have near-native ability in both host codes and western codes. Others, on the other hand, are 'compound multilinguals' who do not have equal competency in all of the languages which they may use in similar social contexts. This applies to the 1920s and the 1990s age cohort. In general the subjects exhibit a mixture of coordinate and compound multilinguality, showing signs of coordinate multilinguality in some codes but only compound multilinguality with others. The codes involved in these sorts of relationships vary across age cohorts. The implication is that the subjects have different states of multilinguality but they are all multi-competent. An elaborated discussion of these findings is beyond the scope of this study.

As has been concluded above, some major language shifts have taken place. Although the members of these families have all been multilingual for generations, the codes that people from different eras have proficiency in have changed. Language shift in immigrant communities is a common-place occurrence across the world and many instances of it have been reported in the linguistic literature. What distinguishes the situation amongst the ethnic Chinese community of Surabaya is not so much that language shift has taken place, but the multilingual nature of this language shift. The increasing use of western codes such as German and English suggest that we have a situation of multilingualism in ongoing transition.

The shifts in language and identity that have taken place include language obsolescence and a reduction in the number of domains migrant codes are used in. In addition, there has been acculturation to the local culture and language by the younger generations as well as a move towards modernization and internationalization with the use of western codes.
Language Repertoire, Language Proficiency and Language Shifts
Chapter 7

Patterns of Unmarked Code Choice in Dyadic Interactions

7.0 Introduction

The present chapter is devoted to discussing the subjects’ language activities within the family domain, with a special focus on patterns of code-choice in dyadic interactions. There are two basic and one additional question raised for discussion in this chapter. The two basic questions are ‘How is it that there is variation in the subjects’ unmarked code choice patterns, either inter- or intra-speaker?’, and ‘why are there variations in a speaker’s code choice pattern towards different family members?’ The additional question is ‘what happens to the migrant codes?’

The subjects’ code choice behaviour is to be discussed using the Myers-Scotton’s (1993b) Markedness Model as elaborated in chapter 2. One of the major aims in this chapter is to establish that speakers are rationally-active actors, or in Myers-Scotton's words:

a. that ‘speakers have an innate theory of socially-relevant markedness and indexicality’ (Myers-Scotton, 1992:148), and

b. that ‘their code choices are based on the persona and/or relation with others which they wish to have in place’(Myers-Scotton, 1993b:75, 111), and

c. that as ‘rational actors speakers make the choices as individuals, not merely because norms cause them to do so but because they consider the consequences, and then go ahead and do as well for themselves as they believe they can’, and ‘because perceptions are not the same as opportunities, not everyone makes the same code choice in the same circumstances’ (Myers-Scotton, 1997b:197).

Since individual motivations are the driving forces behind choice in speech behaviour (Shepard et al., 2001: 34), I argue that even unmarked code choice behaviour
is motivation driven: unmarked codes first need to be negotiated between individual speakers and interlocutors. Speakers also have an innate capacity for evaluating a code's level of markedness and appropriateness in different circumstances.

As explained by Myers-Scotton, (1993b: 85): "indexicality derives from the fact that the different linguistic varieties in a community's repertoire are linked with particular types of relationships, because they are regularly used in conversations involving such types. Through this type of accumulation, a code comes to index an RO set". I would propose that because of differences in proficiency in different languages, different subjects have different kinds of indexicality for different interlocutors even though the code that is chosen might be the same.

Therefore, to set up the 'basic colour' or index of their relationship with each family member, each subject tends to respond according to their family membership which has its own indexed set of rights and obligations. They carry it out through the use of codes perceived as having certain societal status, role and prestige. In addition, the variation in the subjects' code choice practices to different interlocutors, especially the intra-speaker variation, confirms that they tailor their code choices not only to 'suit' their interlocutors but especially also to meet their own intentions.

To offer a better ground of explanation for the subjects' rationality, I propose some minor additions to Myers-Scotton's existing three filters. Also to arrive at a sound explanation of the subjects' rationality, I evaluated her perceptions against the intuitions of the informants/subjects for subjectivity. As suggested by Milroy, "to specify the situation in which bidialectal speakers shifted from one code to another and to explain this code-switching behaviour in terms of its social functions to speakers, it is necessary to focus on the relationship between the choice of code and the local systems of social values rather more explicitly than is usual in the work of Labov" (Milroy, 1987: 65). Thus, the social factors affecting the code choices are discussed as well.

This chapter consists of three sections. The first section presents the suggested refinement details of the Markedness Model to suit the subjects and the data analysed. Section two presents a series of tables showing the patterns of unmarked code choices in dyadic interaction between pairs of family members. It also discusses the manifestations of code-switching practices in the subjects' interactions. The third section covers the

---

1 RO stands for Rights and Obligations. Myers-Scotton (1993b:85) explains that an RO set is "an abstract construct, derived from situational factors, standing for the attitudes and expectations of participants towards each other" (see §2.6.2.1.1 for further discussion on Markedness Model).
connection between variation and rationality. This chapter only covers the use of unmarked code in dyadic interactions, while the use of marked code in dyadic and both unmarked and marked choices in group interactions will be covered in the next chapter.

7.1 Markedness Model in multilingual families under study

7.1.1 Some added details to Myers-Scotton’s Extended MM

It is understood that for Myers-Scotton, language repertoire is seen as a difference between the ability to speak or not to speak a language. In this study language repertoire is treated as a somewhat more complex phenomenon, since it is important to recognize that speakers have different degrees of proficiency which can enable them to participate to different degrees depending on which code is involved. For this purpose, I would like to refine Myers-Scotton’s opportunity set to include the speaker’s communicative competence which includes their sociolinguistic competence. This should be taken into account when assessing their language repertoire. This issue is not taken up in Myers-Scotton’s model of Markedness theory (see Myers-Scotton, 2000:1260). I will propose and show that the subject’s linguistic competence also serves as an evaluator, filter or a basic constraint on whether the code will be employed as an active choice or will only serve as a passive code in the interactions. This is especially relevant when the subject is engaged in group interactions involving codes he does not actively master. With the code in his passive repertoire, a speaker is able to follow or participate in the ongoing conversation although he is unable to use the particular code chosen by other speakers. In the same way, a speaker’s linguistic competence helps determine which code to use with certain interlocutors. A speaker evaluates an interlocutor’s linguistic competence in different codes and uses this knowledge to determine to what extent he can or cannot use a particular code with his interlocutors, whether to use it in full-fledged form or just to use singly occurring words, phrases etc. Thus, language proficiency serves as a driving factor in whether one is able to make full or limited use of one’s language repertoire in one’s interactions.

In addition, as the aim of this chapter is to analyse natural interactions in the family domain\(^2\), I translate and specify social norms to cover not only the prevailing societal norms in their community as implied in Myers-Scotton’s model, but also the

\(^2\) As discussed in chapter 4, the notion of family in the family domain covers both kernel and extended family members.
salient ones in the respective family concerned. These family norms include the micro speech norms pertaining to interactions held between certain sets of speaker-interlocutor in the family. These may be specific for that particular pair or may also be relevant for other family members within that family.

As Shepard, Giles and Poire (2001:38) put it “when engaging in interactions, people have beliefs about what is appropriate and acceptable behaviour”. For this purpose I ‘refine’ the second filter in Myers-Scotton’s extended MM by including not only the somatic marker and markedness evaluator but also an appropriateness evaluator. When developing her markedness evaluator, Myers-Scotton originally tied this idea to Hymes’ (1972b) listed criterion for a competent speaker ‘whether something is appropriate to the context’ (see §2.6.2.1.1 and §2.6.2.1.2). Thus, I consider that my appropriateness evaluator is fittingly tied to Myers-Scotton’s markedness evaluator.

As Myers-Scotton (1998c:22) puts it, with the markedness evaluator, one has the ability to recognize and comprehend that making marked choices offers different consequences from making unmarked ones. With the appropriateness evaluator, I would say that it enables one not only to recognize and comprehend the consequences but also to assess the best possible choice from a range of either marked or unmarked codes available in the markedness continuum. The subjects live in a norm-sensitive environment of ‘mixed-culture’, where age (generation) and status (social, family membership, role relations) determine one’s position in the family and where misjudgement on the appropriate code chosen in particular conversations might put one in a very vulnerable situation. Thus, in most cases a subtle demonstration of appropriate formality in interactions is called for and one’s awareness or understanding of the culture and norms should be reflected in code choice practice amongst other things. In this case, knowing the norms and choosing the most appropriate marked/unmarked code

---

3 As discussed in §2.6.2.1.2, Myers-Scotton (1998c, 2000: 1261, 2001b) proposes three filters in her Extended Markedness Model:

a. external factors: structural constraints which produce opportunity sets which in MM are translated as social contexts which produces the speaker’s linguistic repertoire

b. internal factors: two innately available devices programmed by the speaker’s experience: Damasio’s idea of ‘somatic markers’ and MM’s ‘markedness metric’ which in the extended model, is referred to as a ‘markedness evaluator’.

c. rationality and social norms.

4 Most of the subjects are Indonesian-born Chinese who live in Java. Inevitably, their culture contains traits of both Chinese and Javanese cultures. In Javanese culture, an important consideration one has to take is the interlocutor’s social status. This is determined among other things by one’s social standing (status and position in society, social hierarchy), wealth, family background, education, etc. In Chinese culture, other factors such as one’s age and kinship relations are also important in code choice practices.
for a particular interlocutor in particular circumstances is a skill a speaker has to
develop from early childhood. One usually learns this skill from one’s parents and
surroundings, and gains sufficient practice in it that eventually it is performed
subconsciously. An appropriateness evaluator is especially required in subtle and
vulnerable situations. Such situations include the earliest interactions between in-laws
when one has to negotiate the index of the RO set and set unmarked code choices for
‘the first time’.

To sum up, for this study
1. the first filters are external ones derived from social factors, i.e. the opportunity
   sets which consist of the subjects’ language repertoire and language proficiency.
2. the second filters are the internal ones: the innate intuition-based capacity for
   making the best decision for survival, i.e. the somatic marker, the markedness
   evaluator and the appropriateness evaluator,
3. the third filter is rationality—the speaker’s intentionality in his actions and
   social norms which include family norms.

These three filters are applied when analysing the data. However, before going
on with that analysis we need to discuss the kinds of steps that are taken and what kind
of data is involved. These issues are discussed in the next section.

7.1.2 Code choice behaviour data and steps taken
The code-switching data analysed in this chapter is found within the family domain.
They consist of both situational and conversational code-switching. The situational
code-switching is participant related as it refers to ‘the attributes of the speaker’ (Auer,
1988:192). This kind of code-switching depends on societal consensus (Myers-Scottot
and Ury, 1977:5). Conversational code-switching, on the other hand is discourse-related
and it serves as an organizing strategy to assign interactional values to the code-
switched utterances (Auer, 1998:4). They are discussed in chapters 7 and 8 respectively.

According to past research, some bilinguals use situational code-switching at a
very young age. These types of bilinguals are raised within families with a ‘one person-
one language’ principle and are shown to have sensitivity to appropriate language
choice depending on addressees from a very early age (Genesee et al., 1995, Goodz,
come from similar circumstances, where there is a basic one person-one/two code
principle. As shown in the tables 7.1 and 7.2 on the subjects’ code choice behaviour, the
subjects under study assign different codes at different times to different interlocutors in the families.

How and why a particular code is negotiated to serve as the unmarked norm is worth discussing. In trying to prove that unmarked code choice patterns are rationally-based choices, I compare a speaker’s code choice behaviour towards different interlocutors in his or her family and point out the probable rationale behind his or her choices for each of them. In trying to uncover such a rationale, I take into account the subjects’ comments and perceptions of themselves, their relations to others, their attitudes towards the code chosen and factors such as social status and age,

I also consider the filters that have already been identified, and the social context of the codes involved, including their status in the society in general and in the family interactions in particular. I discuss how the filters can be seen as operating for each dyad.

7.2 The unmarked code choice pattern

This section presents tables which show code choice and patterns of language use in terms of ‘who speaks what language to whom’ (Fishman, 1971). Prior to presenting the tables, I describe how the codes and speakers are mapped into tables, and following the tables is a discussion of the variation shown in the tables and the factors behind the variation.

7.2.1 Mapping the subjects’ code choice behaviour

Myers-Scotton (1993b: 81) stated that “the unmarked is definitely the reference point for the marked choice. That is, the marked choice takes on much of its significance as being not the unmarked choice” (the italics are hers). For this reason, the patterns of the subjects’ unmarked code choices should be constructed before a sound analysis can be performed. Tables 7.1 to 7.4 below display the unmarked structure of the subjects’ preferred code choice for each dyad analysed. These code choice patterns are constructed based on ethnographic questionnaire interviews with the subjects (who detailed their preferred code choice for different interlocutors), participant observation and analysis of recorded interactions. Not all speakers are aware of why they use a particular code with a particular family member apart from saying that it is a matter of habitual action. However, some, especially the younger generations, are aware of their code choice practices and can supply reasonable accounts explaining them.
The code(s) listed is the code(s) usually used or preferred in the majority of daily interactions between those particular pairs. In general, using these unmarked codes does not usually yield any significant changes signalling a redefinition of their RO set. Yet, these unmarked patterns are rationally-based choices negotiated in the first place to serve as an RO index between those particular pairs of Speaker and Interlocutor (hereafter S-I) as discussed in later sections.

All the information collected on the subjects' code choice behaviour is illustrated in a scale of interaction. The scale is adopted and adapted from Gal's (1979:102) and Li Wei's (1994:90-95) work. The scale indicates the intra-speaker and the inter-speaker axes of linguistic variation in code choice. The intra-speaker dimension denotes the different variation of codes or styles within the speech of a single speaker, while the inter-speaker dimension indicates the differences between the speech of different speakers (Bell, 1984, 1997). The speakers are ranked on the vertical axis while the interlocutors for those speakers are listed in the horizontal axis. So a speaker's code choices to different interlocutors are displayed along the horizontal axis, while the codes used to address an interlocutor by different speakers are displayed along the vertical axis. The tables then display the variations that occur between speakers (different speakers with different choices, or different speakers with the same choice) as well as within the speaker (the same speaker with varying choices to different interlocutors). As the speakers are ranked according to age cohorts/generations from the oldest to the youngest in both horizontal and vertical axis, the differences portrayed indicate the intergenerational variation in code choices both between and within speakers from the oldest to the youngest. So, the tables here reflect a two-directional means of communication (Speaker-Interlocutor and vice versa) rather than a one-way communication (from Speaker to Interlocutor only) as in Gal's (1979) or LiWei's (1994) studies. It needs to be borne in mind that the interlocutors have no choices about the codes used to address them. It is the speakers who decide which code will be chosen to address their interlocutors. Later, the interlocutors decide which code is to be used to answer the people with whom they are speaking.

Table 7.1 shows unmarked code choices between members of family A and table 7.2 shows unmarked choices between members of family B.
### Table 7.1 Unmarked code-choice patterns in family A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>Year of Birth</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gen</td>
<td>Start Year</td>
<td>1MCT-P Grandpa/Kong</td>
<td>2FCT-Pb Mimi</td>
<td>2FCT-Pb Titil</td>
<td>2FAT-Pd Indah</td>
<td>2FCT-Pd Jade</td>
<td>3MCT-Pc Denny</td>
<td>3FCT-Pb Cindy</td>
<td>3FCT-Pd Amanda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>*Mandarin, EJM/I Foochow</td>
<td>*Mandarin, EJM/I Foochow</td>
<td>EJM/I, Mandarin</td>
<td>EJM/I, Mandarin</td>
<td>EJM/I</td>
<td>EJM/I</td>
<td>EJM/I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>CMI, Mandarin, Foochow</td>
<td>CMI, Mandarin (Javanese)</td>
<td>CMI</td>
<td>CMI</td>
<td>CMI</td>
<td>CMI</td>
<td>CMI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>CMI</td>
<td>CMI</td>
<td>CMI</td>
<td>CMI</td>
<td>CMI</td>
<td>CMI</td>
<td>CMI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>CMI</td>
<td>CMI</td>
<td>CMI</td>
<td>CMI</td>
<td>CMI</td>
<td>CMI</td>
<td>CMI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>CMI</td>
<td>CMI</td>
<td>CMI</td>
<td>CMI</td>
<td>CMI</td>
<td>CMI</td>
<td>CMI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>CMI</td>
<td>CMI</td>
<td>CMI</td>
<td>CMI</td>
<td>CMI</td>
<td>CMI</td>
<td>CMI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

The codes in each cell are listed in descending frequency of use or preference as employed by that particular speaker to that particular interlocutor. The first code in the list is always the preferred code, the second code can be either his second preferred code or together with the first code, they might be used interchangeably/alternately in code-switching instances. However, except for the first generation, as the second preferred codes, the migrant codes, Mandarin and Hakka, are never used entirely on their own. Instead, they always appear with the first code listed. The third/fourth code is the third/fourth preferred code, the words/phrases of which are used together with the other previous two.

( ): When the second or the third code is put in brackets, its use comprises limited words or lexical items. These items are usually singly-occurring words, terms or expressions e.g. numbers, names of the days, the clock time, certain adjectives, daily routines, concepts or expressions found in family repertoire which are inserted into the previous code(s).

*one asterisk indicates that although the first code listed is the first preferred (dominant) one, the other code(s) listed almost always appear together with the first code in one conversational event that involved those particular speakers and interlocutors. Their use is what Myers-Scotton refers to as unmarked code-switching (1998a).

EJM/I: East Java Malay/Indonesian is a (broken) mixture of East Java Malay and East Java Indonesian spoken by the first generation members of both families. The dominant lexical items employed in the mixture are from East Java Malay.

CMI: Chinese Malay/Indonesian

EJI: East Java Indonesian
Some clear trends about the main languages used by different speakers to different addressees are clear from table 7.1. Grandpa/Kong (1MCT-P) – the sole member of the first immigrant generation from family A – uses code-switching between Mandarin and East Java Malay/Indonesian as his unmarked strategy with his two oldest daughters, Mimi and Titi. With these two he also uses a little Foochow. With his daughter-in-law, Indah, and his youngest daughter, Jade, his unmarked code-choice is East Java Malay/Indonesian. Mandarin serves as a more marked code in his encounters with these two. With all of the younger family members, Grandpa uses East Java Malay/Indonesian as his unmarked code choice.

The second generation exhibit split preferences in terms of unmarked code choice. The two older members of this generation, Mimi and Titi were both born in the late 1940s, while the younger cohort from this generation, Indah and Jade, were born in the 1950s. The older cohort tends to use unmarked code switching with the first generation: predominantly CMI but with some Mandarin as well. The younger cohort, on the other hand, uses CMI alone as the unmarked code in its interactions with Grandpa. Among themselves, Mimi and Titi use CMI with some Mandarin as their unmarked code. Both of them choose CMI as their unmarked code with their younger siblings and nieces and nephew from the third generation. However, between Titi and Jade, Javanese is also used in addition to CMI.

The third generation consists of Denny, Cindy and Amanda who are cousins. They tend to use CMI as their unmarked code with all family members including among themselves. However, to address Grandpa they use East Java Indonesian (EJI). This code is perceived as having higher and prestigious status than CMI which has a ‘mixed’ nature.

All in all, these 8 family members have different code preferences for each individual family member.

---

5 The additional data collected among the younger siblings of the second generation of family A showed that they use Ngôkô Javanese among themselves as part of their code of interaction at home. These subjects were born in the 1960s.
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Table 7.2 below shows the code-choice patterns of the members of family B who consist of ten members listed from the first up to the fourth generation, Rina, the 1990s age cohort.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>Year of Birth</th>
<th>Interlocutor speaker</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1FCT Grandma/Bobo</td>
<td>2PCTa Lisa</td>
<td>2MATa Filip</td>
<td>2PCTb Ani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>e1910s</td>
<td>1FCT Grandma/Bobo</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>*Javanese, Hakka, CMI</td>
<td>Hakka</td>
<td>*Javanese, Hakka, CMI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>L1930s</td>
<td>2PCTa Lisa</td>
<td>*Javanese, Hakka, CMI (Mandarin)</td>
<td>Javanese</td>
<td>Javanese, Hakka, CMI (Mandarin)</td>
<td>CMI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e1930s</td>
<td>2MATa Filip</td>
<td>Hakka</td>
<td>Javanese, Hakka, CMI (Mandarin)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Javanese, Hakka, CMI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L1930s</td>
<td>2PCTb Ani</td>
<td>*Javanese, Hakka, CMI (Mandarin)</td>
<td>Javanese</td>
<td>Javanese, Hakka, CMI</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L1930s</td>
<td>2MATb Jon</td>
<td>Hakka</td>
<td>Javanese, Hakka, CMI, Mandarin</td>
<td>Javanese, Hakka, CMI, Mandarin</td>
<td>Javanese, Hakka, CMI, Mandarin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>L1950s</td>
<td>3PCTa Tania</td>
<td>CMI &amp;/EJI [Hakka]</td>
<td>Javanese, Hakka, CMI, Mandarin</td>
<td>Javanese, Hakka, CMI, Mandarin</td>
<td>CMI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L1950s</td>
<td>3MATa Tom</td>
<td>CMI &amp;/EJI</td>
<td>CMI</td>
<td>CMI</td>
<td>CMI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e1960s</td>
<td>3PCTb Jenny</td>
<td>CMI &amp;/EJI</td>
<td>Javanese</td>
<td>Javanese</td>
<td>CMI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e1960s</td>
<td>3MCTc Gugun</td>
<td>CMI &amp;/EJI</td>
<td>CMI</td>
<td>CMI</td>
<td>CMI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>e1990s</td>
<td>4PCTa Rina</td>
<td>EJI</td>
<td>EJI</td>
<td>EJI</td>
<td>EJI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There are apparent differences in the subjects’ code preferences for different family members as illustrated in Table 7.2 above. In this family B, Grandma/Bobo, the sole member of the first generation, tends to use code-switching as her unmarked conversational strategy. She generally switches between Javanese, Hakka and CMI to speak to her two daughters, but occasionally she will use one of these codes alone. However, with both her sons-in-law, Jon and Filip, Grandma uses only Hakka as an unmarked code. With the third and fourth generation, her grandchildren and great granddaughter, who were born between 1950s and 1990s, Grandma/Bobo predominantly chooses East Java Malay/Indonesian.

The second generation who were born in the 1930s display a massive variety of code preferences as their unmarked conversational strategy for different family members. Hence, their unmarked code choice behaviour will be described separately. The four members of this generation are two married couples: two sisters, Lisa and Ani and their respective husbands, Filip and Jon respectively.

To speak to Grandma, their mother, Lisa and Ani’s unmarked code(s) is a mixture of Javanese, Hakka and CMI. Except for Hakka, both Lisa and Ani, sometimes use these codes individually. Among themselves, Lisa and Ani’s unmarked code is Javanese. To speak to her husband, Lisa’s unmarked code is basically Javanese which is sometimes coloured with a few Mandarin words, phrases and expressions, and this kind of interaction is reciprocal. With her brother-in-law, Jon, the codes chosen are similar to those she uses with Grandma, i.e., Javanese, Hakka and CMI. To speak to her daughters, Tania and Jenny, Lisa’s unmarked code(s) is Javanese with some Mandarin words and expressions used occasionally in a switching manner. With her son-in-law, Tom, Lisa’s unmarked code is CMI while to speak to her youngest son, Gugun, although her predominant unmarked code is CMI, it is sometimes flavoured with Javanese words and expressions. EJI is the code of interaction between Lisa and her granddaughter, Rina, from the fourth generation.

As mentioned above Ani uses a mixture of Javanese, Hakka and CMI to talk to her mother, Grandma. The same codes also serve as her unmarked choices with her brother-in-law, Filip and with her husband, Jon. However, she only uses Javanese with Lisa, her older sister. To talk to her nieces, Tania and Jenny, Ani uses Javanese mixed with CMI, whereas with her nephew Gugun, the mixture is CMI and Javanese with CMI as the dominant code. With Tom, her nephew-in-law, Ani uses CMI and EJI is the
unmarked code she uses with Rina, her grandniece. The unintentionally recorded data shows that Ani’s unmarked code with her own grandchildren is also EJI.

Both Filip and Jon’s unmarked code with Grandma/Bobo, their mother-in-law, is Hakka. With Jon and Ani, his in-laws, Filip uses a mixture of Javanese, Hakka and CMI while to speak to his wife, Lisa, his code is Javanese with some Mandarin. His unmarked code choice with the third and fourth generation is similar to that of Lisa’s, i.e. he uses Javanese with some Mandarin with Tania and Jenny, CMI with Tom, his son-in-law, CMI and Javanese with Gugun, his youngest son, and EJI with Rina, his granddaughter.

Jon's unmarked code(s) with his wife, Ani, and in-laws, Lisa and Filip are Javanese, Hakka, CMI and Mandarin. He employs CMI with his nieces and nephews, Tania, Jenny, Tom and Gugun, while EJI is the unmarked code he uses with Rina.

The third generation in this family consists of four members: the three siblings Tania, Jenny and Gugun, as well as Tom, Tania’s husband. Although not as varied as that of the previous generation, the unmarked code choice behaviour in this generation is nonetheless far from simple.

As the eldest in the family and also with her two-year experience of Chinese schooling, Tania’s unmarked codes with Grandma are predominantly CMI and EJI tinted with some Hakka words. With her parents she uses largely Javanese with some Mandarin colouring. CMI is the unmarked code with Tom, her husband while EJI is the unmarked code she shares with her daughter, Rina.

The other three members of the third generation, Tom, Jenny and Gugun all use CMI and/or EJI as their unmarked code with Grandma. However, there are differences between the three as well. For Tom and Gugun, their unmarked code with all family members but Rina is CMI. Only with Rina do they share EJI as their unmarked code. Jenny's unmarked code with her parents is Javanese; with Ani, her aunt, and Gugun, her youngest brother, it is CMI and Javanese. She shares Javanese and CMI with her older sister Tania and uses predominantly Javanese. With Jon, her uncle and Tom, her brother-in-law, Jenny’s unmarked code is CMI. As with other family members, EJI is her unmarked code with Rina.

The youngest member is Rina who is the sole member of the fourth generation under study. Her unmarked code with all family members is EJI and she is addressed in the same code.
It can be noted that the pattern of codes chosen as unmarked gets less varied and less complex with the younger generations.

The following are simplified versions of the tables just presented, in which similarities between members of different cohorts are collapsed together, thus making the patterns simpler and clearer.

Table 7.3 presents family A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7.3 Simplified patterns of unmarked code choice in family A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>interlocutor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1920s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 1940s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d e1950s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c L1950s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 1970s-1980s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.3 shows that code-switching is the unmarked code choice between the 1920s and 1940s cohorts and among the 1940s group themselves. It also shows that CMI is the code predominantly chosen by most family members to be the unmarked code for most family interactions. Javanese is sometimes used by some family members, and EJ/I is chosen as the unmarked code in interactions between the youngest of the second generation born in the 1950s, all of the third generation born in 1970s-1980s and the single member of the first generation born in the 1920s.

Table below 7.4 shows the simplified version of the unmarked code choice pattern in family B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7.4 Simplified patterns of unmarked code choice in family B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>interlocutor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
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Table 7.4 shows that the conversational strategy of unmarked code-switching is found in almost all family interaction. The only one code used as an unmarked code is found in the interactions between the 1910s member and her sons-in-law (the 1930s) and other interactions involving another son-in-law from the third generation. A single code also serves as the unmarked code in interaction involving the fourth generation member.

7.2.2 Variation in code choice patterns and its rationale
The data just presented show that there is considerable variation in code choice patterns both within and between generations. In general, members of different age cohorts display different preferences for code choice for different interlocutors which in turn reflect intra-speaker linguistic variations in the horizontal axis. Intra-speaker variations are especially obvious within speakers from the first and the second generations who have certain codes to talk to particular family members, especially to those of different generations. In the following section, I discuss some social factors behind the reasons for different people having different preferred codes.

7.2.2.1 Some social factors behind unmarked code choice variation
A variety of different social factors underlying code choice preferences have been identified in the literature. Trudgill (1995: 84) states that many factors come into play in determining which variety from a verbal repertoire is going to be used on a particular occasion. Trudgill notes that an important feature of the social context is "the context of the person spoken to, and in particular the role relationships and relative statuses of the participants in a discourse". Myers-Scotton (1997b) shares this view, and defines her 'structural constraints' in code choice as the social context which constitutes the dynamics of group relations, the participants' social identity features (e.g. age, sex, socio-economic status, ethnic group memberships), social networks and the surface discourse structural features. Similarly, Grosjean (1982) postulates that factors influencing one's language choices among others are the participants or speakers,
situation, content of discourse as well as the functions of interaction. Another scholar, Gumperz, (1971a: 221) suggests that "language variation correlates with socio-economic status in some societies, with educational background in some and with cultural background in others". Bourdieu (1977b, 1991) agrees that code choice might be related to 'power' while psychologists Brown and Gilman (1960) stress psychological factors, i.e. how situational factors place interpersonal relationship along two dimensions: power and solidarity. I will review a number of these potential reasons for variability in preferred code choice in the following sections.

7.2.2.1.1 Language proficiency and preferred code choice

In chapter 6 I noted that high levels of proficiency in the migrant codes were restricted to members of the first and second generations of each family. Not surprisingly, choosing migrant codes as an unmarked choice is also confined to interactions between members of these cohorts.

Tables 7.1 to 7.4 show that the migrant codes are found especially in the interactions involving 1910s, 1920s, 1930s and 1940s age cohorts. The first two cohorts are the migrant generations while the next two are the first Indonesian-born generations who went to Chinese schools. In both families Mandarin was frequently chosen by family members who went to Chinese schools and had formal exposure to Mandarin in their schooling, the 1930s and the 1940s age cohort and some members of 1950s and 1960s age cohorts. Foochow is chosen only by the 1920s age cohort (from family A) while Hakka is chosen by the 1910s and 1930s age cohorts (from family B) as their code of interaction. Mandarin sentences and phrases are found in the interaction involving the first and some members of G2 of family A, while Foochow is only employed by the G1 of this family. Hakka is found in the interactions between the first and second generation of family B. In addition, some members of G3 of family B employ a few Hakka words as part of their individual language repertoire. Mandarin, on the other hand, was not used extensively by anyone in family B, apart from single words or short phrases found in the interactions of the first up to the third generation. No Chinese elements, Mandarin, Hakka or Foochow, are found in the speech of the family members in either family who were born after the closing of Chinese schools in 1965. For those who went to Chinese schools up to year 1 or 2, some Mandarin words are part
of the codes chosen as seen in Tania’s (3FCTa)⁶ speech. For these generations the dominant code is Malay codes, with both CMI and EJI prevalent.

The host codes are particularly found in the interactions involving the Indonesian-born generations, the 1930s and thereafter, in which there is a variety of host codes spoken, Malay and Javanese varieties. In terms of Malay variety codes, the data corpus shows that various Malay varieties are chosen by all subjects especially the age cohorts born after 1965. The youngest generations (the 1970s and thereafter) use CMI characterized by grammatical structures and lexical items taken from Indonesian. The fourth generation family member (the 1990s age cohort) from family B speaks more refined EJI⁷, compared to the previous generations, on all occasions. Older generations (the 1930s to 1960s) prefer CMI, with lexical items taken from Javanese, while the oldest members in both families, the 1910s and 1920s age cohorts use ungrammatical and broken Indonesian mixed with Malay. I classify it as EJMI (East Java Malay/Indonesian). Javanese is spoken among migrant and the Indonesian-born generations up to the 1960s age cohorts in family B and some members of G2 from family A.

To summarize, migrant codes are basically chosen by the first and second generation (the first Indonesian-born generation) for their interactions, while host codes are dominant among the third generation (the second Indonesian-born generation). A similar situation is found in a study of a Tyneside Chinese community in Britain (LiWei, 1994). The British-born children normally prefer to speak English, while their parents prefer to use Chinese in intra-generational interactions. Either generation might switch to the other’s preferred code ‘for certain communicative effect’ (LiWei and Milroy, 1995: 296).

### 7.2.2.1.2 Family speech norms

Speech norms are important factors to take into account when interpreting code choices (Myers-Scotton and Bolonyai, 2001b:12) since they help determine unmarked choice on the part of the speakers. As has been stated earlier, in both families, the male first generation member (the grandfather) had implemented a family language policy in which he insisted that his children speak either Mandarin or their ancestral dialect to retain their identity. The speech norms instigated by the head of the family, and in a way

---

⁶ Refer to chapter six about the subjects’ language background.
⁷ Her EJI contains more structural forms and lexical items taken from SI.
supported by society at that time, bore their mark and influence on some of the subjects' language repertoire and language proficiency. This, in turn is instrumental in their code choice behavioural pattern as illustrated in tables 7.1 to 7.4 in which migrant codes are still part of the unmarked code involving the first, second and some of the third generation in family B.

Generally speaking, in these families, the speech norms concerning certain codes vary from one generation to the other.

7.2.2.1.3 Speaker's perception of their codes

Other factors worth considering are the status, role, prestige and function of each code in the family and in society in general as well as the speaker's perception of and their attitude towards the code. As described in chapter five, some codes that used to be prestigious have now become less prestigious, stigmatized or even prohibited in macro society in general. However, in the eyes of their speakers, these codes might still be considered prestigious. This can be seen from the decision of some family members to use these codes with other family members they respect. For example, the subjects' perception and attitude towards Hakka and Mandarin varies across generations. For some, Mandarin and Hakka are employed to signal politeness, for example in the interactions between Bobo and her sons-in-law, while for others like Tania and Jenny, Hakka is used to accommodate or to converge to Bobo. Similarly, Mandarin is used to signal politeness in the interactions between Grandpa and Mimi and Titi. They consider Mandarin as a prestigious code and retain its use in the family domain and other domains such as work, friendship, business transactions, etc. In other age cohorts the attitudes to Mandarin differ. Amongst the 1950s and 1960s age cohorts, Mandarin is associated only with transactional norms and activities. Among the 1970s and 1980s age cohorts the attitude varies. Some members of this age cohort who speak neither Mandarin nor their ancestral dialects even made joking remarks on these codes by uttering 'funny' unintelligible sounds resembling those of Chinese codes. When the interview was administered none of these young family members showed any interest in learning Mandarin or their ancestral dialects.

7.2.2.1.4 Group identity: 'We-code'

With respect to CMI, although it is considered as a 'stigmatized', 'improper', 'unassimilated', 'salad' code etc. in society in general, CMI is the code most family members feel most comfortable using with each other. In a way it serves as a sign of
group identity, a 'we-code', especially in family A. Thus, the code is employed in their interactions by almost all family members. In some interactions such as when addressing elderly family members like Kong and Bobo, CMI is even considered more polite than Ngókó Javanese. On many occasions, family members use Mandarin and CMI to show respect to their respective interlocutors in the family interactions or even outside the family domain. In both families CMI is spoken and chosen in most intergenerational as well as intra-generational interactions, while Mandarin is confined to those having proficiency in this code.

7.2.2.1.5 Code of modernity
Indonesian is identified with authority and modernity and is gaining increasing social status. Together with its function as a code of interaction in inter-ethnic communication, Indonesian has also become a code of intra-ethnic interaction for the first and second generations. These members, who are aware of the importance of Indonesian as a social ladder and language of education and employment, use Indonesian in their interaction with the younger family members who do not speak the migrant codes and especially with the fourth generation. To the sole fourth generation subject, Rina⁹, all subjects use EJI as the code of interaction. As one member of the older generation explained, Indonesian is the code of instruction at school, so it is only appropriate to employ Indonesian with this generation.

7.2.2.1.6 Code status and politeness
A noteworthy aspect of the subjects’ code choice behaviour is that some speakers choose to employ particular codes considered as more appropriate by them (in other cases by society in general) compared to other codes in their repertoire, with certain family members only. Based on the status and role of the codes in society in general or within the family concerned, the chosen code(s) is employed to denote a degree of formality between the speakers. Some codes are perceived as having ‘higher or better status’ than others and thus are appropriate to indicate distance or politeness between its speakers as is apparent in the codes found in the interactions between in-laws or between G1 and G3. Other codes are seen as more neutral and therefore are more

---

⁹ It is shown in their language repertoire. During my observation, I also noticed them using the code in domains other than the family domain.

⁹ In other conversational data captured in the recording, similar behaviour is applied by most subjects to other family members of the fourth generation.
suitable for use between family members with whom one does not have to be formal such as between siblings of similar ages, spouses, younger family members, etc.

Conversely to the above statements about formality, some codes are considered less formal than others. As illustrated in the family code choice patterns, EJI is considered better and more polite than CMI which is often considered ‘lower’ and is often discouraged from use in public by non-ethnic Chinese. EJI is also considered to be more polite than Javanese. However, within both families, CMI is perceived as having higher status than Javanese and it is thus reserved for older family members or in-laws. Oetomo (1987b: 165) stated that Javanese is considered to be an inferior code among the upper class peranakan. I believe some members of both families have similar perceptions. Since CMI is a Malay code and has Indonesian lexical items, it is considered superior to Javanese and is thus more polite and appropriate to be employed for particular family members.

An example of using different codes to signify politeness between in-laws is shown in the interactions between Bobo and her two sons-in-law, Filip and Jon. With both sons-in-law, Bobo uses only Hakka although they actually share other codes such as Ngoko Javanese, Mandarin, CMI and EJI. Bobo gets reciprocal answers from Filip and Jon (for comparison, with his daughters Lisa and Ani, Bobo interacts in Javanese and Hakka). Bobo, Jon and Filip have substantial proficiency in all these codes and they use these codes with other family members. So why is Hakka chosen in their interactions? For one thing both Bobo and Jon are from a Hakka background and in earlier days Bobo’s husband (also Jon’s father-in-law) insisted that his children spoke no other codes but Hakka. So in family B, especially the older generation, Hakka is considered as the most appropriate code to be spoken to parents as it was the code required to be spoken by Bobo’s husband. Another thing is that in their culture it is normative to have respect to the elderly, and especially to parents-in-law. I believe that both Filip and Jon wanted to impress and show respect to their future parents-in-law by heeding their wishes. Thus, although Bobo, Filip and Jon share other codes in their repertoire, Filip and Jon resort to using Hakka in their dyadic interaction with Bobo. It shows that even though they share many other codes with Bobo, both Jon and Filip choose the most appropriate code to be used to win Bobo’s approval and at the same time to show their respect.

In the same way, Lisa and Filip use CMI to speak to Tom, their son-in-law, although they all share other host codes like Javanese and EJI. Lisa and Filip use
Javanese to speak to their daughters, Tania and Jenny. In my view, for a son-in-law, the use of Javanese can be considered as too intimate or improper while EJI would be too formal. Thus, they use CMI with lots of Indonesian features in it instead. In the younger generation, Jenny uses Javanese or sometimes a mixture of Javanese and CMI with her sister but she chooses to use only CMI to speak to her older sister’s husband, Tom.

In family A, the second generation chooses CMI to speak to Indah, their sister-in-law, but these family members use CMI mixed with Javanese among themselves and with their cousin, Jade. Grandpa also uses CMI to speak to Indah, his daughter-in-law. I would say that why these people do not use Mandarin or Ngókó Javanese with Indah has nothing to do with Indah’s proficiency in the codes. Neither Jade nor Indah are as proficient in Mandarin as they are in Ngókó Javanese. As a cousin who used to live with the family, Jade is more of a family ‘insider’. Their using different codes might be due to their different kinds of family membership. CMI is considered more polite and not as intimate as Ngókó Javanese which is shared by siblings. Another example in family A is the interaction between Indah and Mimi. Indah is much younger than Mimi and she always uses CMI to speak to Mimi although they both share Javanese and EJI as well. Using EJI as their home language is considered ‘too formal and inappropriate’, while Ngókó Javanese is regarded as ‘inappropriate’ between in-laws. Thus, CMI serves as a code of politeness and respect between them.

These examples indicate that there is a kind of different speech norm employed for politeness between in-laws and to indicate formality.

7.2.2.1.7 Family membership and age distance

Tables 7.3 and 7.4 show that the main determinants of the basic patterns between family members are role-relations in the family and age. The family membership factor is reflected in the different code(s) chosen in the interactions between immediate family member and in-laws\(^\text{10}\) as described above. The age factor is reflected in the different codes chosen by different generation or age cohorts in both inter- and intra-generational interactions. Age distance signifying formality is reflected in the interactions between G1 and G3 and G4. Taking the status of the code(s) chosen into consideration, it seems

\(^{10}\) As there is only one in-law member in family A, in order to confirm this phenomena of choosing different codes to in-laws and family members, I cross-checked by closely observing and taking notes on Titi, Jade and Mimi’s interactions with other in-laws in the family. These in-laws are not chosen as subjects in my study but the voices of some are unintentionally recorded.
that the bigger the age gap is the higher the status of the code chosen especially by the younger generation to speak to the older ones.

The examples of unmarked preferred pattern of code choice between G1 and G3 were found in the interactions between Bobo and her grandchildren. They share Ngökó Javanese, but in line with the rising status of Indonesian, Indonesian is considered to be a more polite code for use with the elderly. Neither speaks the high version of Javanese, Krama, so they use Indonesian instead and in this case colloquial Indonesian, EIJ. In family A, a similar thing happens. G3 uses EIJ to speak to Grandpa. EIJ is considered to have higher 'status' than CMI in society in general. Thus, it is deemed more polite and appropriate for the elderly. Similar choices are made in family B as well. They do not employ Javanese for similar reasons to those given above, though among themselves and with their peers, G3 might speak Javanese. The interactions between Mimi and Indah are also illustrative of a similar principle.

On the other hand, less formality is found in the interactions between the younger siblings who use Ngökó Javanese in most of their interactions with each other\(^{11}\). For example, Jade only uses Javanese in her interactions with family members who are younger than she is. Javanese is utilized here to indicate the value of solidarity and equality in their role relations. In this second generation of family A, Ngökó Javanese is found only in the interactions when such feelings are shared by the interlocutors, usually by younger family members\(^{12}\).

The examples in §7.2.2.1.6 and §7.2.2.1.7 imply that the greater the age distance, the greater is the formality required. In addition, consanguineal relationships require less formality than do affinal ones. So, the greatest formality is found in the interactions involving G1 and G3, or G2 and G4 which then is reflected in their code choice practice between these generations and also between in-laws.

As has been presented above, there are various kinds of social factors instrumental to the subjects' unmarked code choice variation. In turn, these factors might give rise to the resultant variety of code choices as discussed below.

---

\(^{11}\) This is an additional observation to answer my curiosity as to who uses Ngökó Javanese. Some of the family members observed are not chosen as my subjects due to their unavailability. The additional data acquired from other family members (not the subjects of this study) reveal that Jade uses Javanese to interact with Mimi and Titi’s younger sisters who are of similar age to Jade.

\(^{12}\) These younger members are also from the second generation but they are not part of the subjects in this study. This phenomenon was checked after the official data collection activities.
7.2.2.2 Kinds of code choice variation

After having presented the social factors behind the variation, this section focuses on the kinds of variation that occur in the subjects' unmarked code choice patterns. As displayed in tables 7.1 to 7.4, there are variations in code-choice both across and within generations. The variation can be seen in terms of the manner of interaction between a pair of S-I, i.e. whether both S-I choose the same or different codes (symmetrical or asymmetrical code choice pattern), the number of the codes paired by S-I and the particular codes being paired together.

Relating to the two basic questions stated in the introduction, this section discusses the variations, how they happen and why those variations take place and what influential factors, reasons or motivations there are behind these patterns of code choice behaviour. Especially since these multilinguals who are linguistically competent in more than two languages (as is shown in their language proficiency) prefer to use a particular code or a 'code' consisting of two or more codes to speak to particular interlocutors in their family.

The following section presents the symmetrical and asymmetrical code choice patterns that occur among them.

7.2.2.2.1 Symmetrical vs. Asymmetrical code choice patterns

A symmetrical code choice pattern means that both Speaker-Interlocutor (S-I) choose to speak the same code in their interaction. In the asymmetrical pattern, on the other hand, a pair of S-I chooses different codes to speak to each other throughout a conversational event. This symmetrical and asymmetrical code choice behaviour can be seen by observing a pair of speaker-interlocutor in both axes. For example in family A, Kong as a speaker usually speaks in EJM/I to his grandson, Denny. In return, Denny as a speaker usually interacts with Kong in EJI. Thus, this pair of interlocutors has an asymmetrical pattern of code choice.

7.2.2.2.1.1 Symmetrical code choice

Symmetrical code choice is found in some of the interactions between parents and children in both families. In family B Lisa (1930s) and Tania (1950s age cohort) both speak Ngökó Javanese with each other, while in family A, both Mimi (1940s) and Amanda (1970s-1980s) speak CMI with each other. Tania, Tom, (1960s) and Rina (1990s age cohort), all use EJI with each other. Similar cases are also found in the interactions between siblings of 1970-1980s age cohorts in which only CMI is
employed in almost all interactions. Also, Bobo and her sons-in-law all speak Hakka with each other.

Symmetrical code choice is also found when two or more codes are used. In other words, some family members use code-switching as their unmarked code choice. They are usually those family members sharing similar language repertoire and language proficiency, i.e. among the 1930s: Lisa, Ani, Jon and Filip who mix Javanese, Hakka and CMI, or among the 1940s age cohort members Titi and Mimi who mix CMI and Mandarin.

In some ways, the fact that some of the relationships discussed above are marked by symmetrical code choices is quite surprising, given other reports in the literature. Gal (1979: 110) describes the situation in the Austrian town of Oberwurt where both German and Hungarian are spoken among the local Hungarian immigrant community:

"Of the two kinds of GH (German and Hungarian) use, one occurs most often between parents and children, or grandparents and children and can be called 'unreciprocal', because the older person consistently uses Hungarian, while the younger person consistently answers in German. Lengthy conversations can be conducted in this unreciprocal way".

What is especially remarkable in the code choice among the subjects of this study is the symmetry that occurs between grandparent and grandchildren as between Kong and his grandchildren or Bobo and her grandchildren. Both G1 members use Malay varieties to speak to their grandchildren, and thus, G1 are the ones accommodating the G3 members.

Considering the multilingual language repertoire each subject has and the variety of choices at his/her disposal, it can be concluded that even though the code choice is symmetrical, the code used is deliberately chosen for the particular addressee/interlocutor.

7.2.2.1.2 Asymmetrical code choice

Although tables 7.1 to 7.4 show that most pairs of S-I have unmarked symmetrical code choice pattern, there are also asymmetrical code choice practices between particular pairs of S-I. One of the reasons for this asymmetrical behaviour seems to be inequality in status and age of interlocutors as also reported by Goebel (2000) and Wolff and Poedjosoedarmo (1982: 4-5, 15-17, 24-27) in their studies of interaction between Javanese speakers. They state that the inequality in status and/or age of the speakers might lead to the asymmetrical use of speech levels in Javanese. Those having lower
status—in terms of wealth, education, occupation, and to a lesser degree noble background—choose to use Krama level (high code) and receive Ngokó level (low code) in return.

Unlike the Javanese speakers who are using the High and Low forms of the same language in their interactions, the subjects in this study use codes of different provenance which are perceived as having higher or lower status/prestige. This issue of what might be called 'speech levels' is discussed further in chapter nine.

The following sections present examples of asymmetrical code choice practices and classify them according to factors such as age and family membership, self confidence and comfort, unequal language proficiency and differences in social status.

7.2.2.1.2.1 Age and family membership

Asymmetrical code choice is often seen in the interactions between generations separated by large age difference such as G1 and G3. When Bobo speaks with Tania and Jenny, Bobo chooses EJM/I while Tania and Jenny choose CMI and/or EJI. When Grandpa speaks with Denny, Amanda and Cindy, he uses EJM/I but they reply in EJI. Another example is found in the patterns of interactions between aunts, uncles and nephews, nieces. For instance, while their aunt Ani addresses her nieces Tania/Jenny in both Javanese and CMI, Tania and Jenny prefer to use CMI alone to speak to Ani although they both know Javanese. To her nephew, and nephew-in-law, Ani employs CMI or Javanese or a mixture of the two, while both nephews choose CMI. There are also asymmetrical cases between siblings such as between Tania/Jenny and Gugun. To speak to Gugun, both Tania and Jenny choose CMI mixed with Javanese while to talk to his sisters Gugun usually chooses CMI.

The following extract is an example of asymmetrical code choice in intergenerational interactions between Grandpa/Kong (1MCT-P) who speaks EJM/I to his granddaughter Amanda (3MCT-Pd) who replies using EJI. As EJI is considered to be more polite than CMI, Amanda uses it in deference to her older Grandfather although she happily uses CMI with her cousin Denny. I would say that the use of EJI with her grandfather is deliberate and is carefully considered for the sake of politeness due to big age difference and family membership.

Compare the verb meaning ‘go’ which Amanda chooses in each extract. With Grandpa she uses the Indonesian or EJI form ‘pergi’ while in extract (2) she uses CMI form ‘pigi’ to her cousin, Denny.

Extract 1:
1. Amanda: **KONG, persi dulu**
   [GRANDPA, (I’ll) go first]
2. Kong: **Pig mana?**
   [where are (you) going?]
3. Amanda: **maw ke Gramedia**
   [(I want to) go to Gramedia]
4. Kong: **Sendili? [naq apa(.)] pokê sopé! (0.4) Parman, ini pigi anta**
   [all alone? how will you go?(.) take the driver (0.4) Parman, bring (her) to go ]
5. Amanda: **[sebentar lagi dijemput Koko (.) persi dulu KONG**
   [In a minute (I) will be picked up by elder brother, (.) (I’ll go) first Grandpa]
6. Kong: ya

In extract two, Amanda uses other forms that indicate she is using CMI rather
than EJI too, including Javanese words such as ‘saq’, ‘se’, ‘ndaq’ as well as Javanese
affix /-é/ as a possessive marker which characterizes CMI.

**Extract 2:**

1. Amanda: **Ko, mau pigi makan mana Ko?**
   [Older brother, where do you want to go for dinner, Older Brother?]]
2. Denny: eh saqsaqaqmu Manda, aku sé sembarang (;) pokoqé énaq
   [as you like Manda, for me nothing particular (;) the main thing is it is delicious]
3. Amanda: **soto-é pak To mau ndaq?**
   [How about Mr To’s soup, will (you)?]
4. Denny: **yhaa bólé laa**
   [it’s alright]

Another example of asymmetrical code choice is between Grandpa/Kong and
Denny as seen in extract (3) below. Here, Denny uses EJI with the verb ‘pergi’ to talk to
Kong/Grandpa while Grandpa’s speech has markers of CMI including Mandarin word
‘NIE’ meaning ‘you’

**Extract 3:**

1. Denny: **KONG -**
   [GRANDPA]
2. Kong (smiling): ya (0.2) kapan dateng?
   [yes, (0.2) when did you arrive?]
3. Denny: **sudah Minggu lalu**
   [last week]
4. Kong: **NIE sta makan?**
   [Have YOU eaten yet?]
5. Denny: **mau persi ke gêjia KONG -**
   [(I) am going to church]
6. Kong: **abis tu makan sini ya?**
   [will (you) have dinner here after that?]
7. Denny: **iyha KONG -**
   [yes, GRANDPA]
The asymmetrical choices of codes between Kong and Amanda and Denny can be explained in terms of the perceived status of the codes used and the age differences which exist between generations.

7.2.2.1.2.2 Self-confidence and comfort

Another reason for asymmetrical code choice is differences in language proficiency between a pair of S-I. With Mimi and Titi, Kong prefers to use Mandarin interspersed with EJM/I words in almost all conversational interactions. Sometimes a few Foochow expressions or words are inserted in the conversation as well. His two daughters, however, speak or address Kong using CMI and Mandarin. CMI is the dominant code of the daughters. From my observation, father and daughters have never had a dyadic conversation held solely in Mandarin, Foochow or Malay. There is always more than one code employed in their interactions even if the inserted code only consists of a few words or phrases. In their interactions, Mandarin and CMI are almost always used interchangeably in code-switching. Both daughters mused that they used to speak more Mandarin in their younger days, but nowadays they speak more Indonesian in their daily life, they feel more confident and comfortable using CMI instead of Mandarin as the dominant code. However, Kong said that he still prefers to speak in Mandarin as he can express himself better and he remarks that 'using Mandarin is already a habit'.

7.2.2.1.2.3 Unequal language repertoire and proficiency

An asymmetrical code-choice pattern also prevails in the interactions between Kong and the younger siblings of G2 who did not go to Chinese schools as well as between Kong and all G3 members. None of these younger people have great proficiency in Mandarin or Foochow, although they still have some passive understanding of the codes. On the other hand, Kong has more limited proficiency in Indonesian compared to these family members. So between Kong and these family members the unmarked code is CMI and/or EJI with Kong using his East Javanese Malay/Indonesian version together with Mandarin here and there, with features such as his direct calquing of Mandarin greetings into Indonesian/Malay.

Compare the following three extracts which show Kong’s code choice behaviour in greeting different family members. The interactions are between Grandpa and his daughters (extract 4), his niece and daughter-in-law (extract 5), his grandson (extract 6), his daughter and his granddaughter (extract 7).
Basically Kong speaks Mandarin and EJM/I\textsuperscript{13} to his daughters and his niece, but only EJM/I to his daughter-in-law and grandchildren. Kong/Grandpa (the 1920s age cohort) and his two daughters, Mimi and Titi (1940s age cohort) have the same relatively high level of proficiency in Mandarin, but other family members do not.

In extract 4, Mimi and Titi enter the house and greet Kong. Kong then greets his daughters in Mandarin and his second daughter greets him back in Mandarin to accommodate Grandpa. However, the first daughter answers him in a Malay variety (CMI) which is another unmarked code shared between them. Thus, the exchange does not signify any negotiation of a new RO set between them.

Extract 4:

Mimi: Pa
Kong: \textit{Jek fan lek mei-yhuh?}
    [Have (you) eaten yet?]
Titi: \textit{Jek leq pa}
    [(we) have, Pa]
Mimi: \textit{Suja pa}
    [(we) have Pa]

In the next extract (extract 5), Jade greets Grandpa using his kinship name in Fuzhong, \textit{Yu ‘Uncle’}, and Grandpa greets her and Indah (Grandpa’s daughter-in-law) using a typical Chinese greeting which he then reiterates in Indonesian. This is an example of what Grosjean (1982:152) calls ‘clarification through immediate translation’, or what Baker (1993:77) calls ‘repetition to clarify’ and Gumperz (1982:78) labels ‘reiteration’. Jade answers in EJI. Then Grandpa/Kong asks Indah in Malay/Indonesian only and Indah answers in CMI (characterized by a Javanese word ‘sèq’ still). It seems that Kong repeats his greeting either to accommodate both addressees who Kong knows are not really proficient in Mandarin or just to clarify his meaning. Kong does not do this when he speaks to his two elder daughters with whom he shares Mandarin as an unmarked code. However, between Kong and Indah or Jade, the unmarked code is CMI. As in the earlier dialogue, both addressees answer in the

\footnotetext[13]{The use of lexical items from East Java Indonesia and East Java Malay with EJM grammatical structure commonly found among the Chinese speakers who were mostly born in 1930s and before that.}
unmarked code they share with Kong.

Extract 5:

Jade: **YU**  
[Uncle]

Kong: **JEK FAN LEK MÉI-YHU?**, sda makan?  
[**HAVE** (you) **EATEN YET?**, have (you) eaten yet?]

Jade: **Baru aja makan YU**  
(l) **have just eaten UNCLE**
(to his daughter-in-law)
(0.2)

Kong: **Ayo makan?**!  
(let's eat)

Indah: **Iyha Pa, séq nunggu Manda**  
[yes, Father, still waiting for Manda]

Extract (6) below presents a conversation between Grandpa and Denny, a member of G3. The conversation is held in EJI. Denny studied overseas and at the time the recordings were made he was home for a holiday. Denny dropped by at Kong’s house on his way to church which is next to Kong’s house. Kong greets Denny with Malay *sda makan?* which is a calque of his typical Chinese greeting **JEK FAN LEK MÉI-YU?** “have you eaten yet?”. Denny answers and talks to Kong in EJI while Kong continues in EMJ/I. Malay varieties are the only codes they share. Notice how Kong still retains the Mandarin personal pronouns ‘nie’ you’.

Extract 6:

1. Denny: **KONG-**  
[**GRANDPA**]
2. Kong(similing):-ya (0.2) kapan dateng?  
[yes, (0.2)when did you arrive?]
3. Denny: **sudah Minggu lalu**  
[last week]
4. Kong: **NIE sda makan?**  
[Have **YOU** eaten yet?]
5. Denny: **mau pergi ke gréja KONG-**  
[(I) am going to church]
6. Kong: **abis tu makan sini ya?**  
[will (you) have dinner here after that?]
7. Denny: **iyha KONG-**  
[yes, **GRANDPA**]

This asymmetrical code choice between Grandpa/Kong and Denny (and also between Grandpa and Amanda in extract (1) are due to differences in language proficiency, age or family membership. On Grandpa’s side it is more because his
proficiency in Indonesian is not as good as the younger generation. However, from the younger generation’s point of view, I observe that the more fundamental reason is related to the norm of speaking to the elderly, i.e. politeness, as is evident in Amanda’s and Denny’s code choice practice (extract 2) in which they employ CMI between themselves. As was previously mentioned, by its status and nature, EJI is considered to be of a higher or more polite standard than CMI which is a kind of ‘salad code’ and their choice to speak EJI with their elders shows that they are innately aware of this.

The extract below involves Titi and her daughter Cindy who came to Kong’s house. However, Kong only speaks in Mandarin to address both his daughter and his granddaughter. His daughter answers Kong in Mandarin while his granddaughter answers in Malay. Thus, they both answer differently using the preferred code they share with Kong.

Extract 7:

Titi: Pa
Kong: JEK FAN LEK MÉI-YHU?
       [Have (you) eaten yet?]
Titi: JEK LEQ PA
       [(I) have, Pa]
Cindy: Suda KONG
       [(I) have GRANDPA]

The reason why Kong greets his grandson, Denny (in extract 6) and Cindy (in extract 7) differently is that in dyadic interaction it is clearer who the intended addressee is. In this dialogue, it can be Titi only or both Titi and Cindy. Kong expects Cindy to recognize his way of greeting the family members in Mandarin. Hence, Kong does not repeat his greetings in Malay as he did in extracts (5) and (6).

Grandfather’s contrasting code-choice behaviour in the previous four extracts indicates that one way or another he is aware of the language repertoire and language proficiency, of his family members and he accommodates his interlocutors by converging on the code he shares with his intended addressees. This shows that he varies his code choice intentionally.

Another example of unequal proficiency is illustrated in the extract below. This is a conversation between Bobo and Tania. Notice Bobo’s choice of word for ‘child’ which is the Eastern Javanspe (Suroboyoan) lexical item arèq. To that question, Tania, answered by using the word ‘/anak/’ an Indonesian version for ‘kid’. In the next turn,
Bobo also uses the same word ‘anak’. As Tania and Bobo share a variety of codes including Javanese, it would seem that Tania's choice of EJI is again related to status differences between the two women. Bobo's choice of CMI is clearly related to the fact that she has relatively weak active proficiency in Indonesian codes.

Extract 8:

1. Bobo: **masiq banyaq arèq**¹⁴ kost?
   [(are there) still plenty boarders?]
2. Tania: **anak kost**?
   [boarders?]
3. Bobo: **ndaq anu (.) lès, anak lès**!
   [no, what is it?, (.) taking lesson, the children taking private lesson]
4. Tania: ya lumayan
   [it's OK]
5. Bobo: **masiq banyaq**?
   [still plenty]
6. Tania: **Ya ada lima, enam anak (.) ada anak tetangga dua (.)**
   [yes, there are five, six kids (.) there are two kids from the neighbourhood]

The examples presented above demonstrate that speaker and interlocutors are aware of each other's language ability and react accordingly.

### 7.2.2.1.2.4 Social status difference

I have already noted a number of instances where family members from different generations use different codes with each other in order to show appropriate levels of respect. In addition to age differences, other factors can also lead to differences in social standing between interlocutors/interactants. One such difference relates to family members and non-family members like domestics, care-givers and drivers. The information gathered and discussed in the following paragraphs is mainly based on the observation of unintentionally recorded interactions between members of the families and their household servants, who although not strictly family members do regularly take part in intra-familial exchanges. Most of the family members who were interviewed mentioned that the presence of these non-family members in the vicinity of a conversation was an important consideration for the family members in choosing a particular code to be used with other family members. Usually these domestics, drivers and care-givers are local natives of Javanese origin, so the language of interaction

¹⁴ Javanese Suroboyoan /arèq/ literally means ‘child’ or ‘kid’, but in this interactions /arèq kost/ means ‘boarder’.
employed by the members of both families to address and speak to them is mostly Javanese.\footnote{In other cases the domestics are young girls graduating from SMP (year 7-9) who often indicate that they prefer to be spoken to in EJII by always answering, asking or addressing their employer in EJII.}

The following extracts are examples of those interactions that either were caught by the recording or observed by the researcher. In the first example, Tika, the domestic helper was asking whether to serve lunch now and Titi asked Tika what she had cooked and told her to prepare four plates. Tika uses Indonesian (CMI) while Titi uses Ngökó Javanese. Although she is a native Javanese speaker Tika never uses Krama or Madya levels of Javanese with her employers. Whether the domestic helper considers CMI to be more polite than Ngökó Javanese or whether she was of the opinion that Titi might not understand ‘Madya’ or ‘Krama’ level of Javanese, it is clear that she uses Malay in deference to her employer’s higher social status. It is unmarked behaviour between them for Tika to speak CMI to Titi and for Titi to speak Ngökó Javanese to Tika.

Extract 9:

1. **Tika:** mo makan skarang tά?
   [would you like to eat now?]

2. **Titi:** YHO WÉS, SAQIKI ÁE, KOWÉ MASAQ OPO Tik?
   [OK, it’s better now, what have you cooked Tik?]

3. **Tika:** Jangan asem, empal, tapi ndaq ada sambelé lbhó, ndaq ada lombok
   [Jangan asem, empal, but there’s no sambel\footnote{Jangan asem is a sour Javanese vegetable soup, empal is fried meat and ‘sambel’ is chilli sauce usually grounded with shrimp paste.} y’know, there’s no chilli]

4. **Titi:** PIRING-É PAPAT YHO, NON IKA MANGAN KÉNÉ
   [Prepare four plates, will you, miss Ika will eat here]

The asymmetrical code choice behaviour between Titi and Tika signifies their social status difference in which the CMI as a Malay code is used to indicate more formality and therefore implies politeness on the part of its speaker.

The next extract is between Mimi and the carer who is looking after Kong who is sick. Unlike the previous example, the interaction below is held in CMI although the care-giver is a native Javanese.

Extract 10:

1. **Mimi:** Sós, obaté Papa wés diminómnó?
   [Nurse, have you given Dad his medicine?]

2. **Care-giver:** Suđa. Tadi isiq muntah lagi dua kali, panasé tiga lapan stenga
   [Yes, already. Just now he vomited two more times, his temperature is 38.5]

3. **Mimi:** Komprèsen Sós.
4. Care-giver: **lya suda**
   [Yes, (I) have]

The code choice practice behaviour between Mimi and the care-giver does not signify any social status difference. Based on my observation I notice that like Titi, Mimi also employs Ngókó Javanese with the domestics.

The following is a conversation caught by the recorder. Lisa answers a long distance phone call intended for Gugun, her son. As Gugun does not answer when she calls out to him, Lisa asks Yani, the domestic helper, who is around to call him. Lisa uses Indonesian to answer the phone but switches to Ngókó Javanese to speak to Yani. It shows a situational code-switching in which there is a change of addressee, so the code used changes too. Lisa’s unmarked code with Yani is Ngókó Javanese.

Extract 11:

(Phone rings):

1. Lisa: **Halo (.) oh ya sbentar. Gun telpón** (in a loud voice while covering the mouthpiece)
   [hello (.) oh yes, wait a minute. Gun a phone (for you)]
   (0.3)
   (talking to the domestic who is around)

2. Lisa: Yan, Yani!, **KANDANONO GUGUN ÖNÖQ INTERLOKAL, TEKÖ Bangil.**
   [Yan, Yani!, tell Gugun, there’s a long distance call from Bangil]

These examples show that there are differences in the subjects’ code choice towards the domestic helpers on the one hand and a care-giver on the other. In my opinion, the differences are due to the perception that a care-giver is more like a family member than a servant and that the job status is also perceived as higher than that of a domestic. Therefore, Ngókó Javanese is not used to talk to a care giver. However, my
observation reveals that all G3 members of family A use CMI to speak to their domestics, and driver as well as the care-giver and they receive CMI, in return. I would say that this generation is more egalitarian and they are not as status-conscious as that of the older generation.

To conclude, the three reasons for asymmetrical code choice patterns discussed in this section are gaps of age and family membership (role-relations in the family), discrepancy in language ability and facility and differences in social status between speaker and interlocutor. The next section covers instances of code-switching as the unmarked code-choice.

7.2.2.2.2 Conversational code-switching as an unmarked conversational strategy

In a family domain there are usually established patterns of code choice between members of the family as seen among the subjects under study. Most of them share some codes with some family members and for various reasons, social or psychological, it is sometimes convenient for them to employ more than one code in their conversation. This use of codes in alternation is something common or to be expected and thus switching codes is not necessarily always deliberately done to negotiate or to put across a certain message, but can be seen simply as a natural part of their interaction, or communicative strategy (see §2.6.2.1.4).

---

17 My observation and the unintentionally recorded interactions indicate that there are differences in the subjects' code choice behaviour toward these non-family members. All the family members in family B—from G1 to G3 address their domestics in Ngókó Javanese and receive Ngókó Javanese in answer whereas G4 uses EJI and is answered in EJI too. However, it is worth noting that some differences in how different servants were addressed were noticeable in family A. All family members use CMI to address care-givers or babysitters, and EJI to drivers, but employ either Ngókó Javanese or CMI to address domestics. To be more specific, the first and the third generations in family A use CMI to address and talk to the domestics while G2 use Ngókó Javanese to talk to their domestics. To answer them the domestics use either CMI or a higher level of Javanese, whereas the care-givers answer in the same code, CMI. To address and summon the young driver, all the family members in family A make use of CMI or EJI and the driver uses EJI. However, to talk to the elderly driver who has been with the family for thirty years, the interactions between G2 and the driver are held in Ngókó Javanese. The difference is due to the perception that the care-giver and the baby-sitter are more like family members than servants and that the job status is also perceived as higher, better and more modern. Thus, Ngókó Javanese is not used. Care-givers and baby-sitters usually have had a little training in nursing and have a higher wage than a servant and they usually sleep in one room with the ’patient’, the care-receiver. Drivers nowadays are usually young men who are mostly high school graduates. As for the elderly driver, Javanese is used because his proficiency in Indonesian might not be very good or because when he was originally employed using Javanese was the norm and is now the code of solidarity between him and his young master and mistress who are now grown-up. Another probable reason is that there is greater familiarity after many years working in the family.
7.2.2.2.1 Bilingual and multilingual code-switching

Based on the number of codes involved, two distinct kinds of code-switching can be identified in the data, i.e. bilingual and multilingual code-switching. In both bilingual and multilingual forms, there are various combinations of which particular codes are paired together. These vary not only from one generation to the other, but also from one family to another or even from person to person in the same family. As shown in §6.4.2 on their language proficiency, one of the major causes of variation is due to the variety in their language facility and ability.

The primary site of code-switching is in the intergenerational interactions between 1910s and 1930s age cohorts, in which Javanese and Hakka are the dominant codes used, and between the 1920s and 1940s where Mandarin and CMI are the codes chosen. The secondary site is in the intra-generation interactions within 1940s age cohort, with CMI and Mandarin involved, and within 1930s age cohort, with Javanese, Hakka, CMI and sometimes Mandarin, too. In the interactions between these age cohorts, there are usually two or more codes involved and used in a code-switching manner as the unmarked code: a conversational discourse strategy.

An example of bilingual code-switching as a conversational strategy can be seen in extract 17 where Lisa is using Javanese and Hakka to speak to Bobo. As found in table 7.2, this mixture serves as their mode of interaction. An example of using more than two codes is in the conversation involving Mimi and Titi, in which CMI, Javanese, Mandarin, and Hokkien are all employed (see extract 12 below). Other interactions found in the tables are the interactions between Titi and Jade, using CMI and Javanese or Bobo and Ani who are using Javanese, Hakka and some CMI. Similarly, in the conversations between Grandpa and Mimi (see table 7.1), two codes, at least, are involved, Mandarin and EJM/I, and sometimes there are features of Foochow.

In the following extract Mimi (2FCT-Pa) and Titi (2FCT-Pb) are talking about rapid price inflation. Line (10) shows how Mimi uses four codes, CMI, Mandarin and Javanese and Hokkien in her sentence. The rest of the dialogue is conducted alternately in two codes, CMI and Mandarin. This is Mimi and Titi's normal discourse strategy.

Extract 12:

9. 2FCT-Pa: he
   [he]
10. 2FCT-Pb: gila ndaq CING DYEN GAE SE JI CIA, aduh aku di telpon Tin ngomong,"
    KOWE IKU LHO DIDOLEKI ANU ITU Ihó Cik Lani-Cik Lani itu lhó, GROHE ATE MUNDAQ"
The following extract is of a conversation between Ani (2FCTb), and Bobo/Grandma (1FCT) who are talking about where Bobo is going to live. Ani starts asking Bobo a question using Javanese, Malay and Hakka (line 183). In line 184, Bobo answers using the same codes: Javanese, Malay, and Hakka in her sentence. This kind of code-switching serves as their everyday conversational mode.

Extract 13:

183 Ani: LHA SAQIKI békén betól róma, NYI NA NGAI JU A? LÉQ OMAH DIBONGKAR KOWÉ NYI NA NGAI JU?
[well NOW the house (is being) renovated, WHERE WILL YOU STAY? IF THE HOUSE IS BEING RENOVATED WHERE WILL YOU STAY?]  
184. Bobo: PÏYE gampang lhó, Bobo JU () gampang, Mama tinggal gampang lha, M SE YUILA, cariq () kalq ini suda jadi róma suda anu ada yang ato, Mama pinda, jangan sampéq mbésōq () lêq Tuhan tuq () kalq suda ada kos róma ini, isa buat pengasilan () * 
[how’s it? easy, you know, Bobo live () easy, it’s easy where I live, DON’T WORRY, looking for () if this house is ready, already eh there’s somebody taking care of, Mother will move, don’t wait until later () if God I () if this house has boarders, it can earn money ()]

Both extracts above and extract 17 illustrate that there are bilingual and multilingual code-switching in the dialogue. It is apparent that using two or more codes alternately as a ‘distinct’ code in S-I interactions is pervasive among particular age cohorts only. These are the people brought up required to speak two/three codes as necessities and who usually share the codes they use alternately in their interactions.
These codes turn out to be those in which the subjects have substantial proficiency, at least 4 points on the scale used in chapter six.

7.2.2.2.2 Different pairs of codes for different pairs of S-I

While different family members may have a single preferred code for use with other family members, and while this preference may change from one addressee to another, people who use code switching as an unmarked strategy also use different mixes of codes with different addressees. For example in family A: Titi (1940s age cohort) uses CMI and Mandarin to speak to Grandpa (the 1910s age cohorts) but CMI and Javanese with Jade (the 1950s age cohort). In family B, Lisa uses Javanese and some Hakka with Ani but Javanese and some Mandarin with Filip. She uses CMI and Javanese to talk to Gugun, her son. Another example is Tania (1950s age cohort) who uses Javanese and some Mandarin with her parents, CMI/EJI with Hakka with Bobo, Javanese and CMI with Jenny, her sister (1960s age cohort) and CMI and Javanese to speak to Gugun, her youngest brother.

Of course, one of the major factors lying behind the use of particular preferred groups of codes is again language proficiency and length of exposure to the codes. Another factor that seems to be important is the amount of contact those particular pairs or groups of codes have had with each other: to be used in unmarked code-switching, the languages need to 'go together' for the people who use them. For instance, the 1930s age cohort employs Hakka and Javanese. Although Lisa and Ani went to Chinese schools and studied Mandarin, their home languages are Hakka particularly with their parents, but Javanese with siblings and peers. Later, they had more chance to use Javanese at home with their siblings after their father passed away and Hakka with Grandma. Gradually Javanese and Hakka were the codes they used with siblings and their mother. Thus, the two codes are frequently used together in their conversation. Later on, along with societal changes, CMI become part of the codes chosen too. So, the codes grouped together are Javanese and Hakka and sometimes CMI.

Family A's case is similar. For 1920s and 1940s age cohorts, Mandarin and CMI are the codes they use at home. For the 1940s Mandarin is the language of education used at school, the codes spoken among Chinese where they used to live and the code they share more with their parents, especially their father. In addition to Mandarin, they also employed CMI with their mother, who was a first Indonesian born generation. After the Chinese schools were closed they also use CMI with their younger siblings.
and with their parents, too. Thus, CMI and Mandarin have always been used together in communication between the 1940s age cohort and their parents. A similar explanation applies to G3 members who speak CMI as their home language but speak Javanese with peers and younger siblings who do not speak Mandarin. So, for these age cohorts, CMI and Javanese are the codes of their choices.

To sum up, the different patterns of code choices predominant in each family exhibit different language contact configurations. This involves both the length of contact and quality of contact which take place either between the subjects and the codes concerned or between the codes paired. In addition, different individual sociolinguistic and socio-psycholinguistic experiences also give rise to the use of different codes. These practices are again related to language proficiency.

The next section presents the kinds of code-switching used and the reasons behind the subjects’ employing code-switching as their conversational strategy.

7.2.2.2.2.3 Manifestations of code-switching as conversational strategy

The following are some of the typical ways in which code-switching is manifested in the subjects’ interactions.

7.2.2.2.2.3.1 Reiteration/repetition through immediate translation

The following extracts contain repetitive messages in different codes. The extract below contains words or phrases expressed in one language then repeated in other language(s) or code(s) by the same speaker in the same turn. The message repeated might be the exact translation or a paraphrase of the previous code, but both yield similar meanings.

The codes used in the following inter-sentential code-switching between Grandpa and his niece are Mandarin and Malay/Indonesian which appear within turn. This type of greeting is typical of Grandpa/Kong’s greeting to his elder children and nieces/nephews who know or speak some Mandarin as found in extract 14 (taken from extract 5).

Extract 14 (from extract 5):

1. Kong: JEN FAN LEK MÉI-YHU? sda makan?
   [HAVE (you) EATEN YET?, have (you) eaten yet?]
2. Jade: Baru aja makan YU
   [(0) have just eaten UNCLE]
In extract 15 (line 183), there are two sentences having the same meaning but which are immediately translated in different combinations of codes. The three codes involved are Javanese, Malay and Hakka. In the first half of the sentence there are two codes used, Javanese and Malay which are then followed by a Hakka question sentence. This sentence is directly followed by another sentence having the same meaning. The first half of the sentence consists of Javanese and Malay which is then finished off by a mixture of Javanese and Hakka question. Both sentences have the same meanings, i.e. 'Ani wants to know where Bobo plans to stay if the house is being renovated'.

Extract 15 (from extract 13):

183 Ani: **LHA SAQIKI bêkên betôl rôma, NYI NA NGAI JU A? LÊQ OMAH DIBONGKAR KOWÊ NYI NA NGAI JU?** [well NOW the house (is being) renovated, WHERE WILL YOU STAY? IF THE HOUSE IS BEING RENOVATED YOU WHERE WILL YOU STAY?]

184. Bobo: **PIYÉ gampang îhê, Bobo JU () gampang, Mama tinggal gampang îha, M SE YULILA, cariq () kaloq inî suđa jadi rôma suđa anu ada yang âto, Mama pinda, jangan sampêq mbésoq () lêq Tuhan taq () kaloq suđa ada kos rôma inî, isa buat pengasilan ()** [how's it? easy, you know, Bobo live () easy, it's easy where I live, DON'T WORRY, looking for () if this house is ready, already eh there's somebody taking care of, Mother will move, don't wait until later () if God I () if this house has boarders, it can earn money ()]

Ani’s using different codes to formulate the same ideas in asking her question indicates her efforts to make use of her multilinguality to show her insistence in getting an answer from Grandma/Bobo. To answer Ani’s question, Bobo is also using Javanese, Malay and Hakka, and stretches of Malay sentences.

The next extract (line 6) also shows repetition of ideas spoken in three different codes, i.e. Malay, Javanese and Hakka. The dialogue is between Lisa and her mother, Bobo. Lisa is trying to get her message across by using all the three codes she shares with Bobo. She’s trying to tell Bobo that there are lots of people queuing in the restaurant. The switches occur both between and within sentences.

Extract 16:

5. Lisa: **restoran Iku antrií WONGÉ () UNTEL-UNTELAN () AN TO NYIN antri [THE restaurant, THE PEOPLE are queuing () JOSTLING WITH EACH OTHER () LOTS OF PEOPLE are queuing]

6. Bobo: **bilangé suđa dôdôq didalem, ndaq antri [it’s said once (you) sit inside, no more queuing]**

7.2.2.2.3.2 Using discourse markers from different code(s)

Often, a speaker will use discourse markers from a language other than the one which is otherwise being used in an utterance. Some examples of these tag switches found in the
data are among others (1) the Indonesian discourse marker ‘ya’ together with its Javanese counterpart ‘yho’ which means ‘yes’, ‘yeah, ‘okay’, and (2) the Javanese ‘ngónó lhó’ meaning ‘you know how it is’ or just ‘y’know’. Just for this section the underlining is used to indicate the tag elements. These discourse markers are found after another code or in between other codes.

The next example is an interaction between Bobo and Lisa who tries to advise Bobo not to travel a lot due to Bobo’s difficulties in walking. In this extract (17) there are two codes, Javanese and Hakka, which appear in one sentence. The sentence starts in Javanese, then some part of the message is repeated in Hakka and is finished off with a Javanese discourse marker ‘yho’. The same discourse marker ‘yho’ appears again in line (117) between Hakka phrases.

Extract 17:

115. Lisa: MANGKANÉ MA, LÉQ AKU, HENG NGAI ROIYHO (?) [THAT’S WHY MOTHER, IF I, IF I COME, OK (?)]
116. Bobo: yha ini seng ngganténì po-[that’s it who changes po-]
117. Lisa: -GAQ, HENG NGAI ROI YHO, HOK UK GWA KÓ HO-- [NO, IF I COME, OK, IT’S BETTER TO STAY HOME-]
118. Bobo: ndaq tau pigi mana mana-[()] never go anywhere-[
119. Lisa: SEK U GWA KÓ HO, NUNAQ-NUNUQ, NUNAQ-NUNUQ (?) NDELOQ OPO SÉ? (.) NDELOQ PASÉR PUTI? [-IT’S BETTER TO STAY HOME, walking step by step, step-by-step with difficulties () what do you want to see? () to see the White Sand beach?]

The following extract illustrates two things, first, the use of the Javanese discourse marker ngónó lhó ‘that’s how it is’ after a Hakka sentence and second, a repetitive message found in the use of Hakka ‘me i se’ which repeats what was earlier said in CMI ‘bolaq-baléq’. The repetitive expressions mean more or less the same ‘every time’ and ‘every now and then’ respectively. The speaker, Ani, is using Hakka to emphasize her message. In this extract, Javanese, Hakka and Malay are used.

Extract 18:

157. Ani:—OJO MUNI gampong Ma, KOWÉ bolaq-baléq MO FAN BO, koq gampong gampong, MÉ İSE MO FAN BO NGONÒ LHO, FAN BO SE SONG OI CHON JUI CHON, SE SONG OI CHON JUI CHON=: [DON’T SAY easy Ma, YOU every now and then HAVE NO SERVANT, how (could you say) easy easy, EVERY TIME (YOU HAVE) NO SERVANT, YOU KNOW THAT, A SERVANT EVERY TIME (SHE) WANTS TO GO HOME (SHE) JUST GOES HOME EVERY TIME (SHE)WANTS TO GO HOME (SHE) JUST GOES HOME=}
Both extracts 17 and 18 show the use of a Javanese discourse marker after Hakka sentences or expressions.

7.2.2.2.3.3 Translating part of a story into the shared code

In the following extract Mimi is giving an account of her interaction in Javanese with a nurse in the hospital. However, in telling Titi about that encounter, Mimi translates part of the story into the codes she shares with Titi. In line (1), Mimi starts retelling her conversation with the nurse. It is apparent that the nurse, a native Javanese girl, does not speak Mandarin but Mimi aligns most of her story into the unmarked codes she shared with Titi, namely CMI and Mandarin. Notice that it is mostly Mimi who speaks in mixed code.

Extract 19:

1. Mimi: iya dêqé kan I KÓ FANG-CIÈN I KÓ RHEN, jadi itu kan YHU HAU JI KÓ CTA-JYÈN, ada sêng LIOK PEQ U, JIQ PEQ U ato CYU PEQ. WHÓ WEN Ani... "WHÓ TEQ PAPA TEQ TÓ SAU?" “WHO MEI YHU WEN NI YAU EJI HAU FANG?” S: “Nì ngenyèk ya?” S

   [yes, they have ONE ROOM ONE PERSON, so that THERE ARE SEVERAL PRICES, there is (one costs) SIX HUNDRED FIFTY, SEVEN HUNDRED FIFTY or NINE HUNDRED. I ASKED Ani “HOW MUCH IS MY FATHER’S?” “HAVEN’T I ASKED YOU WHICH CLASS YOU WANTED TO HAVE?” S(Do)

   YOU look down upon (me)?” S]

2. Titi: [he he he he]

3. Mimi: “NI koq PUQ WEN WHÓ yang I DIAU TEQ, WHÓ YAU KAN FANG-CIÈN-né sêng mana”

   [“Why didn’t YOU ASK ME if (I want) the ONE MILLION ONE, I WANT TO SEE which ROOM it is”]

4. Titi: S tros? S

   [S then? S]

5. Mimi: tros... “MEI YHU”, “WHÓ TEQ TÓ SOW?” “LHó OPO?” ONOQ SÈNG LIQOQ PEQ U ONOQ SÈNG IJQ PEQ U?... YOQ-é!

   [then... “IT’S NOT AVAILABLE, “MINE IS HOW MUCH?” “WHAT IS IT?”

   “THERE IS THE ONE THAT IS SIX HUNDRED, THERE IS OTHER SEVEN HUNDRED FIFTY? ... The MEDICINE!”]

6. Titi: lhó YOQ-é laên lêg gitu?

   [oh the MEDICINE is different, is that right?]

7. Mimi: Laên Titi, YU TEQ RHEN, YU TEQ RHEN kan OPO NÉ, SE MEQ, BAI CÉQ-é, kuranj ato apa, YOQ é [spezial gitu lhô], [jâdî isa LIQOQ PEQ] [U isa IJQ PEQ U, sêng ômôm IJQ PEQ U

   [It’s different Titi, FOR THE HAVE, FOR THE HAVE what is it WHAT IS IT, THE ELECTROLITE, isn’t enough or what, the MEDICINE is [special you know] so it can be SIX HUNDRED][FIFTY can be SEVEN HUNDRED FIFTY, the common one is SEVEN HUNDRED FIFTY]

8. Titi: [oooooh] [oooooohh] [oooooohh]

9. Mimi: lêq LU/mau VIP-é ruangan khusus MAXIM, CYU PEQ JYÈN
I think Mimi translates her conversation with the nurse into Mandarin and CMI because the codes are the unmarked codes she shares with Titi. Mimi also quotes a few Javanese words used in her interactions with the nurse, and thus code-switches from Mandarin, CMI and Javanese in order to give more colour to her story-telling.

7.2.2.2.2.3.4 Mixed pronominal usage

There are also instances of employing pronouns from different codes. This typically involves the use of pronominal forms from migrant codes when Malay/Indonesian is the predominant code in the conversation. For example, even though Mimi and Titi have significant proficiency in Mandarin and Malay/Indonesian, in their use of CMI with Kong, both Mimi and Titi use a Mandarin second person singular to Kong and use either their name or Mandarin first person singular to refer to themselves. Kong also sometimes uses Foochow personal pronoun in speaking Malay to his daughters. When asked about this behaviour, they say that it is their habit and they are more comfortable with using Mandarin personal pronouns even when they otherwise use Malay. However, I would rather say that their behaviour is intended to show politeness towards the elderly which is specifically emphasized by the unequal rank between interlocutors, such as between parents-children, parents-in-law and children-in-law. This issue has been pointed out by Brown and Gilman (1960) in their study on personal pronouns selection in the social relationship to signal power and solidarity. As Mimi and Titi are not sure which personal pronouns to use in particular situations, they might choose the ones they consider as most polite or appropriate and might end up with employing a mixture of personal pronouns. This kind of ‘confusion’ or ‘indecisive manner’ in addressing another person is illustrated by Trudgill (1995) who said that many British people are not certain how to address their parents-in-law and end up with using no address term at all.

Pronominal forms are very often embedded in the Malay verbs or sentences especially in asking questions or giving orders. It is considered more polite to use a kinship term or at least an address term especially to speak to the elderly, people of
higher rank or those considered more superior than the speaker. Using ‘kamu’ ‘you’ in Malay/Indonesian is more common among peers or to speak to a younger person, but never to the elderly or someone respectable. Therefore, to avoid using the second personal pronouns to the elderly, the speakers can either use the embedded forms or use the address forms or kinship terms. In addition, pronouns, especially the personal pronouns of codes having certain social prestige, might be used as address terms and terms of reference and they become conventionalized somewhat like names for particular individuals. I believe for this reason the subjects (Mimi and Titi) avoid using Malay pronominal forms to Kong and since they speak Mandarin, it serves as one alternative and in some cases they adopt the Mandarin personal pronouns instead.

For example, although Mimi and Titi speak in CMI to Grandpa, they do not employ the Malay second person singular pronoun kamu ‘you’ towards their father and aku ‘I’ to refer to themselves. Instead, they are using either the Mandarin nie ‘you’ or the kinship term ‘Papa’ to address their father and Mandarin wo ‘I’ or their self-name to refer to themselves. When this fact was pointed out to them, they commented that they consider it more proper (lebih pas, lebih cocok ‘more appropriate’) to use nie instead of Malay kamu ‘you’ to speak to their father. In speaking Malay to his daughters, niece and daughter-in-law, Kong also uses either Mandarin or Foochow personal pronouns. He also uses Mandarin personal pronouns to his grandchildren. However, my observation reveals that Kong sometimes uses ‘kamu’ to his workers.

The same practice is observed among the 1970-1980s age cohort (Denny, Amanda and Cindy). To address and speak to older family members (Kong, Titi, Mimi, Indah and Jade) they use kin terms instead of using the Malay/Indonesian first personal pronoun kamu ‘you’. For example, although his grandchildren speak to Kong in Malay, they never use Malay first or second personal pronouns. They will either omit mentioning them or use the Hokkien kinship term ‘Kong’ ‘Grandpa’ to address Grandpa and use their names to refer to themselves. I would rather say that Mandarin and other Chinese kinship terms are used to indicate politeness in these interactions. Culturally, as

---

18 In formal situation the first personal pronoun Anda ‘you’ is more appropriate than ‘kamu’.
19 Similar practices are observed in the Javanese speakers who switch to Javanese personal pronouns when using Indonesian in order to show respect or switch to Indonesian to indicate social distance or solidarity. For example, even though speakers converse in Indonesian, they very often adopt the Javanese ‘panjenengan’ or ‘sampeyan’ ‘you’ as the use of the Indonesian ‘Anda’ or ‘kamu’ is not deemed appropriate to show respect. ‘Anda’ seems so distant while ‘kamu’ is more or less similar to the use of ‘kowe’ in Javanese which indicates familiarity or ‘indefinite anonymous as ‘you’ in English, as in ‘You never know’ (see Errington, 1998: 95).
the subjects are of Chinese origin, using Chinese kinship terms among them is the expected unmarked practice to show filial piety and respect especially to those older and using the first personal pronoun to an older person is uncalled for. In addition, between Kong, Mimi and Titi, they might not be used to using Malay/Indonesian personal pronouns between them. Thus, between Kong, Mimi and Titi, Mandarin is a high code to show respect to their father as it is from Kong to other family members.

In the following dialogue, Grandpa uses the Foochow first personal pronoun ‘WAI’ ‘I’ in his Malay sentence in the last part of his Mandarin sentences.

Extract 20:

   [yes, (it’s) a habit (.) sleeping in the morning (.) we are looking for one who can guard the house (.) Agree? (if) we don’t use him, he watches over the house, (if we) don’t use him, (.) in the afternoon we use him (.) until evening, whether there’s a person or no person at home, he’s watching over the house, you tell him how high is his salary? He’ll busy with other things, so (he’s) not specially for ME (.) what do you think?]

2. Mimi: YHA DA MEN YHA CE TAO TING (.) I GO YHEQ ITU NEN KO NA TAO CIA LI TÓ SOW JYEN
   [well, they want to know later (.) that in one month how much money (they) can bring home?]

3. Kong: ya kira-kira ya SAN PEQ TÓ JYEN
   [well, approximately three hundred thousand]

The same thing is illustrated in the extract below in which Mimi uses the same Foochow pronouns ‘WAI’ to refer to herself and Mandarin ‘Nie’ ‘you’ when talking to Grandpa. Otherwise, she basically uses CMI utterance with a few other Mandarin words/expressions (see line 3 and 5 respectively). Grandpa also uses ‘Nie’ in line (6) to refer to Mimi. Mimi admits that once in a while she uses Foochow words with her father and amongst the Foochow vocabulary used are personal pronouns. She cannot explain why, but since the personal pronouns ‘you’ and ‘I’ are the easiest to remember and to retain especially when they are perceived as indicating politeness or elevating the speaker-interlocutor status²⁰.

---

²⁰ A similar event is the retention of the use of Dutch personal pronouns ik and jij ‘I’ and ‘you’ by the peranakan amidst the all Malay/Indonesian words or sentences they have in their conversation. These personal pronouns are applied when talking to those they respect or those from the older generations from the Dutch colonial time.
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Extract 21:
1. Mimi: naq tukang lampu itu lho (.) dulu Bali ada sitoq (.) JA PUTO PA (.) WAI suku dëqë ini lho atôr ini lho (.) ini sengkrängë khan ndaq karuan (.) Bali, suku dëqë ngatôr (0.2) JIEN PU CE ME YANG KWI, kabel semua suku dëqë cëk waktu itu. Ali tahu alamatë (.)
   [if the electrician, y'know (.) formerly there is one in Bali (.) HE'S OK PA (.) I ask him this y'know, arrange this, y'know (.) the fuse is out of order (.) Bali, ask him to take care (.) HOW MUCH ALL OF THEM COST, ask him to check all the wires then. Ali knows his address (.)]

2. Kong: CE KO kabel HEN YAO JING
   [THESE wires ARE VERY SERIOUS]

3. Mimi: kabel HEN YAO JING, NIE kebakaran kabel WAN LEQ lho (.) naq kabelé tiliq lho perlu ganti apa—
   [the wires are VERY SERIOUS, YOU burn the wire, all FINISHED, y'know (.) if the wire is inspected, please check whether it needs replacement-]

4. Kong:—Comaq sekarang makanya CIAO, CIAO anu tukang listrik konstët YHU MEY YHU? (.) ING WEI-
   [only now that's why CALL, CALL eh an electrician, short-circuit, IS THERE ONE?'( .)
   BECAUSE-]

5. Mimi: ini kan mesti liaq kabel keseluruan, néq naq NIE comaq liaq konstët tøq ya séng konstët tøq didandani, mungkin ndeq sana kabelé keneg têkos (.)
   [this y'know, should inspect the whole wire, if YOU only check the short-circuited one, well only that one will be repaired, maybe up there the wire is gnawed by rats (.)]

   [do you want to sell (the house)? Well, you just (repair) that, just repair, if (you) want to have all checked, (you have) to replace, (it's) expensive]

In the following extract Ani speaks in an angry and irritated tone to Bobo using Javanese and Hakka. However, in answering Ani, Bobo uses Hakka and Malay and even switches between using Malay aku and saya, both meaning ‘I’ (line 188).

Extract 22:
185. Ani: LHA KOWÉ, KOWÉ GELEM KON TEN TAU KI SE WA A?, NYI CHONG TAU KI SE?
   [AND YOU, UNTIL WHEN ARE YOU WILLING TO TAKE CARE OF HIM? UNTIL WHEN WILL YOU LOOK AFTER HIM?]

186: All: ha ha ha ha huh

   [until when (will you) look after (him)? will you look after him until he's gone first? You look after him until he's gone first, (will you) look after him until he's gone first?]

188. Bobo: CHONG TO NGAI KON M TO, YU DA CHONG TO NGAI SIEN CHON, kaloq aku
   CHONG TO NGAI KON M TO ya saya, kaloq saya masiq liat, denger kasian
   [(I) look after him until I don't see, see him until I die, if I look after him until I can't see so that's it, if I still can see, hear, (I) pity him]

As seen in the dialogue, in line (185) Ani asks Bobo a question in Javanese and Hakka, then the question is repeated in Hakka. Line (187) is a repetition of line (185) but uttered in Hakka only. In line (188), Bobo answers using Hakka and CMI. Bobo
changes the Indonesian ‘aku’ in ‘kaloq aku’ into ‘kaloq saya’ to show change of formality from informal form to indicate solidarity to formal form to indicate politeness\(^{21}\). As Ani indicates her irritation and impatience in the previous turns, I believe Bobo intends to distance herself by using a more formal form and at the same time to ‘appease Ani’s irritation’ by being more polite and less assertive.

7.2.2.2.2.3.3 Free variation of pronominal usage

Sometimes a mixture of pronominal usage from different codes is used in free variation. In the following dialogue, Titi uses the Hokkien second personal pronoun *lu* ‘you’ to refer to Mimi her older sister but she uses *aku* to refer to herself (line 5).

Extract 23:

1. Mimi: **LU** diparani Guntur yha?
   [Guntur came to you, didn’t he?]
2. Titi: i*ya*
   [yes]
3. Mimi: dikèqi formulir yha?
   [(you) were given a form, weren’t you]
4. Titi: iha **LU** khan wès taqbilangi
   [I told you already]
5. Mimi: wès taqbilangi (.) lhò arèqè ke Co-saqbelómé gi AKU wès gi **LU**
   [(I told you .) you know the boy went to Co-before coming to ME he already went to you]
6. Titi: oh gitu, CIE
   [oh, that’s the case, older sister]
7. Mimi: dadi-
   [so-]
8. Titi:-AKU séq baru gi KAMU
   [-ME first then went to YOU]
9. Mimi: eh gi KAMU—“Iaq KAMU boq gi Jalan Slamet”, “saya tadi sudah
   [eh, (he) went to YOU—‘YOU don’t go to Jalan Slamet’, ‘I went there already.]
   pergi, tadi Ibu Titik nya senam” “Kapok” naq gituqno
   [and But Titik was going to the gym” “Serve (you ) right”, (I) told him.]
10. Titi: huh huh huh huh

Even though the two siblings speak in CMI, they seldom use the second person singular pronoun *kamu* ‘you’ in their interactions. Instead they use either the Hokkien word *lu* ‘you’, a kinship term or their names, which is paired with the Malay/Indonesian first person singular *aku* ‘I’ instead of using the Hokkien *gua* ‘I’. For example, Mimi and Titi address each other with ‘*lu*’ (line 1 and 4). Then in line (5) Mimi addresses Titi

---

\(^{21}\) The Familiar /informal first person in Indonesia is ‘aku’, the second person is ‘kamu’ or ‘(eng)kau ‘and the third person is ‘dia’ while their polite or formal forms are ‘saya’, ‘Anda’ and ‘beliau’ respectively. Compared to ‘aku’ using ‘saya’ indicates an action of self-lowering on the part of the speaker in order to elevate the interlocutor’s position, and thus showing respect. (‘saya’ comes from the Malay word ‘sahaya’ in ‘hamba sahaya’ meaning ‘servant’. Among the older peranakan speakers, ‘saya’ is always used by a female family member to refer to herself or when being summoned by an elderly person, while *Owe*, a Hokkien word is used by the male one. Both mean ‘I’).
with 'lu' but uses 'aku' to refer to herself. Later, Titi, addresses Mimi with the kinship term 'Cie' older sister (line 6) then 'kamu' and 'aku' to refer to herself (line 8) and again the pair of saya and Kamu 'you' and 'I' in line (9) when she quotes a certain incident.

My observation of interactions between Titi and Mimi would suggest that they only use 'kamu' sometimes, but they never use gua 'I' to speak to each other. Towards other family members who are younger or non-family members, the pair 'aku' and 'kamu' is used. I am of the opinion that this bit of Hokkien 'lu' serves as free variation in their interaction to show solidarity for sharing the same codes or closeness between them.

7.2.2.3 Some additional reasons behind the use of particular unmarked code(s)

The following are some of the reasons why the subjects use one particular code or more than two codes in their interactions with particular subjects.

7.2.2.3.1 Habitual action and convenience

Besides the linguistic and societal factors that put some constraints on speaker's language choice, there are also individual attitudinal factors that determine the speaker's code-choice behaviour. In the interview, most subjects report that they choose the code they speak out of habit. Using a particular code out of habit seems to be the opinion shared by most subjects including those who employ code-switching as their unmarked code choice patterns. These subjects usually reason that these practices are more convenient and practical for them especially with particular family members who share the codes. As they are rational actors, this means that there may originally have been a reason for the choice, but with the passage of time this may have slipped in the background and been ultimately forgotten. This habitual action is expressed by Myers-Scotton as 'conventionalized exchange' that takes place as a manifestation of a specific set of rights and obligations established between a certain speaker and addressee (Myers-Scotton, 1983a: 115, 117) to index a code as their unmarked choice.
7.2.2.3.2 To exclude an unwanted audience

Mimi reported that using Mandarin is their habit in talking with her father and sisters, and is especially useful when they want to share something ‘secret’ in the presence of non-family members (the domestic and the care-givers) who live in their homes. Nowadays, Mandarin especially serves this purpose.

To speak to her sister and father, Mimi employs Mandarin. The conversation between the two siblings, Mimi (2FCT-Pa) and Titi (2FCT-Pb) is mostly held in CMI and Mandarin with some Javanese sentences inserted when they mention the times of the day, days of the week, kinship terms, business and money matters, other daily routines, family, and household matters. However, the amount of Mandarin, and sometimes also Foochow and Hokkien words, phrases and expressions in their conversation especially increases when there are unwanted listeners or audience. On one occasion, Mimi and Titi were going to the airport and they were discussing a family matter they did not want the driver to know about. They employed a mixture of Mandarin and Foochow, with even some Hokkien key words in their interaction. CMI lexical items are confined to words that will not reveal the secret.

In the next extract, Titi supplies reasons for her using Mandarin. She also muses that she used to speak more Foochow with her father, Kong/Grandpa. She starts her sentence by addressing the writer (Guest) with Hokkien second person singular Lu ‘you’ and continues with CMI. In between she uses Mandarin words and expressions and at the end she uses Foochow to ask her father to speak in Foochow. The participants are Titi, Mimi, Kong and a guest.

Extract 24:

1. Titi: Lu mest ngēq sini ni ngomong WO MEN ini sukaq kadan-kadang CHYANG KUO I, kadan-kadang CHYANG INI HUA, apalagi lēq ada () sunggo’o mo CHYANG sêng PIK MIK, PIK MIK, sunggo’o ada kyak () ada soster gitu toh ada soster lēq teros WO MEN khan ndaq sa ngomong, kebanyaqan ngomong KUO I () gitu () lēq nggaaq aku sehari-hari yha ngomong Indonesia ambeq arêq-arêq () lyha [toh?]
   
   [YOU have to say here, WE like to sometimes speak MANDARIN, sometimes, INDONESIAN, particularly if there is () for example (I) want to say something SECRET, SECRET, for example there is like () the nurse is around, like that, the nurse is around, then if WE can’t speak, usually (we) speak MANDARIN, like that () if not for daily use (I) speak Indonesian with the children () isn’t that true?

2. Mimi: ................................................................. = campuran

22 Further discussion on code choice involving or in the presence of an audience will be dealt with in the next chapter.
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3. Titi: [campuran wès]
   [well, mixed]
4. Kong: [kebiasaan]
   [habit]
5. Mimi: mo kyak apa lagi?
   [what can (we) do?]
6. Titi: heqe, tapi læq aku læq dulu èsq isa ngomong ambèq Papa, èsq isa ngomong FU CHOU HUA. Saqiki wès gaq, ya Pa ya? Gaq tau KUNG HOK CHIU HUA wësan, NIE KUNG lho, NIE KUNG lho! NIE BU DIANG A?
   [yes, as for me formerly, I could still speak with Papa, (I) could still speak FOOCHOW. Now, no more, isn’t that true Pa? Never speak FOOCHOW anymore. YOU SPEAK, please, YOU SPEAK please, YOU DON’T THINK SO?]
7. Guest: NIE KUNG itu apa maksute? agomong?
   [what does NIE KUNG mean? To speak?]
8. Titi: heqe, [NI CHYANG]
   [yes, TO SPEAK]
9. Mimi: [NI CHYANG/]
   [TO SPEAK]

7.2.2.3.3 Politeness and solidarity
One subject is of the opinion that he feels the code he uses with a particular interlocutor is the most appropriate to speak to that particular interlocutor especially when he/she is an elderly family member. Others state that they choose a particular code because that is how they communicate so far and that is the right thing to do. I would rather say that their code choice practices indicate that the motivation behind those practices is to show polite behaviour to the interlocutors as is governed by the norms. Some ways of showing this politeness are by employing certain codes having a certain status or prestige, either in full or in part—just the pronominal forms or kinship terms even while using other codes as was seen in some code choice practices. In the same way, some subjects show solidarity between themselves by using the code associated with solidarity or ‘sameness’ such as Ngoko Javanese and CMI between siblings or those of similar age (see §7.2.2.1.6 and §7.2.2.1.7).

7.2.2.3.4 To comply with societal changes
Another reason for code choice is that the situation has changed so that people have to use the codes employed by the majority, especially when the young generations do not speak the migrant codes any longer. Most of the older generations share this opinion.
Normative reorientation in speech

Nowadays, young parents try to teach the speech norms and give orientation to correct forms to their young children. Most parents, regardless of their language background, try to speak EJI or possibly SI to their children as their home language in order to encourage the children to use the correct forms. They even correct the children’s wrong use of the code. This phenomenon is apparent in the interaction between the older generation and the young ones as is shown in the following extract from an interaction between Tania and her daughter, Rina (the 1990s age cohort) who uses SI.

Extract 25:

Rina: Mak Ji, minum! (in a loud and harsh voice)
[Mak Ji, drink]
Tania: MAK JI, TOLONG AMBILKAN MINUM, (.) ayo mina baik baik
[Please, get me some drinks, Mak Ji (.) Come on, ask politely (correctly)]
Rina: <MAK JI TOLONG AMBILKAN RINA MINUM> (in a softer and slower voice)
[Mak Ji, please get Rina some drink]

A similar purpose is shown in the following unintentionally recorded interaction between Ani and her grandson, Andrew, who is three years older than Rina. Although Andrew is not the subject under study, the interaction will illustrate Ani’s code choice behaviour to speak to the young generation. Ani uses SI. Notice that Ani uses the formal Indonesian ‘tidak’ for ‘No’, while Andrew uses the colloquial form ‘ndaq’. The dialogue shows that Ani consistently uses the standard form with her grandson. This phenomenon is unusual, since here the older generation is using what is seen as a more formal code to talk to her adult grandchildren than she does with either her siblings or her children. It shows that she is trying to give examples of, and teach the appropriate and proper forms. This behaviour is similar to what Errington (1998: 123-24) describes as a sub-type of speech modelling, i.e. ‘prescriptive modelling’: mbasakaké which is a shift of interactional self. In this instance an older person corrects a younger person’s speech by modelling the right kin terms and speech style, usually the more formal style, to address an elderly person. It is an unusual phenomenon, because it is a reversal of what is expected in terms of younger-older respectful practices. However, in most interactions between the older generations and the 1990s age cohort, the older generations seem to use a more formal style as a device to teach the younger generations the appropriate kind of behaviour and the correct form of Indonesian.

Extract 26:

Andrew: Aku ndaq mau ikut ke greja!
[ I don’t want to go to church!]
Ani: TIDAK, TIDAK, KAMU IKUT DREW! KAMU JANGAN BANDEL YA!

268
[No, no, you are coming Drew! Don’t be naughty, Ok!]

Andrew: >ndaq mau, ndaq mau ikut, aku mau di rumah<
[(I don’t want to, (I) don’t want to go, I want to stay at home]

Ani: KAMU SUDAH BESAR, ANAK-ANAK KECIL DI RUMAH. RINA, LUKI (.) DI RUMAH SEMUA!
[You are a big boy, small children stay at home. Rina, Luki (.) all stay home!]

This phenomenon also explains some of the code choice practices which take place between Lisa, Filip and their children, Tania, Jenny and Gugun. To Tania and Jenny, their daughters, both Lisa and Filip employ Javanese, however to Gugun, their son they employ CMI. Both Tania and Jenny also employ CMI to Gugun while among themselves they use Javanese. When they were asked why these differences existed, they do not know the reasons. I would suggest that both parents and elder sisters tried to ‘teach’ Indonesian to their younger brother and that this practice has just stayed with them to the present time. Gugun was born in the late 1960s and, by that time Indonesian had started to be the only language used as a medium of instruction and the one the government was promoting. Since CMI has Indonesian elements in it, this code is considered more appropriate to be used as a home language and it replaced the Javanese code still spoken with the older children. CMI is also the main code spoken by Lisa and Filip to talk to Tom, their son-in-law. For this, both Lisa and Filip comment that it is a more appropriate and polite code since Tom does not know Hakka, and using Javanese is considered too intimate and inappropriate to talk to a son-in-law. With regard to this phenomenon, Oetomo (1989) reports that speaking Indonesian as a home language is found among middle class Indonesians, including Chinese Indonesians.

7.2.2.3.6 Socio-semantic reasons
There are words or expressions in one language that are not readily translatable to other languages, often due to the distinct cultural and societal meanings they convey. In other words, the richness and the flavour of their meaning would be impaired if they were to be translated into other languages. I notice that in some instances the subjects are aware of inexact semantic matches across languages. To retain the original semantic content of the word(s) might lead them to borrow from other languages they know, so code-switch. This kind of code-switching can be explained in terms of cultural schema theory as discussed by Sharifian (2002) or in terms of societal schemas if it is a group’s collective knowledge (Sharifian, 2000). Some examples of words of this type which occur repeatedly in conversation are the Javanese word ‘ngopeni’ that more or less means ‘to take care of, to feed, to look after tenderly and lovingly and its passive form ‘dioopeni’
Lisa, Bobo and Tania are talking about Bobo looking after her son. The Javanese word ‘ngopêni’ is used even though they speak in other codes. In line (171 and 173) Bobo uses CMI and so does Tania in line (175). Tania even uses the passive and active form ‘diopêni’ and ‘ngopêni’ in her CMI sentence. These words are underlined.

Extract 27:

170. Lisa: PIYÉ LÈ MU NGOPÊNI WONG KOWÉ DÉWÉ NJALOG DIOPÊNI WONG
     [HOW ARE YOU GOING TO LOOK AFTER YOURSELF, YOU YOURSELF WANT TO BE
     LOOKED AFTER]

171. Bobo: ndaq usa NGOPÊNI liaq dia taqsuru masaq ini, masaq itu dia bisa masaq, kalo ndaq,
     ndaq jalan
     [there is no need TO LOOK AFTER (me), (I) just see him and ask him to cook this and
     to cook this, he can cook, if not (he) doesn’t do anything]

172. Lisa: makan ya urusané déqé, wong wis gedhé, KOWÉ KOQ ISO NGOPÊNI SAKIU WONG
     KOWÉ DÉWÉ NJALOG DIOPÊNI WONG
     [eating is his own problem, he is big already, HOW COULD YOU LOOK AFTER SAKIU,
     YOU YOURSELF ASK TO BE LOOKED AFTER]

173. Bobo: bukan NGOPÊNI dia ya (-) cumaq ya-
     [it is not LOOKING AFTER him yeah (-) only yeah-]

174. Lisa:-LEQ MBIYEN AKU PERCOYO, ISO NYUCIQNO BAJUNÉ DÉQÉ, ISO NGGOSIQNO
     BAJUNÉ DÉQÉ, LIHA SAQIKI NDI ISO?
     [IF IN THE PAST, I BELIEVE (IT), (YOU) COULD WASH HIS CLOTHES, (YOU)
     COULD IRON HIS CLOTHES, WHAT ABOUT NOW HOW COULD (YOU) ]

175. Tania: Bo, orang suja besar ndaq usah DIOPÊNI, Bo, bisa NGOPÊNI awaqé déwèq suqa
     [Bo, grown-ups need not TO BE LOOKED AFTER, Bo, (they) can LOOK AFTER
     themselves already]

7.2.2.3.7 Familylect

There are some Hakka or Mandarin words or expressions that belong to the familylect. Among these words in family B is the Hakka word ‘fan bó’ that is used to refer to a ‘maid-servant’ although literally it means ‘other woman in the house that is not a family member’. There are actually other words referring to domestics or maid-servant, i.e. an Indonesian word ‘pembantu’ or a Malay one ‘babu’ or Javanese word ‘rewang’. One subject is of the opinion that the Hakka term is considered ‘less harsh’ in meaning than the Indonesian term ‘pembantu’ or Malay ‘babu’ 23. However, I would rather say that the family members use the Hakka term because they have been using this word or expression even before the Indonesian term became prevalent. Besides, in the first place the family member might have used the Hakka term in order to exclude the person referred to (the domestics), and this practice has stayed within the family. In other

---

23 ‘Babu’ is often used pejoratively as a derogatory remark in public society.
words, the term has become part of their familylect. In addition, the similar words in Indonesian, ‘pe mbantu’ or Malay ‘babu’, do not really capture the nuance of meaning conveyed by the Hakka word ‘fan bó’. This word is always used by family members to refer to a maidservant and appears in any code they use. In lines (150) and (129) it is with CMI and in line (46), (56) and (58) it appears with the Javanese code and in line (57) it is used within a Hakka phrase.

Extract 28:

150. Jenny: ada FAN BÓ-NÉ lho
     [there is HER MAID-SERVANT, y’know]

Extract 29:

129. Jon: SEKARANG TINGGAL KARANG ANYAR, Mama dikèqi ruma rongsqovan itu, dikèqi
     FAN BÓ—
     [Now living in Karang Anyar Mama is given that wrecked house, is given a MAID-
      SERVANT-]

Extract 30:

46. Lisa: MELOQ SuroboyO YHO OLE TAPI GAQ ONOQ FAN BÓ MA....SAQIKI FAN BÓ
     MULIH, MBÒH KAPAN TEKO GAQ ERO AKU ()
     [going (with us) to Surabaya is OK too but now no MAID-SERVANT Ma, now the
      servant has gone home, (I) don’t know when (she) is coming back (.)]

Extract 31:

56. Lisa: SAQIKI AKU GAQ DUVÉ FAN BÓ Ma!
     [now I don’t have a MAID-SERVANT Ma!]

57. Bobo: YHO FANÉ CANG TO SESOQ? MÓ FANBÓ?
     [1FCFT: yes it’s MOSLEM NEW YEAR tomorrow, isn’t it? NO MAID-SERVANT?]

58. Lisa: FANÆ CANG FAN BÓ-É MÔLÉ
     [2FCFT: the MAID-SERVANT has gone home during MOSLEM NEW YEAR]

The examples above show the use of one Hakka word that has become part of the subjects’ familylect.

7.3 Variation and rationality

Matching the subjects’ language repertoire and language proficiency with their code choice patterns reveals that the availability of the codes in one’s repertoire and proficiency in the codes (their opportunity sets) govern and constrain code-choice activities. Differences in the opportunity sets the subjects have serves as one of the reasons for variation in code choice patterns. Other factors are the societal and family speech norms as to what occurs between certain age cohorts and in-laws, or other cultural values such as those occurring between those of different social status, family
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members domestics, and care-givers etc. All these factors serve as filters in ‘decisions’ to choose a certain code to index a particular RO set with a particular interlocutor/addressee. Some factors, individual and social, bring about variation in the subjects’ code choice behaviour, both inter- and intra-speakers as shown in the tables (7.1 to 7.4).

In other cases, despite the highly similar shared language repertoire and language proficiency these subjects have, some pairs of S-I choose a particular code(s) to be the unmarked code choice between them. The decision to choose which particular code for particular addressee, topic, occasion, and relationship should be made automatically in any interaction in order to seek the best alternative possible. Thus, to match the situation and their intentions, speakers have to make a quick mental calculation regarding the most eligible or appropriate code chosen. A speaker’s practice of choosing one code rather than another, the intra-speaker variation in particular, indicates the intentional nature of the speaker. This capacity signifies the existence and demonstration of rationality in the speaker as reflected in his code choice practices. Thus, the unmarked codes between a pair of S-I are rationally chosen to index the RO set between them in the first place. These codes are decided based on opportunity sets (language repertoire and language proficiency), social factors including norms, the somatic marker, the markedness evaluator and the appropriateness evaluator which speakers innately possess.

7.4 Summary and conclusion
A number of questions were formulated in the introduction of this chapter ‘How is it that there is variation in the subjects’ unmarked code choice patterns, either inter- or intra-speaker? What is the rationale behind their code choices? What happens to the migrant codes, Mandarin, Hakka and Foochow? The response to these questions given in this chapter can be summarized as follows.

The reason why variation happens in dyadic interactions is due to the subjects’ significantly different language background experiences, language repertoire and language proficiency, as well as attitudes, especially pertaining to G1 and G3/G4. So, different individuals have different opportunity sets to start with. In addition, there is inequality in terms of status in the family, owing to age differences and these all motivate different language choice behaviour. The variation then is manifested in the use of different codes from different origins for different age cohorts. Also, there are
symmetrical and asymmetrical code choice practices due to the discrepancy in the S-I language repertoire and proficiency. Using two or more codes as an unmarked conversational strategy seems to be something confined to particular age cohorts. This unmarked code-switching as a conversational strategy especially involves those having or sharing substantial language proficiency. Variation is also due to other norm-instigated reasons which require speakers to choose the most appropriate code and other personal reasons such as excluding an unwanted audience, normative reorientation in speech, politeness and solidarity, etc. This occurs both between and within generations. Stylistic variation within a speaker’s speech is highly prevalent in some subjects, particularly those having a vast variety of codes, both migrant and host, with significant and substantial proficiency. These subjects are especially from the first and the second generations. In short, the variation is determined among others by the social factors as postulated by some scholars like Gumperz (1971a), Franceschini (1998), Bourdieu (1977b, 1991), Brown and Levinson (1987) etc.

All these variations and the motivations behind the choices each speaker makes, indicate that code choices are made carefully. Code choices are discourse strategies, and speakers make choices because of their long-term relationship with the interlocutors. Even though the interactions are between family members, the unmarked preferred code chosen is negotiated in the first place, the decision as to which code to choose among their multilingual language repertoire involves rationally-based process. A particular RO set is accepted by using a certain preferred code in their interaction. However, despite all these social factors (age, language background, norms etc.) the final choice is decided individually between a particular pair of S-I which then reflect that their code choice is speaker-oriented.

What happens to the migrant codes? Although there are changes in their code choice behaviour in line with the changes in the society to use more Indonesian, some subjects still have high regard for and a positive attitude towards the migrant codes, Mandarin and Hakka, and use the codes in particular interactions. The migrant codes are found in the interactions of the elder age cohorts and have been gradually replaced by the host codes in the younger age cohort. Migrant codes are totally absent from the 1970s-1980s age cohort’s language repertoire and language choice. In light of the host codes, EJI is considered as more acceptable and formal than CMI. In all interactions, there are no interactions with solely a migrant code as the unmarked code choice between a pair of S-I, while CMI as the only code of interaction is prevalent among
most family members. In family A, the migrant codes diminished totally within the span of 2 generations. In family B, the migrant codes are diminishing and are being gradually replaced by the host codes. This turnover is apparent among G3 (the 1950s and 1960s) age cohorts. The host codes CMI and Javanese are later replaced by EJI in the 1990s age cohort. This means that the shift took place within a span of 3.5 generations.

What the subjects perceive of their code choice behaviour, how they perform their various code choice practices, and their attitude towards the codes they choose are all things that reflect their multiple identities. All members of the second generation, and especially the 1930s and the 1940s age cohorts, acknowledge that they are of Chinese origin and that they are Chinese Indonesians who speak Chinese, Javanese and Indonesian. Most of the third generation, on the other hand, especially those born after 1965, simply say they are Indonesians, while some others cannot really say ‘who they are’ or simply say ‘mixed’. Thus, their code choice practices coincide with their attitude and perception of themselves.

To conclude, a speaker makes use of codes with certain societal status, role and prestige in order to practice the ‘agreed’ rights and obligations set with his interlocutor. The speaker indexes this certain code with certain a RO set shared with a certain interlocutor/addressee to be their shared unmarked code. The variation in a particular speaker’s unmarked code choice practices with different interlocutors in dyadic interactions shows that his/her code choice is intentional and thus rationally-based.
Chapter 8

The Complexities of Markedness & Group Interactions

8.0 Introduction

The previous chapter discussed a variety of unmarked patterns of code choice in dyadic interactions. The discussion emphasised the rationality behind speakers' preferred choices. The present chapter presents a discussion of marked code choice in dyadic interactions and of the complexities of both unmarked and marked choices in group interactions. I argue that among close-knit extended family members such as the subjects of this study, speakers employ different codes in their interactions to project their identities and their rights and obligations as family members. To demonstrate their membership as part of a multilingual family or their ‘we-ness’, they exploit their multilinguality. They do this in order to index their intentions for accommodating the audience and for presenting themselves in regard to both the topics and the contributions of others in the ongoing conversation.

This chapter is organised as follows: section 8.1 explains how the Markedness Model is applicable in analysing the subjects' code choice behaviour, then section 8.2 presents marked code choice instances in dyadic interactions. After that comes a discussion on the use of Myers-Scotton's (1983a, 1988a, 1993b, 1998c) Markedness Model to analyse the complexities of code choice behaviour in group interactions. Both the unmarked and marked choices and their varieties are presented. The examples of excerpts from dialogues which are presented are analysed sequentially within the types of switches in the Markedness Model. Finally, the last section ends the chapter by providing a short summary of the chapter's findings.

8.1 Markedness Model and code choice behaviour

When all family members gather together in group interactions, a complex situation arises in which family members from different age cohorts sharing different language repertoires take turns participating in the discussion by employing their own preferred
codes or code combinations. My hypothesis is that the Markedness Model (Myers-Scott, 1983a, 1993b) can serve as an adequate tool to disentangle the complexity of these code choice practices in interactions involving three or more participants. In order to implement this, as explained in chapter 2, a sequential approach which looks at the dialogue on a turn-by-turn basis is applied in the analysis.

As mentioned previously, the five maxims postulated by Myers-Scott (1993b: 114-49, 1998c: 26) in the Markedness Model are used in analysing the data in this study (see §2.6.2.1.1 for description of what each type covers and signifies). These five maxims are manifested in five types of switches which serve as an explanatory framework for the subjects’ code choice behaviour. They are code-switching as an unmarked choice, codeswitching as a marked choice, codeswitching as an exploratory choice, codeswitching as a deferential strategy and using ‘virtuosity’ in code-switching (using any code to carry on the conversation). Although what each type signifies is explained in chapter 2, they are partially reiterated in this chapter as the discussion goes on.

As stated in §2.6.2.1.2, the theory of code choice behind the Markedness Model is more speaker-oriented than audience-oriented. Therefore, by analyzing and associating the code choices or switches that occur in the interactions as one of these types, the Markedness Model enables the writer to account for the subject’s language behaviour and the various or possible intentions a speaker wishes to convey to attain specific goals in their interactions. To determine whether a subject is using his unmarked code or exerting a marked one with a particular interlocutor, or whether an instance of code-switching signifies a negotiation of a new RO set, I compare a subject’s code choice practices with their unmarked pattern presented in chapter 7. Initial observation of the dialogues in these multilingual families often suggests that code-switching is taking place throughout the interactions. Although frequent code-switching may be taking place, it can turn out that no new RO set is being negotiated since each participant is employing his own unmarked choice to address his particular interlocutor. In other instances marked choices also take place. These can occur for a variety of reasons, such as when a speaker wishes to convey specific intentions through negotiating a new RO set or when a third party (either part of the interacting group or an unwanted listener) is present.

The third party or audience in this case covers the intended addressee (if others have been the addressees up to the point of analysis) as well as other participants
including ‘unwelcomed’ listeners/hearers/eavesdroppers. With regard to the number of participants, Hymes (1974: 54) states that “the common dyadic model of speaker-hearer is oftentimes too few”. In light of this, Bell (1984, 1997) posits that there are different kinds of audience—addressee, auditor, overhearer and eavesdropper—whose “roles are by no means passive”. Kartomihardjo (1979:17) also indicates that “in East Java, the presence of a hearer in addition to that of the speaker and addressee is often significant in relation to the choice of rules which in turn determine the choice of variety”. He illustrates that two Javanese friends who share Javanese as their unmarked code might switch to EJI or an Indonesian-Javanese mixture when a non-Javanese speaker joins them in their conversation.

What happens among the subjects of this study is that the presence of the third party usually gives rise to the disruption of the ‘default’ unmarked code choice practices in dyadic interactions. This then compels both speaker and addressee to employ another code, either for the advantage or disadvantage of the other audience as well as for both speaker and addressee themselves. As Bell (1984: 161) suggests, the audience can be instrumental in a wide variety of speaker’s linguistic choices including a switch from one language to another, the forms of speech acts, pronoun choice, the use of honorifics, and other kinds of style shift. Some studies indicate that language switch is strongly determined by who the addressee is (Fishman, 1971b: 251), and even that the choice of code can be an indication as to who the intended addressee in the audience is (Gal, 1979: 121).

The following section focuses on a discussion of some typical examples of marked choices in dyadic interactions found in the data. Regarding the varieties of choices, however, the varieties of marked choices in dyadic interaction do not seem to be as many as those of marked choices in group interactions.

8.2 Marked code choices in dyadic interactions

Although this chapter focuses on the analysis of markedness in group interactions, it also presents some instances of marked code choices in dyadic interactions found in the data.

8.2.1 Exerting ‘authority’

The following example concerns the use of a marked choice in a dyadic interaction between Amanda and Denny. Amanda is going out and Denny is asking Amanda
whether he can come along. He uses CMI as it is the unmarked code between them. Amanda answers with CMI and then switches to EJI in a ‘playfully’ commanding tone. Implied from Amanda’s using the marked EJI is her negotiation of a new RO set, i.e. ‘giving an order’ to Denny to be quick as she is ready to go. Denny accepts this and acknowledges by saying that he will be quick, but still using CMI himself.

Extract 1:

Denny: Manda, mo brangkat skarang tā? mêloq yha? tapi aku taqmandi séq, yha?
[Manda (do you) want to go now? May (I) come along? but could I have a shower first, is that OK?]
Amanda: Cepetan Ko! kalau mau ikot, haros cepet-cepet. (.) [Kalau tidak ya ditinggal dirumah!]
[Be quick older brother, if (you) want to come along, (you) have to be very quick (.) otherwise (you’ll be) left behind at home]
Denny: […..]
[iyha yha, cepet koq]
[Yes, yes, (I’ll be) surely quick]

Since formal Indonesian is associated with authority, then the choice of a more formal form than CMI serves Amanda’s purpose well. Amanda mitigates the order by saying it in a playful, half joking tone. In Brown and Levinson’s politeness model (1987), the use of this warm joking tone is a strategy of positive politeness.

8.2.2 Indication of reported speech (quotation)

The next extract is another kind of marked code-switching in a dyadic interaction between Tania (3FCTa) and Bobo (1FCT). In this extract the speaker uses a marked code to quote while retelling an account of her daily life. In line (204) below, Bobo addresses her granddaughter Tania (Tania) using CMI, their unmarked shared code. In the middle she switches to Javanese, an unmarked code she shares with her son, when she quotes something that her son had said before she goes on to tell the rest of the story. Grandma/Bobo identifies herself as ‘Mama’ when she reports the words that her son said to her but as ‘Bobo’ when talking to her granddaughter Tania. These two kinds of ‘signposts’ in her quotation: the code and the kinship terms index the new RO set and justifies her use of another code in her quotation.

Extract 2:

203. Tania: yha itu tanggung jawabnya A Kiu Amë jagaq
[yes, that’s the responsibility of Uncle and Auntie too]

Another example of quotation is found in the following extract. The interaction is between Lisa and Bobo and it is held in Javanese, CMI and Hakka. In line (333) Lisa starts her sentence with Javanese (all caps italics), then she continues with CMI (lower case bold). In between Lisa quotes aircraft ground crew talking about the danger of elderly people going by plane in SI (all caps bold) or rather in EJI (perhaps the closest approximation to the standard language in her repertoire). Lisa addresses Bobo by using a mixture of Javanese, Malay and Hakka words/expressions in her sentence. Usually Lisa never uses EJI as her unmarked code to speak to Bobo. In line 335 Lisa is using a mixture of Javanese and Hakka, their unmarked code which has some Indonesian words.

Extract 3:

333. Lisa: LHA IYHO KOWÉ DÉWÉ YO ERÔ MA, mintaq, DIKON tanda tangan lho lêq misalé DI KAPAL TERBANG ADA APA-APA, TANGGUNG JAWAB KAMU SENDIRI LHO YA, NGÔNÔ, soalé kapal terbang IKU YHO NĐEQ atas, atas itu(,) hawané am-hampa NGÔNÔ LÔHÔ, kurang hawa. Jadiné nêq WONG TUWÉQ umôr SUDAH DELAPAN PULUH KEATAS ITU SUDAH BAHAYA, jantungé ya gaq kuat, ndêq atas tu lho (,) ntiq lêq misalé ngeq sana ada apa-apa, ada sakét, ato ada apa-apa kapal terbang ndaq mau tanggung jawab. Sêng tanggung jawab sêng ngajaq NGÔNÔ KOWÉ mesti haros ngerti itu lho Ma—

[WELL, YOU YOURSELF KNOW MUM, asking, (YOU) ARE ASKED to sign, y’know IF FOR INSTANCE ON THE PLANE SOMETHING HAPPENS, (IT’S) YOUR OWN RESPONSIBILITY y’know, that’s it, because the aeroplane, y’know, at above, above is (,) LIKE THAT y’know, less air. So for ELDERLY PEOPLE, WHO ARE ALREADY EIGHTY YEARS OF AGE IT IS ALREADY DANGEROUS, (his) heart is no longer strong, above is y’know (,) if for instance something happens up there, either sickness, or something, the airline doesn’t want to be held responsible. The responsibility is on the person who travels with that person, LIKE THAT. YOU should understand that, y’know Ma-]

334. Bobo: ya betol...betol ...memang tau

[yes, right...right...() know]

335. Lisa: WÈS TUWÈQ IKU, QIO TERLALU LUNGO-LUNGO, AWAQÉ GAQ KUAT, FE CI NYAM MUI YHO AN KWI, AMBÈQAN YHO TANGGUNG JAWAB(.) TANGGUNG JAWAB(.)

[(WHEN YOU ARE) ALREADY AT OLD AGE, DON’T TRAVEL TOO MUCH, (YOUR) BODY IS NOT STRONG ENOUGH, THE PLANE TICKET IS ALSO EXPENSIVE, IN ADDITION y’know, RESPONSIBILITY (.) RESPONSIBILITY(.)]
Both extracts above show how a speaker quotes a sentence expression as enunciated by the original speaker. As the code used is not the shared unmarked code between the speaker-interlocutor, the code then serves as a marked choice and represents a new negotiated RO set representing a formal atmosphere usually born by authorities or officials. In the above case it is the airport or airline officials. As seen above in line 334, Bobo responds using Malay/Indonesian, a marked code between Bobo and Lisa. I suspect Bobo's choosing Malay/Indonesian is influenced by Lisa's use of Malay/Indonesian in her quotation.

8.2.3 Marked behaviour to exclude an unwanted audience

In the extract below, Kong and Mimi are talking about the problem they have with the tenant of their house. This tenant has not paid the house rent for years but they cannot evict him because he is a 'man of power'. Therefore, they are discussing the possibility of asking the help of the tenant's boss who is of a higher rank. For this purpose they have to pay some money. They have consulted some people about how much money they have to pay to ask that high officer's help. Kong and Mimi are talking in the living room-cum-dining room where the domesticas are within earshot since the room is not far from the kitchen and the domesticas are busy preparing lunch.

The codes used in this dialogue are Mandarin, CMI, and EJM/I (also in lower case bold Times New Roman). There is also a phrase of Foochow in line 17 uttered by Mimi to Kong. The markedness in this interaction is found in the nature of the mixture of the codes Kong and Mimi employed. Here, it is dominated by Mandarin expressions. The Malay/Indonesian words used are function words such as 'lèq 'if', kaloq 'if' and a discourse marker lho 'y'know'. In addition, there are culturally loaded words which have no Mandarin 'exact synonym' such as koramil\(^1\), komandan, eksekusi\(^2\), and those that will not reveal the essence of the interaction too much such as mesjid 'mosque', pengadilan 'court', pengacara 'lawyer'.

The Mandarin phrases and expressions uttered by Mimi are repetitive in her efforts to convey her intended message to Kong and to exclude the unwanted audience. Notice how she uses repetitive phrases or expression or at least part of it e.g., HO BING CVÈQ CVÈQ YOK SE NA LAI 'peace and the key will come' twice in line (1), once in line (7), and twice in line (13). There is also repetitive mentioning of the amount of

---

\(^1\) Koramil is shortened from 'Komando resort militier' Military Area Command'.

\(^2\) In Indonesian 'eksekusi' also means 'being evicted from one's house' which is the case in this dialogue.
money they will have to spend ‘OL SE DIAO’ twenty millions’ as many as fourteen times. Throughout the dialogue she also employs the Indonesian keywords repetitively, e.g., the word ‘osol’ to suggest’ is spoken as many as eleven times: three times in line (5), three times in line (20), five times in line (24).

Extract 4:


[=Dad, some time ago Swantek called, Darman said that they definitely didn’t want ten millions, because Sayoko said how about twenty millions, twenty millions then he will go to the mosque tomorrow to go and look for Edo’s lawyer, to meet that commander because Edo realized it might not be sincere, y’know it seems not right, they want to use power, the commander’s power so this eviction is not successful. So Edo said he would see what the police officer would do, so if (they want) peace how it is, if you agree with twenty millions, twenty millions will do, maybe Monday they can give (the money) with that who’s it, ‘koramil’. Maybe if (they) want twenty millions, then (they) don’t have to share with ‘koramil’, so there’s peace and the key (of the house) will come. Then if you agree with twenty millions, so tomorrow you tell Darman that (you) agree twenty millions, tomorrow he will see them all at the mosque overthere, tomorrow night. He will see them at the mosque. Darman said If they agree with twenty millions, then ‘peace’ and the key will come, so on Monday, he’ll go to court, so don’t share that five millions, OK=]}

2. Kong: yha
3. Mimi : iyha?
4. Kong: heqe
5. Mimi: Jadi Swantek SWOQ YA NIE MING DYÊN CAO SANG TA TYÊN HWA KEQ Darman. NIE KAO SU DA, NIE osol, NIE osol, SE BU SE déqé osol NA KO OL SE DIAO [So, Swantek said OK, tomorrow afternoon you call Darman. You told him, you suggest, you suggest, not him who suggests that twenty millions]
6. Kong: heqe, TING SIA, TA TYÊN HWA

[OK, later, (I’ll) make a phone call]
7. Mimi: Yha lêq Papa CANG JEN, yha uda HOBING CYÊQ CYÊQ OL SE DIAO, NA MEK PAI I DA CIU BU PIK FEN HONG PAO lho, yha CE KO U DIAO SYÊN CYÊQ SEN I SIA....

[yes, if Papa agrees, well, that’s it ‘peace’ and twenty millions, so on Monday don’t give him red pocket (tip), OK?, yes for the moment (you) save this five millions first]
8. Kong: Iyha
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9. Mimi: nà mèi NIE CANG JEN, DA SWOK YA MING TYÈN WAN SANG YAO KEN DA MEN CYÈN MYÈN CAY mesjid NA PYÈN.
   [and if you agree, he said Ok tomorrow afternoon (he) will see them personally at the
   mosque there]
10. Kong: hege
11. Mimi: yha NIE MING TYÈN CAO SANG TA TYÈN HWA-
    [yes, tomorrow afternoon you make a phone call]
12. Kong: DA CE KO Darman TA TYÈN HWA KEK Swantek
    [He, this Kong will call Swantek]

   [He called Swantik (.) yesterday he said we saw this police officer like commander will ask
   them to use power, so this eviction will be cancelled. Using power is y'know troublesome.
   You have the documents but you can't use them, they are useless—ten millions (you) don't
   need to say anything. Last time at the court (they) already said ten millions, they didn't
   want to, (they) want twenty millions, how is it? So tomorrow I'll meet them. If you want
   twenty millions, see them, they want 'peace', then key comes so Monday he doesn't need to
   be given a tip, Ok? Peace and the key will come]
14. Kong: yha NIKAU SU DA—
    [yes, you tell him—]
15. Mimi: {}
16. Kong: DA MEI YHU GAN CIA
    [they haven't seen the house]
17. Mimi: soalè DA KEN Swantek DA CIA JYEN GO NEN DA HAIBA, ING WEI LI Mrien
    COK DIEN DA YU GAI HWEI KEN DA MEN DE REN, TWE DA CE YANG CIANG, NIE kan pengancara, NIE YEK YHU NA TAO JYEN LHO, NIE DE JYEN SUNG KE WO MEN, WO MEN CE KO MEI YHU JYEN, DA CIU SE SWOK CE KO HAI CIUN NA MO CIENG A

   [The problem is he and Swantek maybe he’s afraid with that price, because yesterday they
   had meetings with their own men, it's true they said this “you are a lawyer, if you have got
   the money Ok, you give the money to us, we don’t have money”. He said that this naval
   officer HAS NO MONEY.]
18. Kong: HAI CIUN GAI GAI—
    [this naval officer—]
19. Mimi:—CE YANG CE KEN CE KO Darman GAI GO—
    [If that's so, let this Darman speak—]
20. Kong: WO MEN KEN PAN TU MEI YHU JYÈN, trus Darman YEK SIANG, NA KO
    komandan SWOK WO, CONG SE WO BU GO I DA CING JI, BU GO I YU eksekusi. Jadi
    komandan kaloq YEK SE SIA SO, TENG SIA SE JING YUNG TEK REN TA LUK. LONG
    DE DA TWE WO MEN MEI YHU SE MO jadi Darman osol DA BU CE TAO YAO BU
    YAO, NIE CANG JEN DA MING TIEN GAI OL SE DIAO, NEN KO, NEN KO CIU
    HAO, BU NEN KO YEK BU CE TAO. DA SE osol, DA YAO osol OL SE DIAO, SE BU SE
    OL SE DIAO DA MEN YAO JEK, BU CE TAO.
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[In fact we don’t have money, then Darman also thinks, that commander said after all we don’t allow them to go in, don’t let the eviction take place. So if the commander also interferes, the problem will be more complicated. Towards us he has nothing against us so Darman suggested, he doesn’t know if (they) want to, if you agree then tomorrow he will offer twenty millions, (if it’s) possible, if it’s agreed that’s good, (if) not well (I) don’t know. He suggested, he will suggest twenty millions, whether they’ll eat that twenty millions, (I) also don’t know.]

21. Kong: **DA MEI YHU, MEI YU GAI CIA JYEN**
   [He hasn’t, hasn’t mentioned the price yet]

22. Mimi: **MEI YHU GAI CIA JYEN, BU KO SE Darman CE CI SIANG, CE ME YANG YAO SE OL SE DIAO, NA MEK WO KEN DA MEN CIANG, GO NEN YEK DA MEN YAO, YHA GO NEN DA MEN BU YAO. Yha NIE MING TIEN CAO SANG TA TIEN HWA KEK Darman**
   [((they) haven’t yet mentioned the price, but Darman himself thinks what about twenty millions, so we can let them speak, maybe if they they want to, well maybe they don’t want to. Well, then tomorrow morning you call Darman]

23. Kong: **TING SIA WO TA TIEN HWA**
   [I will call later]

24. Mimi: **yha? WEN DA NIE osol CE ME YANG NIE cobaq WEN DA, NIE osol CE ME YANG, NIE osol, DA osol OL SE DIAO. OL SE DIAO itu HAI SE osol lho, BU I TING JEN KUNG lho**
   [OK? Ask him you suggest how’s it? You try asking him, if you suggest how’s it? You suggest, he suggested twenty millions, that twenty millions is only a suggestion, y’know, it’s not yet confirmed, Ok?]

25. Kong: **Iyha (.) tau BU I TING**
   [yes, (.) (I) know, it’s not confirmed yet]

Then they went into Kong’s room where the phone is located

Although switching between Mandarin and CMI is an unmarked mode of interaction between Kong and Mimi, the nature of this dialogue is rather unusual in that this particular conversation is conducted much more intensively than usual in Mandarin. (Only a few, largely difficult to translate, words from Malay/Indonesian are used.) Thus, I suspect, since the topic is rather ‘sensitive’ and both Kong and Mimi do not want the domestics to understand, they employ Mandarin almost throughout the dialogue in order to exclude the unwanted eavesdroppers.

8.3 Markedness Model in Group interactions

The next sections discuss the code choices in which the use of two or more codes prevails. In regard to the number of participants involved, the conversations might be triadic (with an active participant, a listener, or even an unwelcome audience such as an eavesdropper). In some examples there are four, five, six or even nine family members sharing different or the same unmarked code choice patterns.

In these two multilingual families occasions with many participants tend to arise when members of different generations are present in the interactions. The
conversations between family members are grouped into the types of switches proposed by the Markedness Model: CS as an unmarked choice, CS itself as an unmarked choice, CS as a marked choice and CS as an exploratory choice. (CS as unmarked refers to when there is more than one addressee and the intended addressee changes during the course of an utterance, but CS itself as unmarked occurs when CS is the unmarked discourse strategy between a pair of interlocutors). The reasons and the motivations behind a speaker’s intention are discussed. In these group interactions, a particular code chosen or a pair of codes being used alternately in a sentence can be either marked or unmarked depending on the speakers involved and the codes they share. This code-switching phenomenon is particularly widespread and rampant in the interactions among certain age cohorts, i.e. those of the older generations. Some of the excerpts discussed are extracts taken from much longer family group interactions in which more than two participants are involved (see appendix 5 for further reference of the full-length conversations).

8.3.1 Code-switching as an unmarked choice

Because one or more of the situational factors change within the course of a conversation, the unmarked RO set may change to index a new unmarked RO set. In many cases the unmarked RO set changes when the participant in the conversation changes or when the topic is shifted as seen in the following examples. (In CS itself as an unmarked strategy, neither the topic nor the interlocutor has changed. There is no change of RO set either. CS serves as an accepted mode of interaction between Speaker-Interlocutor). As presented in chapter two, the unmarked maxim has two auxiliary maxims, the virtuosity maxim and the deference maxim which will also be discussed in the extracts below (see §2.6.2.2.1).

8.3.1.1 Sequential unmarked codeswitching

Sequential unmarked code-switching takes place when a speaker addresses different interlocutors using the different unmarked codes they share (see Myers-Scotton 1993b: 114). In the following extract the topic of the discussion is the same but there is a change in the interlocutors being addressed. Lisa and Tom are engaged in a conversation using CMI (line 1-4). Then in line (5) Jenny joins in using Javanese. This causes Lisa to switch to Javanese to acknowledge Jenny’s remark and to engage in interaction with Jenny (line 5-8). Then when in line (9) Tom gives his remarks in CMI, Lisa knows the question is addressed to her so she switches back to CMI to answer
Tom. Again in line (11) Jenny comments in Javanese and Lisa switches back to Javanese. CMI is the unmarked code shared between Lisa and Tom, while Javanese is shared between Lisa and Jenny. Notice Lisa uses Malay ‘iyha’ ‘yes’ (line 4) to Tom but is using Javanese ‘iyho’, ‘yes’, to Jenny (line 6). Tom’s and Jenny’s choice of their shared unmarked code with Lisa is employed to specify their addressee and Lisa switches back and forth between codes to acknowledge her interlocutors.

Extract 5:

1. Tom: enaq tidôré tadi malem?
   [could (you) sleep last night?]
2. Lisa: ndaq isa tidor tadi malem, angel (.) ndaq tau (.)
   [(I) couldn’t sleep last night, difficult (.) (I) don’t know (.)]
3. Tom: ranjangé læn
   [different bed]
4. Lisa: iyha begré
   [yes, (that) might be so]
5. Jenny: DUDU OMAHÉ
   [(it’s) not (her/your) house]
6. Lisa: IYHO, AUKI IKI NITÊNI RANJANG
   [yes, I am really sensitive about beds]
7. Jenny: DUDU RANJANGÉ
   [(it’s) not (her/your) bed]
8. Lisa: HEGÈ LÊQ AKU NDEQ KAMAR KONO YHO LEQ PINDA KAMAR MBURI NDEQ NGGONÊ GUGUN (.) WÈS ANGEL, PINDA KAMAR NJOBO YHO ANGEL GAQ ISO TURU, ANEH KOQ AKU
   [that’s right, when I’m in that bedroom, y’know, if I move to the room at the back, in Gugun’s bedroom, (.) well, it’s difficult, move to the front bedroom is also difficult, (I) can’t sleep, I am strange really]
9. Tom: bukan, itu memang ini apa? ada orang nêq uda omoré itu, nggaq orang nêq usia—punya obat tidur yha?
   [No, that’s true, that’s what is it? There are people who are at certain age, no, people whose age—you have sleeping pill, right?]
10. Lisa: gaq pakèq gitu-gitu <Tooom>
    [(I) don’t take that kind of things <Tooom>]
11. Jenny: AUKI LÊQ TURU LAPAN JAM ENDAKU NGELU, AUKI LÊQ TURU SEHARI ENEM JAM, ndaq biasa
    [If I sleep eight hours my head is dizzy, if I only sleep six hours a day, (I’m not) used to it]
12. Lisa: LHÔ NGÔNÔ TÀ?
    [oh, is that so?]
13. Jenny: IYHO!
    [yes!]

Thus, there is a sequence of unmarked codeswitching performed by Lisa from CMI to Javanese, then back to CMI and after that to Javanese again based on a change in the interlocutors she is attending to. She performs this code-switching in order to accommodate, specify and project her messages. To meet her intentions, Lisa moves back and forth from one code to another to indicate code mobility on her part.
8.3.1.2 A sequence of unmarked codes which ends with a marked choice

A similar kind of sequential unmarked code-switching is presented in the following extracts. Unlike the previous example in which the turns are in direct sequence, the extracts below are from a long dialogue in which their original occurrence is interrupted by other speakers’ turns. There is a sequence of unmarked code-switching which then ends with a marked one.

In the dialogue below different speakers are telling Bobo that different family members are giving her some money to buy an airplane ticket to go to Jakarta. Three different generations of family B, the first, second and third generations participate. They are Bobo, her daughter, Lisa and Lisa’s daughters, Tania and Jenny and also Jon, Bobo’s son-in-law. Each speaker addresses Bobo using the unmarked code they share with Bobo and Bobo accommodates each speaker by converging to the code they share in order to acknowledge what each speaker says to her. As a result there is a sequence of unmarked codes in Bobo’s turns when she is saying exactly the same thing in different codes (Javanese, CMI and EJ1) to different speakers, as seen in the lines with asterisks (lines 36, 50, 54 and 62) in the extracts below. In short, Bobo is using her shared unmarked code with her interlocutors who are addressing her with the code each of them shares with Bobo.

All the expressions in Bobo’s lines in the following excerpts mean the same: ‘yes, take it with you’, as the topic in the main interaction is the same, i.e. each of Bobo’s addressors wants to give her some money. There are words or expressions in the extracts which have the same meanings (see the underlined words). These words are ̈Jyen (Mandarin) and duwéq (Javanese) which means ‘money’, dikasiq (Malay word ‘kasiq’ ‘to give’ with Indonesian passive marker ‘di’) and dikéqi (Javanese) meaning ‘is given’. Both are used interchangeably by CMI speakers. Other words are ‘gowoén diséq’ (Javanese), ‘bawaqen’ (CMI) and ‘bawaq ajaq’ (EJ1) which means ‘take (it with you) first’, and moléh (Javanese) and pulang (Malay or Indonesian) which means ‘to go home’.

Extract 6:

31. Lisa: _IKI LHO DİKEQİ DÜWEQ U'UN SİTİQ YHO, PAS KANGGO NUMPAQ FEİCI_ ( )
   [This you know some money given by U‘un, enough for going by aeroplane ( )]
32. Bobo: heqe
   [yeah]

In line (31) above, Lisa tells Bobo about the money from Lisa’s son and Bobo acknowledges that. Lisa speaks in Javanese, their unmarked shared code.
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Extract 7:
35. Lisa: HEQE, ENGKÔQ TEKO KONO TAQKEQNO YHO, TAQGOWO SELQ TÀ?
   [yes, later, when (we) arrive there, (I) give it to (you), OK, shall (I) bring it first?]
36. Bobo: IYHÔ GOWOEN DISEQ **
   [yes, take it (with you) first]

Again in line 35 above Lisa repeats her statement of line 31 (extract 7), still in Javanese and Bobo answers in the same code.

Extract 8:
46. Lisa: MELOQ SUROBOYO YHO OLE TAPI GAQ ONOQ FANBO MA (.). SAQ IKI FAN BO
   MULIH, MBÔH KAPAN TEKO GAQ ERÔ AKU (.)
   [going (with us) to Surabaya is OK too but now no servant Ma, now the servant has gone
   home, (I) don’t know when (she) is coming back I (.)]
47. Jenny: JYEN-É (. ) NGOMONGO DIKÈO! U’UN
   [the money (.) just tell (her) it was given by U’un]
48. Lisa: hoqe JYEN-É IKI DIKÈO! U’UN, TAQTUKOQNO FÈICI BIAO YHO ?
   [yeah, this money was given by U’un, shall I buy air plane ticket (with it)?]
49. Bobo: iyha bawaqen, iyha bawaqen**
   [yes, just take it (with you), yes, just take it (with you first)]

Then in line (47) using Javanese, Jenny also mentions the money allocated for Bobo, but this time to Lisa, and then Lisa repeats Jenny’s statement to Bobo (line 48). In the next line (49) Bobo answers in CMI, the code she shares with Jenny. Scrutinizing the previous lines (46) in which Bobo has volunteered no answer to Lisa’s questions or statements, it’s highly possible that in line (49) Bobo is addressing Jenny while at the same time projecting her message to Lisa.

Extract 9:
52. Tania: ntiq aku ya ngasiq Bobo, ndeq Surabaya aè yha?
   [Tania: later I also give you (some money) Bobo, better in Surabaya Ok?]
54. Bobo: iyha, iyha bawaq aja**
   [Bobo: yes, yes, take it (with you first)]
55. Tania: iyha, Tania kasiq Bobo nantiq ndeq Surabaya aè, yha?
   [Tania: yes, Tania (will) give Bobo later, (it’s) better (when we’re) in Surabaya, Ok?]
56. Bobo: iyha, yha
   [Yes, yeah]

Still about the same issue, but this time it is Tania who asks and tells Bobo in CMI (line 52) about giving Bobo some money. For this Bobo also answers in EJI.

Extract 10:
61. Lisa: DADI DƯWÉOŒ IKI TAQGOWO MÔLÈ SUROBOYO YHO, NGGO TUKU FÈICI BIAÒ,
   NUMPAQNO FÈICI BIAÒ, NGKOQ TAQKHON NGETERNO GÔGO OPO LIN YHO?
   [so (I) will bring this money going home to Surabaya for buying airplane ticket, go by
   airplane ticket, later (I) will ask Gogo or Lin to take you Ok?]
   [yes, yeah just take it (with you first)!]
Finally in line (61) Lisa asks about the same thing again in Javanese. To this Bobo also answers in EJI but with a stressed tone (line 62).

In those lines with asterisks the codes employed by Bobo are the codes she shares with her intended interlocutors to accommodate, to acknowledge the speakers, and to send the intended message. At the same time, code switching is also indirectly regulating the turns as well. This phenomenon is identified by Coupland et al as discourse management (Coupland et al., 1988). Only later in the last line (62) Bobo repeats the same answer to Lisa but in EJI, the code they do not share, thus, a marked code between them. The tone is emphasized and that ends the conversation. It seems Bobo is getting annoyed about the discussion, and she thus ends by using EJI, a code associated with authority and distance between her and her daughter. Bobo switches to a marked code to imply her answer to Lisa’s nagging and repetitive questions in the previous lines (lines 13, 28, 31, 33, 35, 37, 40, 41, 47, 51) which are then paraphrased in line (61). By using EJI to Lisa, Bobo seems to try to distance herself and to sound more formal. It is clarified by Bobo’s repeated statement ‘iyha yha’ in a stressed tone with higher pitch (phonological flagging) which indicates impatience and irritability as if to say ‘yes I understand, you can bring the money and that’s it’. Lisa picks up Bobo’s intended message and stops fretting about the issue.

To conclude, in both examples sequential code-switching takes place as the situational factors change and thus a speaker wishes to negotiate a new unmarked RO set in alignment with his different addressees’ unmarked code. In the second example, however, the one who is actively switching between codes is not the speaker but Bobo as the addressee, who accommodates all her addressees using the shared unmarked code with each speaker within the same situation. What can be inferred from Bobo’s use of the different code she shares with her addressees illustrates that as the first generation speaker, Bobo is the one who accommodates to the other speakers, the second and the third generations. The examples show Bobo’s agility and mobility in employing different choices of code to accommodate and specify her addressees.

This situation is different from other studies (Ng and He, 2004) in which the second generation becomes the mediator to accommodate between first and third generation communication. Although the second generation subjects in this study tend to have the largest repertoires of both migrant and host codes, the 1st and 3rd generation subjects can communicate directly with each other using host codes and thus need no
mediation. In addition, the extracts also demonstrate that a sequence of unmarked codes shared between the speaker and her different addressees can only be assessed and thus understood through sequential scrutiny of turns in the whole dialogue.

8.3.1.3 Unmarked personal pronoun to specify the addressee

The conversation below displays how Mimi uses different codes and also different personal pronouns to specify her addressees: her friend Sani, her sister, Titi and her niece Cindy. The codes shared between Mimi and Sani are German, CMI, and Mandarin; between Mimi and Cindy it is CMI, while with Titi, Mimi shares CMI and Mandarin. The four of them are in the car and Sani is talking to Mimi in CMI mixed with German and Mandarin, their unmarked mixture of codes. In line (1) Mimi excuses herself for interrupting using German which indicates her excuse is intended for Sani who was talking. Later Mimi asks Titi and Cindy a question in CMI but she uses different personal pronouns to each interlocutor. To speak to Titi, Mimi uses the Hokkien ‘Lu’ ‘you’ which she would not use with either Sani or Cindy. Then she uses ‘kamu’ in the next question directed to Cindy. As they both do not know the telephone number, Mimi asks Sani in German to which Sani answers in CMI and Mandarin. There is a sequence of different codes used by Mimi to address different interlocutors, German and CMI. Even though Mimi is using CMI to both Titi and Cindy, she employs different personal pronouns ‘Lu’ and ‘kamu’ respectively. This practice shows a sequential use of different codes and different unmarked personal pronouns to specify the addressees.

Notice also how Titi refers to Mimi as cik, ‘older sister’ and Cindy refers to her auntie as ku ‘auntie’ which indicates different use of kinship terms to specify the addressee.

Extract 11:

1. Mimi: DU ENTSCHULDIGUNG, ICH WILL ANRUFEN yha?
   [well, excuse me, I’ll make a phone call, Ok?]
2. Sani: Yha
   [sure]

(0.10) Mimi tried to make a phone call three times but couldn’t get through, then she asked Titi, Cindy and Sani for the phone number of the person she is calling.

---

3 Lu’ ‘you’, a personal pronoun of Hokkien provenance, is found as part of the pronominal usage in Jakarta Indonesian which is nowadays spoken among youth in Jakarta and also even among Surabaya youth. However, among the subjects under study, the personal pronoun ‘Lu’ is used only by the 1940s age cohort or when the members of this age cohort address their younger siblings or sometimes the younger generation members (1970s-1980s age cohort) and not the other way around. My personal observation also reveals that this particular personal pronoun, together with its pair ‘gua’ ‘1’ are found to be employed (in their in-group interaction) by the older generation of peranakan speakers who mostly went to Indonesian or Chinese schools and are now in their late seventies or eighties. Therefore, I suspect that my subjects’ use of ‘Lu’ is not the influence of the flourishing Jakarta Indonesian but rather still the influence of the Hokkien language use prevalent among older generations of Chinese Indonesians.
3. Mimi: **Latu nomeré Hadi ndêg Ball?**
[Do you know Hadi’s number in Bali?]

4. Titi: **ndaq éléng CIÉ**
[(I) don’t remember Sis]

5. Mimi: **Kamu tau?**
[Do you know?]

6. Cindy: **wah, gaq mbawaq KU**
[oh, (I) didn’t bring it with (me), Auntie]

7. Mimi: **DU, SAN, KENNST DU HADI VON BALI?**
[hei, San, do you know Hadi from Bali?]

8. Sani: **sapa itu? BU REN SEK**
[who is he? (I) don’t know (him)]

Similarly, the conversation below is basically in CMI but in this conversation Mimi is using two different personal pronouns to address different addressees. In the first sentence she uses Indonesian ‘kamu’ ‘you’ to refer her statement to her niece Cindy but then directs her question to her sister, Cindy’s mother, Titi, by using Hokkien ‘Lu’ ‘you’

**Extract 12:**

Cindy: **Perutku mules Ku, kemanèn munta-munta, mèncrèt**
[My stomach was upset Auntie, yesterday (I) vomited several times and (had) diarrhea]

Mimi: **Kamu kakeen njajan-njajan bèqé. LU'wès ngasiq dèqé obat apa?**
[You have too much food from the hawkers probably. What kind of medicine have you given her?]

Titi: **yha biása, Imodium**
[well, the usual Imodium]

### 8.3.1.4 Delayed unmarked choice

At first glance, the use of Javanese by Lisa in the extract below seems to be a marked code-switching exchange between Tom and Lisa as their turns come one after another (lines 71 and 72). What actually takes place is that there are no marked choices but only unmarked exchanges instead. The unmarked code chosen to answer the question can be identified only much later in the dialogue.

The background story is that Bobo is trying to find reasons for travel to Jakarta. In the extract, Tom (line 71) and Tania (line 73) are asking Bobo questions about Bobo’s plan to travel. However, Bobo does not reply immediately in the turn that comes after Tom’s and Tania’s. Instead, Bobo answers only in the last line, line 77, and digresses from the beginning of the dialogue up to that point. I think Bobo is trying to stall from giving a specific, clear answer immediately. She dodges the question and addresses Jenny about something else instead. Bobo’s stalling and avoidance is apparent from her use of the filler ‘anu’ ‘well’ (line 74) and the fact that she talks about another
topic to Jenny. While Bobo is stalling from giving her answer, Lisa and Ani, who are
talking to each other, volunteer their opinions as to why Bobo wants to travel (lines 72
and 76 respectively). Only after Lisa and Ani’s statements, Bobo attends to Tom’s
question and Tania’s suggestion by voicing her opinion (line 77). It is clear that line 77
is intended for Tom and Tania as Bobo uses CMI, their shared unmarked code.
However, Bobo’s answer seems also to be addressed or perhaps ‘projected’ to Lisa and
Ani.

Extract 13:

71. Tom: ndeq sini aé Bó, yha? (.)
    [just stay here Grandma, OK? (.)]
72. Lisa: CIU SEQ SWÉ AMÉ TEKO, SEN MING-É KARÉQ PIRO SÈ?
    [Almost Ninety years old, how much longer is left of her time (age)?]
73. Tania: ntiq pulang Jakarta ndaq mbaleq ya? (to her Auntie) Iq, (.).Jakarta, ndaq bole (.)
    [later when (you) go back to Jakarta, (you) are not coming back, right? (to her Auntie)
    Auntie, (.). Jakarta, please don’t (.)]
74. Bobo: ndaq nantiq anu tapi Yenny taqkasiq ini, ndaq apa-pa, sering hó taqkérémi-
    [no, later uh but I gave Jenny this, it’s OK, I often send (something to her)]
75. Jenny: -arak (.) laq gitu
    [Jenny: -Chinese wine (.) is that it?]
76. Ani: NDEQ OMAH KEJU
    [(she’s ) bored at home ]
77. Bobo: gampang dah ntiq bisa baliq
    [it’s easy, y’know, then (I) can go back]

To sum up, although there seem to be some marked code choice behaviours
between the participants, there are actually no instances of the participants choosing a
marked code to converse to each other. They all are actually employing the shared
unmarked code with their intended interlocutor. What happens is that the unmarked
answer comes later in the dialogue.

8.3.1.5 Ambiguous or disguised code: marked or unmarked?

In this instance a speaker uses one code to ostensibly answer a certain interlocutor but
really uses that code choice to signal that his reply is intended for another participant in
the conversation. The code concerned has dual or hidden purposes. Thus, the code(s)
chosen, which can be marked to an interlocutor, is at the same time an unmarked one for
the covert addressee. Hence, the code(s) actually have hidden unmarked messages for
another participant who may recognize this and acknowledge the message much later in
the dialogue.

The main speaker in this dialogue is Gugun. Gugun always uses CMI to address
Bobo and others, while Lisa and Ani use Javanese to speak to each other. In lines (6 to
8) Lisa and Ani seem to be talking to each other using their shared unmarked code, Javanese. In line (10) Lisa switches to CMI. Seemingly she is talking to Ani who repeats her previous account (in line 7) about her ‘encounter with the airline crew’ by using full CMI (line 11), but it appears that she is really addressing Gugun, for whom CMI would be the unmarked choice. As demonstrated in the next line (12) Gugun picks up on the message ostensibly addressed to Ani and then conveys the same idea embedded in the previous lines (10-11) to give advice to Bobo. It seems Ani and Lisa ‘borrow Gugun’s mouth to advise Bobo’.

Extract 14:
5. Gugun: **Bobo naèq FEICI yha kena tekanan itu gaq baèq, omoré kurang**-
   [Bobo goes by airplane, well, exposed to the pressure is not good, (her) age is not enough—]
6. Lisa: **GAQ ENTUQ LHÔ, LÉQ WÈS OMOR PAQ SEQ SWE, IKU WÈS DILARANG SAQDONGÉ NUMPAQ FEICI**
   [—it’s not allowed, y’know when (one) is 80 years old already, it’s actually forbidden to go by airplane]
7. Ani: **IYHO AKU DIOMONGI “tànggung sendiri lhô Buk” “iyha saya yang nanggung”**
   [that’s right, I was told “your own responsibility, Ma’am” “yes, that’s my responsibility”]
8. Lisa: **FEICI IKU UDARANÉ HAMPA AMBÈQ KAN MEDUN IKU SÉEÉT NGÔNÔ, IKU LÉQ JANTÔNG GAQ KUAT IKU ISO PÔTÔS**
   [the air on the airplane is a vacuum and also if it is going down like that, if (one’s) heart is not strong, (it) might stop]
9. Ani: **MAKANÉ PEKEREN AYHO**
   [that’s why, please give it a consideration]
10. Lisa: **masi orang muda léq jantongé gaq sehat numpaq FEICI gaq gampang lhô**
    [even young people, if their hearts are not healthy, going by plane is not easy, y’know]
11. Ani: **aku diomungi “tànggung jawab sendiri lhô Buq sama Mam, Mamanyâ” “lhô iyha wong mama saya”**
    [I was told “you are responsible for you Mom, your mother, Ma’am” “yes of course, she’s my mother”; isn’t she]
12. Gugun: **he Bo, Bo, Bobo seneng seneng ndèq sini aé, jalan-jalan ndèq deket-deket sini, omor lebi panjang, ya Bo?**
    [he, Bo, Bo, Bobo please be happy here, traveling around here, (you’ll) live longer, OK Bo?]

CMI (which is used in lines 10-11) is a shared unmarked code between Gugun and Ani, and also between Gugun and Lisa, and the code choice can be seen as unmarked in nature. However, if the message is intended for Bobo, the use of CMI is a marked practice which signifies the negotiation of a new set of RO to take CMI as their first instead of the third preferred unmarked code (Between Lisa, Ani and Bobo, the first preferred code is a mixture of Hakka and Javanese). In other words, the use of CMI in lines 10-11 has an ambiguous nature because it contains disguised messages intended/projected for Bobo but spoken to Gugun.

8.3.1.6 Violations-cum-complementations to the unmarked-choice maxim

The following two types of strategies are violations of the unmarked-choice maxim, but they are violations because they are performed in order to satisfy either the
deference strategy or the virtuosity maxim which both complement the unmarked-choice maxim.

8.3.1.6.1 Code-switching as a deferential strategy

As stated in chapter 2, Myers-Scotton (1992: 419, 1993b: 114-149) postulates the use of codeswitching as a deferential strategy "in cases where speakers switch to a code which expresses deference to others when special respect is called for by the circumstances". As explained "this maxim complements the unmarked-choice maxim by calling for deference where it is unmarked, i.e. when societal norms indicate it is appropriate. So what appears to be a marked choice becomes unmarked". The deference maxims also enjoins speaker to 'show deference in your code choice to those from whom you desire something'. A speaker proposes that his/her marked choice become the unmarked choice thus implicating a new RO set for the exchange (Myers-Scotton, 1983a:123). This type of negotiation is similar to Giles and Powesland's (1975) accommodation theory which explains code selection through the speakers who converge and diverge to their interlocutors by way of their code choices.

A deferential strategy seems to take place in the dialogue between Bobo and Jon in the presence of other participants in the dialogue. Jon uses a code that would normally be marked when addressed to Bobo. Normally, Hakka would be the unmarked code for Jon to use with Bobo. However, socially appropriate behaviour is called for from a son-in-law towards his mother-in-law. What appears to be a marked choice becomes unmarked in the presence of others to whom Jon wishes to show his deference. In the dialogue Jon advises Bobo who is worrying about her sons. Jon suggests that Bobo pray for her sons so God will look after them. In so doing he uses EJI, thus indicating his respect to Bobo and the expected appropriate manner he should show towards her. The participants in the dialogue are Bobo, Jon, Tania, Lisa, Ani and Gugun.

The dialogue opens with Jon talking to Bobo in Mandarin and CMI, and Bobo answering in CMI (line 234). In this line Bobo refers to herself as 'Mama' so she is addressing Jon in particular and also her daughter Lisa in CMI. In the previous lines Jon speaks in a mixture of CMI and Mandarin before he switches into Hakka and CMI (line 235) when he starts 'advising' Bobo (line 235). In all the lines when Jon 'advises' Bobo, Jon uses Hakka and EJI or CMI. In line 235, he starts advising Bobo by using Hakka which he immediately translates into EJI, then the whole advice is in Hakka (line 265) which he paraphrases shortly afterwards in EJI (line 270). Then again in line (279)
he advises in a mixture of EJI with Hakka (Mandarin) words. Why does Jon use EJI to
give advice to Bobo, rather than simply Hakka their shared unmarked code?

I argue that there are several reasons for Jon’s choice of EJI. First, Jon wants to
show his respect to Bobo by using a code identified with prestige and politeness, which
is the appropriate conduct he should show in front of others. Thus, it is an unmarked
kind of behaviour. Second, he wishes to elevate Bobo but at the same time he wants to
show formality and authority. He can distance himself and change his identity as a son-
in-law to that of a religious authority (his profession) and so that he has ‘the right or
authority’ to give advice (line 279). He is using the prestigious code to show respect, so
he can still preserve Bobo’s face and Bobo will heed his advice.

Thus, it is a deferential strategy on Jon’s part in which he shows respect. At the
same time he ‘wants something’ from Bob. He wants her to listen to his advice. Jon’s
code choice generates the implication that he is dis-identifyfying himself from the
unmarked RO set as a negotiation to establish a different RO set as unmarked, so he
expects Bobo to take his marked EJI/CMI as an unmarked code for that conversational
event. Second, as Bobo started using CMI in line (234) it is also considered alright for
Jon to continue with this code. Third, since Tania is heavily involved in the dialogue by
affirming Jon’s advice (lines 266, 269, 274, 276, 278), Jon also wants to acknowledge
and to accommodate Tania and the other participant, Gugun, by immediately translating
his advice in Hakka into Indonesian (lines 268 and 270). It is noteworthy to mention
that Tania’s participation in the conversation while Jon speaks in Hakka demonstrates
her comprehension of Hakka and shows that this code is part of her passive repertoire.

Extract 15:

234.Bobo: Mama pulang dulu, Mama ada ada ini barang keci, keci gini, gini la mesiq banyak,
taqlaq-taqlaq sampêq satu bulan, dua bulan ndaq apa-pa, nantiq mau sini gampang dahi, musi
baliq sini lagi, kan ndaq lama, yha musi kah baliq sini lagi, sehbab Mama lki ya (~) sudah
omorina suda cokop, ntq kapan-kapan panggil Tuhan ndaq tahu. Tapi, tapi satu kali saya
mikir, ya memang ada sini panggil Tuhan ya baq ya, cumaq ya kasian itu tuh seng ndeq
Jakarta, yha? (= she is saying the last sentence with a lump in her throat)

[=Mama will go home first, Mama has these small things, these small (things), these(things)
are still plenty, I will consider up to one month, two months it’s OK, later if I want to come
back here, it’s easy, surely (I) will come back here, not long, surely (I) will come back here
again, because Mama yeah...I am old already, when I will die (I) don’t know. But, but, once
I think, well it’s OK if I die here, but I pity those who are in Jakarta, y’know? (= she is
saying the last sentence with a lump in her throat) =]

235.Jon: SONG TI DOI TE LIONG CAK KI TING, Tuhan yang peliara mercka
[God will look after them both, God will look after them]

236.Tania: iya betul Bo
[that’s right Grandma]

(other participants are conversing in side sequences which are not included here)

265. Jon:=makané yha, Mama MI AMBU, DOI KI TING KI TAU KAU, SONG TI, SAKUN
AMIN TE LIONG CAK M KOI, SIN SAK SING SANG-SONG TI FI KOI, M TE LIONG
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CAK M FI KOI, SONG TI M CUK FUK, HE KI LIONG CAK FI KOI SONG TIE CUK FUK, MAMA NGE M SE SEI, SONG TI WOI ON BAI KITING IN CAK YA? =
[=that's why Mama, EVERY NIGHT, HELP THEM BY PRAYING, GOD, SAKUN, AMIN IF BOTH OF THEM CHANGE, BELIEVE IT, GOD WILL BLESS THEM, IF THEY DON'T CHANGE, GOD DOESN'T BLESS THEM, IF BOTH OF THEM CHANGE, GOD BLESSES THEM, MAMA, YOU DON'T WORRY, GOD WILL TAKE CARE OF THEM, OK? =]

266. Tania: iyha betól, Bó
[that's right, Grandma]
267. Bobo: iyha memang
[that's really so]
268. Jon: Kalq dua orang itu ndaq FI KOI, SONG TI ndaq CUK FUK
[If both of them don't CHANGE, GOD doesn't BLESS THEM]
269. Tania: iya betól Bó (.)
[that's right, Grandma]
270. Jon: saya bilih doakan anaq-anaq dua itu, biar bertobat, kalq ndaq, hidup mereka ndaq karuan, kalq suga bertobat, sugalah Tuhan yang peliara mereka, (.). M SE-SEI, JANGAN KUATIR (.)
[I say, pray for both of them so they will realize their mistake, if not, their life isn’t in order, if they have, don’t worry, God will take care of them (.) DON'T WORRY, DON'T WORRY (.)]

271. Tania: iyha-
[yes]
272. Bobo:- suga agerti
[-(I) understand (that) already]
274. Tania: Bobo, ya orang tua jugaq ngeliaq anak tapi terbatas Bo, paling cumaq berapa (. ) [jam toq,
[Grandma, y'know parents are also concerned about children but it's limited Grandma, the most is (. ) for several hours,]
275. Bobo: iya
[yes]
276. Tania: Bobo serahno sama Tuhan, Tuhan jaga dua puluh empat jam, setiap hari dijaga—
[Grandma just surrender (them) to God, God will take care of (them) for twenty four hours, (they) will be watched over everyday--
277. Jon:-ehm-
278. Tania:-iyha? jadi Bobo ndaq usah kuatir-
[-OK? So Grandma doesn’t need to worry]
279. Jon:-YANG PENTING Bobo doakan, TAU KAU BUAT ANAK-ANAKNYA YHA?
[-the most important thing is Grandma pray (for them), pray for the children, OK?]

280. BOBO: YHA
[yes]
281. Tania: yha Bo?
[is that right Grandma?]
strategy a speaker is enjoined ‘to make an otherwise marked choice whenever the linguistic ability of either S or I makes the unmarked choice for the unmarked RO set in a conventionalized exchange infelicitious’ (Myers-Scotton, 1983a: 125). In using code choice for virtuosity reasons, the speaker switches to whatever code is necessary to carry on the conversation or to accommodate the participation of all speakers present who might not share the same repertoire or have the limited repertoire required in the conversation. This usually happens when speakers who are not fluent in the unmarked choice must make a marked choice while still overtly recognizing what the unmarked choice in that situation should be.

In the following dialogue what happens is the other way round. It is not the speakers who choose a marked code because of their lack of facility in the unmarked code. Rather, Bobo chooses a marked code because she recognises her intended addressees’ lack of facility in what would be the normal unmarked choice.

In line (148), Lisa states her worries about Bobo’s not wanting to stay at her place to her eldest daughter, Tania, using Javanese, their home language. In line (149) Tania ‘reminds and reprimands’ her mother in a mixture of EJI and CMI. Lisa continues to state her worries in line (150). So Jenny reminds them that Bobo has a maidservant to look after her using CMI with a Hakka word for ‘maid servant’ (one of the words in the family/lect) that has been assimilated to Javanese by attaching a Javanese affix ‘/é/’ to it. Bobo then reassures them all that they can look for a maid-servant for her in line (152). Bobo answers Jenny’s mixture of CMI and Hakka, and Lisa’s Javanese by using a mixture of at least three codes, Javanese, CMI and Hakka, all in one sentence.

By using a string of codes in her sentence, cognitively and socio-psychologically Bobo tries to appease Lisa’s worries, confirms Jenny’s suggestions, and accommodates them all at once by customizing her code choices to the extent of putting together combinations of choices as her best optimal strategy for that specific exchange. She uses all the codes she shares with them all, thus a mixture of codes from different origins to form a sentence of ‘language salad’ by just combining the key words ‘PIYÉ and _FAN BÓ’ (see the underlined words below) spoken previously by Lisa and Jenny.

---

4 The last word in the sentence ‘Yu’ can be either Hakka or Mandarin as they have a similar meaning and sound. I suspect Bobo is using Hakka instead of Mandarin as the previous phrase is in Hakka. Francheschini (1998:58-59) wrote that if two languages are closely related it is difficult ‘to attribute elements to a particular code’ even with such an elaborate model as that proposed by Myer-Scotton. Similarly, it is difficult to determine which function of code-switching is being used especially when those closely related varieties are used alternately in intra-sentential code-switching.
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Extract 16:

150. Lisa: CUMAOÉ PIYÉ TAN? LÉQ NÉNG OMAH RAQ ONO SÉNG NGÓRÓS [Lisa: BUT HOW IS IT TAN, IF AT HOME THERE IS NO ONE TAKING CARE (OF HER)]
   [But how’s it Tan? If at home there is (no one) to look after (her)]
151. Jenny: ada FAN BÓ-né lhó [Jenny: there is (HER) MAID SERVANT, y’know]
152. Bobo: PIYÉ? bisa cariq FAN BÓ KON TEN(.) YU ** [Bobo: How’s it, (we) can look for a servant to look after (me), (.) there is one]

In the dialogue above Bobo mixes a string of codes to attain communicational efficiency and to keep the conversation rolling.

8.3.2 Code-switching itself as an unmarked choice

As explained in the previous chapter some age cohorts use code-switching as their mode of interaction. The following extract shows how the subjects use codeswitching as their discourse mode in group interactions. Throughout the interaction the subjects are employing Mandarin and Malay interchangeably in every turn as their unmarked mode of interaction. Like the previous extracts, the following conversation is basically held in Mandarin and CMI.

Kong, Mimi and Titi are discussing medicine and the increasing price of all things. Mandarin is introduced only when Grandpa joins in (line 4). Later in line (10) a Javanese expression is employed by Titi in a kind of reported speech on the conversation she has had with her domestic. Fukkien is also used by Titi to mention a certain amount of money ‘SA TIAU’ ‘three millions’ and ‘SA TIAU POA’ ‘three and a half millions’. In line (10) there are words, phrases and sentences from Mandarin, Fukkien, CMI and Javanese. In short, there is code-mixing by all participants and this kind of mixing serves as their unmarked choice.

Extract 17:

1. Mimi: naq ini memang dari pabriqé sumbang, tapi YOK-É WHO MEN mesti beli ambèq déqé dimonopoli ambèq déqé [if this one, it is the donation from the factory, but THE MEDICINE WE HAVE to buy from them, (it) is monopolized by them]
2. Titi: oh [oh]
3. Mimi: tapi alaté di këqi gitu lhó, lhó séng dulu yha gitu, sekarang séng dulu yha gitu, séng— [but the machine is donated, you know, you know the former one is the same, now the former one is the same, the—]
4. Kong-katanya CE KÔ, CE KÔ YOK YAU JI-CIA I PAI JYÈN [-it is said THAT THIS, (the price of) THIS MEDICINE IS GOING TO GO UP ONE HUNDRED THOUSAND]
5. Mimi: heqe = [suga JI-CIA CING DYÈN]
Chapter 8

[that's right [it has GONE UP TODAY]

6. Titì: =sudə JI-CIA
   [has GONE UP]

7. Kong: sudə JI-CIA
   [has GONE UP]

8. Titì: kábəh JI-CIA, aku tadi mau beli alatè GROHE CIÈ, kran
   [everything WENT UP, just now I would buy GROHE, Sis, the faucet]

9. Mimi: he

9. Titì: gila ndaq CING-DYÈN GAI-SE JI-CIA, aduh aku di tel-Tin
   ngomong, KOWÉ IKU LHÔ DİDİLOËQI ĂNU İTU lho Cîq Lani Cîq Lani itu lhó, GROHE
   ATÈ MUNDÂQ akun kurang sitoq kranè, taqparani JI-CIA sungguan dari SA
   TIÀU sekarang SA TIÀU POÀ
   [isn't that crazy, TODAY HAS STARTED TO GO UP, oh I was call-Tin said “YOU
   ARE WANTED BY WHO’S THAT’S Lani-that Sis Lani, GROHE IS GOING UP” I still
   need one more faucet, I went there really WENT UP from THREE MILLIONS now
   THREE AND A HALF MILLIONS]

11. Mimi: JI-CIA kábəh
    [everything GOES UP]

12. Titì: ini hari mulai
    [today it starts]

13. Kong: tapi MEI-CING LOK-CIA
    [but AMERICAN DOLLAR GOES DOWN]

14. Titì: iyha MEI-CING LOK-CIA tapi
    [yes AMERICAN DOLLAR GOES DOWN but]

15. Mimi: .... [biarpun LOK-CIA tapi] MEI-YHU PAN FAK, DA-MEN kan sudə
    import sudə lama masi MEI-CING LOK-CIA ini kan JANG JE SING A. Gus Dur
    CANG CE AN TING LOK CIA, MING DYÈN YU CAI JI, YU CAI JAO, YU
    CAI-JI
    [..... [although (it) GOES DOWN but NO WAY OUT, THEY imported (the goods)
    long time ago so even though THE AMERICAN DOLLAR GOES DOWN, this is
    common, Gus Dur IS NOMINATED THE SITUATION IS PEACEFUL, (dollar)
    GOES DOWN, TOMORROW (it) GOES UP, THE SITUATION BECOMES
    UNSTABLE, (dollar) GOES UP AGAIN]

The example above shows how the subjects use code-switching as an unmarked mode of interaction. More examples of this type of code-switching are found in appendix 5.

8.3.3 Code-switching as a marked choice

A marked choice is made to negotiate a change in the expected social distance holding between participants, either increasing or decreasing it (Myers-Scotton, 1993b: 132). The presence of another person or an audience might have the effect of changing the set of rights and obligations between the particular speaker and addressee (Bernsten, 1998: 179) and in turn cause the choice of code to be negotiated from marked to unmarked and vice versa. As stated by Myers-Scotton (1993b:152) markedness can only be interpreted within specific interactions in specific communities. Thus, the use of a
certain code choice is marked/unmarked only in the relationship between that particular speaker-interlocutor and in this study the community concerned is the family domain. The following extracts discuss group interactions, in which there are marked code choice practices employed to attain communicative intentions.

8.3.3.1 Complying to a prompting to ‘show off’

In the extract below the interaction is between Mimi, Amanda and Denny, and it is held in CMI and German. Denny is entering the room when Mimi says to Amanda that Denny is already good at German. Denny is home for his holiday after having spent some time studying overseas. He comes to pick Manda up to go to church after which they plan to have dinner together. Having acknowledged what Mimi says, Amanda suggests that Mimi speak German to Denny. However, it is actually Denny who starts the conversation in German as if to comply to Mimi’s ‘bait’. In addition, it seems that Denny wants to show Amanda and Mimi how good his German is (see in line 5 how he challenges them). Since the shared unmarked code among the three of them is CMI, using German is a marked code in this dialogue. Denny negotiates German, the marked code between Mimi and him, to be taken as part of the unmarked code between them in this dialogue. In the last line when Amanda comments how good he is, Denny smiles happily.

Extract 18:

1. Mimi: ini KOKO dateng, wés pinter ngomong Jerman skarang  
   [here comes OLDER BROTHER, he must be good at speaking German now] 
2. Amanda: Ajaqen omong KU MI (.) (to Denny), KO wés pinter ngomong Jerman tá?  
   [Talk to him Auntie Mi (.) (to Denny), OLDER BROTHER are you good at German already?] 
3. Denny: (smiling) yhaa, lumayan la, kamu laq yha lés to Manda?  
   [yaaah, so so, you also take (German) lessons, don’t you Manda?] 
4. Mimi: iyha tapi séq amburadul (.) he he (.) gaq isa lancar séqan  
   [yes, but (it’s) still ‘chaotic’ (.) he he.(I) still can’t speak fluently] 
5. Denny: YA WAS WILLST DU WISSEN?  
   [ya what do you want to know?] 
6. Mimi: KOKO, WILLST DU EE (.) SATE ESSEN?  
   [Koko, will you ee (.) eat sate?] 
7. Denny: ES MIR EGAL  
   [It’s OK with me] 
8. Mimi: ES EGAL, NE VORHER DER KOMMUNE DARF MAN NICHT ESSEN, NE?  
   [It’s OK, isn’t it, before the communion man may not eat, that’s right?] 
9. Denny: ZWEI STUNDE VORHER, ODER? DARF MAN NICHT-  
   [two hours before, or? man may not-] 
10. Mimi: EINE STUNDE  
    [-one hour] 
11. Denny: EINE STUNDE?  
    [one hour?] 
12. Amanda: wah wés hebat yha KO?
[wow, (you) are great already, aren’t you **OLDER BROTHER**?]

13. Denny: (smiling and grinning)

### 8.3.3.2 Marked choice to provide a dramatic effect

The example below shows an interaction between Jade, Mimi and Titi who are talking about Jade’s daughter. Jade is the one telling the story. Their interaction is mostly carried out in CMI with some Javanese and Mandarin expressions as well. Jade uses a variety of codes in certain words she uses. These words are /dèqè/ and /dia/ (line 6) meaning ‘he’ in CMI and EJI respectively. Jade is also using the Indonesian and Javanese possessive marker suffixes /-nya/ and /-è/ respectively, attached to the same word ‘guru’ ‘teacher’. In line 10 Jade says ‘guru-è’ when she starts giving the background story and later in line 12 she says ‘gurunya’. The two words have the same meaning. I would say Jade’s use of EJI in line 12 is influenced by her previous account of her encounter with Corina’s teacher and her conversation with the teacher, which was held in EJI\(^5\). As EJI is not a code she usually uses with Mimi and Titi, using EJI here can be seen as a marked choice in the dialogue. Jade attaches the Indonesian third person possessive marker /nya/ to the Javanese word KONCO ‘friend’ and uses the EJI version gurunya instead of the Javanese gurue ‘her teacher’ for dramatic and aesthetic effect to close her story. The intonational and stress patterns of this sequence are also characteristic of greater emphasis for dramatic purposes.

As in previous examples with other speakers, code-switching is used for quotation when her quoted interaction with the teacher is produced in EJI rather than unmarked CMI. Notice also the change in pronominal use when she uses *aku* ‘I’ to refer to herself with Titi and Mimi but *saya* when referring to herself as she recounts her encounter with Corina’s teacher (line 10). There is a change of formality to indicate that she is quoting her conversation with the teacher. Jade might also be using EJI to tell her story to dramatize the event.

**Extract 19:**

1. Jade: **mosoq cièciè-è tujug-tuju dèqè ikuteulong pòlò limo aduuuuuu**
   [you know, her elder sister got seven-seven, he got **THIRTY-FIVE**, woouww]
2. Titi: **padahal bareng ya Jade ya, sioq kung bo-è yò bareng (.)**
   [in fact they **TAKE LESSONS** together, **ISN’T THAT RIGHT** Jade (.)]

---

\(^5\) As has been discussed earlier the younger generation has more Indonesian words and expressions in their CMI and their Malay code use is moving towards that of standard Indonesian.
3. Jade: tapi dia itu-
   [but he is-]
4. Mimi: deqé itu ndeq sekolah itu, GAQ NGRUNGOQNO
   [he is at school, HE DIDN’T LISTEN]
5. Titi: gaq konsen
   [(he) didn’t concentrate]
6. Jade: bukan, belajaré itu ya wés NGONO LHÔ, besóq ya lai, deqé itu kan
   orangnya pelupaan, dia kan orangnya masa bôdô
   [No, the way he learns, well, yes LIKE THAT, you know, tomorrow he forgets,
   he is that kind of forgetful person, he is that kind who doesn’t care]
7. Mimi: acu
   [indifferent]
8. Jade: eh acuh kayaq yang di rumah
   [eh indifferent like the one at home]
9. Titi: Corina
   [Corina]
10. Jade: heçe, kemaren ini dikasíq raport bayangan (.) semuanyng tiga, empat
    [hee, yesterday (she was) given a preliminary report (.) all were three, four,
    empat dua, empat tiga, ndaq berani kasiq aku liat. Aku kesekolahan ke gurué deqé
    four two, four three, (she) dared not show me. I went to school to her teacher
    nanyang “Buru pulang ya” “Baru pulang? baru pulang dari mana, saya
    who asked “Ma’am, you just came back, didn’t you”, “came back?, came back
    ndaq kemana-mana?” “Oh koq itu hari Corina dateng sama kakaknya”
    from? I didn’t go anywhere!” “Oh that day Corina came with her older sister”
    “kakaknya? kakaknya siapa?” ndaq punya kakak”, KONCOPnya!!!
    “older sister? whose older sister? she has no older sister, her FRIEND!!!]
11. Mimi: <$$oh$$> (laughing)
12. Jade: diajaq mengadep gurunya!!!
   [she was brought along to come and see the teacher!!!]

In short, the marked code EJI is employed to provide dramatic effect to the speaker’s
account and also because EJI is the code the reported interaction was held in.

8.3.3.3 Using others’ unmarked code and unmarked kinship terms as address
terms (personification)

There are instances in the dialogues when a speaker uses others’ unmarked code to
address his/her intended addressee, together with a kinship term, that is unmarked
between his intended addressee and another family member. For example, CMI and/or
EJI are the unmarked codes shared between Grandma and her grandchildren who
address her as ‘Bobo’ or ‘Bo’. CMI/EJI is also the unmarked code(s) shared between
Ani and her nieces and nephews. The unmarked codes shared between Bobo and her
daughters Lisa and Ani are Javanese and Hakka. Lisa and Ani generally call Bobo
Mama ‘mother’ (which occurs in both Hakka and Javanese) as their unmarked address
term. Bobo calls her daughters by their names. However, in some instances, Ani, and
Lisa use CMI or EJI to speak to Bobo and at the same time they call her Bobo or Bo (a
Hakka term) for ‘Grandma’, thus personifying their children for whom the term (and the unmarked codes) would be appropriate. In turn, Bobo sometimes uses CMI/EJI to speak to Ani and calls Ani, A yie (another Hakka term) ‘Auntie’, thus personifying Lisa's children (her own grandchildren) through the use of both appropriate codes and appropriate kin terms. Thus, in this case, their code choice behaviour is something marked in terms of both the code(s) and the kinship terms chosen.

This phenomenon is similar to what Errington (1988: 160-62, 1998: 124-25) calls prescriptive modelling or mbasakaké, translated by Koentjaraningrat (1957: 99) as ‘to speak the speech of the children’⁶. In those instances grown-ups sometimes speak on behalf of children using children’s language. In this study, however, grown-ups speak to grown-ups by using the unmarked code(s) and the unmarked kinship terms employed by the children or grandchildren in the interlocutor's family. In Ani’s referring to Bobo as Bobo, she is using the shared unmarked code between Bobo and her grandchildren and addresses Bobo in the same way as Bobo's grandchildren do. In the case of Bobo calling Ani, A Yie ‘Auntie’, Bobo uses the unmarked terms of address employed by her grandchildren in addressing Ani. There seems to have been a negotiation to adopt a marked identity (role-relationship) between interlocutors and to make it unmarked for that conversational event by personifying the unmarked role-relations that exist between the addressee/interlocutor and the family member being personified. The choice of unmarked code employed by the personified member will clarify why this personification takes place. The following extracts illustrate examples of this phenomenon.

In the extract below Bobo, Lisa and Ani are talking to each other. Throughout the dialogue (see line 156) Lisa refers to her mother as ‘Ma’ or ‘Mama’ and Bobo also refers to herself as ‘Mama’ to Lisa and Ani. However, in line (165) Lisa addresses Bobo as Bo ‘Grandma’ which is then a marked kinship term between them. I believe Lisa is using a marked kinship term to personify her children, put herself in her children’s place and ‘endear herself to Bobo’. Thus, Lisa expects Bobo will not get upset when she shows her ‘irritation’ as indicated by her raised voice and angry tone (line 162).

---

⁶ Errington (1998: 124) writes that “normatively older, higher status speakers use such interactionally crucial elements as a co-present person should or would, and in a manner broadly analogous to the ways one can refer in English to an adult as would a child whom one is addressing (e.g., asking a child “Where’s mommy?” rather than “Where’s your mommy/mother?”).
Extract 20:

156. Lisa: SAKUN ONOQ BÔJÔNÉ NDĒQ KÔNÔ LHÔ MA
[Sakun has his wife over there, y’know Mom]

157. Bobo: bôjôné giha, wong gaq ngena gitu
[his wife is crazy, of course (she) is no good y’know that]

158. Lisa: WÔNG DEQÈ GELEM, APE DIAPAQNO?
[but he likes (her), what can be done]?

159. Bobo: pulang TENGÔK-TENGÔK DÊWEQAN, kaloq Mama da situ laq-
[get home all alone, if Mama is there then-]

160. Ani: MOSÕQ DEQÈ GELEM NUNGGONI MAMA, DÉQÈ GAQ TAU NUNGGONI MAMA
[is he willing to sit down with (you) Mom, he never sits with (you) Mom]

161. Bobo: bukan nunggoni Mama, itu gaq usa pertu nunggoni, suru kaloq tau dia pulang kasiq
makang gini-gini seneng suda (') ini-
[No sitting with Mama, that’s not important to sit with (me), just ask if (l) know he’s home, give (him) something to eat, just this, (he’s) happy already (') this-]

162. Lisa: kualiqan ÒO!!!
[(-should be) the other way around Grandma!!!]

163. All: huh huh huh (the audience laughs)

In the next extract Bobo worries about her grown up son, Sakun, who lives in another city. Each participant, especially Ani, has been trying to make Bobo realize why there is no need to worry about Sakun, Bobo’s son. At the beginning of the dialogue, Bobo, Lisa and Tania are discussing why Bobo should not look after her grown-up son. The conversation is held in CMI and Javanese with each speaker using the shared unmarked code with their intended addressee, Bobo. Ani explains to the audience that Bobo usually stays at her house for two months at the most. However, before Ani finishes her sentence (line 183), Bobo cuts it off by speaking to Ani in EJI and addressing her as A Yie ‘Auntie’, a kinship term, used by Tania and Jenny to address Ani. Bobo employs EJI and then continues in broken and ungrammatical Malay/Indonesian to explain that it is actually her other son, Amiku, who looks after Sakun.

Extract 21:

183. Ani: ngomong Mama—
[say Mother--]

184. Bobo: A YI yha mau tahu? ini yha Amin, dia bilang kaloq Sakun itu nêq sda tua bagêmana
masanya tua, rumanya nyang mau bêkén betol lotêng dibangôn, bawa diganti lès têgel, kan
suda bêkén betol dikotak kotak kamar, kost, panggil anak anak
[Auntie, yes (you) want to know? This Amin y’know, he said if Sakun is old how’s his old age, his house is to be renovated, storeyed house is built, the floor is refurnished with tiled floor, being divided into rooms, boarding room, for boarders]

185. Ani: LHA SAQIKI bêkén betol rôma, NYI NA NEAI JU A? LÊQ OMAH DIBONGKAR
KOWÈ NYI NA NEAI JU?
[well NOW the house (is being) renovated, WHERE WILL YOU STAY, IF THE
HOUSE IS BEING RENOVATED WHERE WILL YOU STAY?]

186. Bobo: PIYE gampang thô, Bobo JU (') gampang, Mama tinggal gampang lha, M SE YU LI LA,
cariq (') kaloq ini suda jadi rôma suda anu ada yang ato, Mama pinda, jangan sampèq mbèsôq
(') leq Tuhan taq (') kaloq suda ada kos rôma ini, isa buat pengasilan (') *
I argue that Bobo negotiates the marked code to be unmarked by personifying her grandchildren and uses both the code and the kinship term used by her grandchildren towards Ani. The negotiation to change the marked RO set to an unmarked one is realized through this act of personification. This kind of code choice is referred to as flouting the maxims by Myers-Scotton (1983a:127) who states that a marked choice in a conventionalized exchange (i.e. the unmarked choice is clear) in cases other than those specified by the deference or the virtuosity maxim is a flouting of the maxims. The marked choice generates the implicatures (intentionality) that (in Myers-Scotton’s terminology) a speaker is dis-identifying7 herself/himself and personifying others with the unmarked RO set for that conversational event. The implication is that the marked choice is a negotiation to establish a different RO set as unmarked and it generally evokes an emotional response from the interlocutor.

This is exactly what happens in the next line (185) in which Ani asks Bobo a question in a high raised voice which indicates her irritation or possibly anger. Ani’s anger and irritation seem to affect Bobo who is trying to answer Ani’s questions and give her reasons for being worried. See in line 186 how Bobo uses both kinship terms ‘Bobo’ and ‘Mama’ in her first sentence (in Javanese, Malay and Hakka) then goes on using CMI to refer to herself as Mama ‘mother’. I argue that Bobo is trying to address all the audience, her granddaughters, Tania and Jenny, and her daughters, Lisa and especially Ani by switching kinship terms. Scrutinizing her unmarked code choices with these particular family members, she should have been using ‘Mama’ in her Javanese, Malay and Hakka sentence, while using ‘Bobo’ with her CMI. However, she did the opposite, which might have been ‘confusion’ on her part.

To conclude, Lisa (extract 20) and Bobo (extract 21) use a marked code and a marked kinship term towards her interlocutor in order to personify other family members and at the same time disidentify themselves in their effort to negotiate a new RO set for that conversational event.

7 ‘Dis-identify’ in this case means that a person tries to depart from his/her own rank as a family member as the expected RO set and personify someone else’s. Myers-Scotton defines CS as a marked choice when the speaker dis-identifies with the expected RO set (Myers-Scotton 1993b: 151).
8.3.3.4 Marked choice to make up for an unknown word in the shared unmarked code

In the extract below an interaction takes place between Mimi and Indah who are talking about the clothes suitable for different seasons in Europe while waiting for Amanda, Indah’s daughter, who is about to return home from her mathematics course. They are talking largely in the shared unmarked code between them, CMI, except that a few Mandarin term of address such as ĉiĉe ‘older sister’ are uttered by Indah (2FAT-Pd) to address Mimi (2FCT-Pa) in line (6). However, Mimi uses two marked codes to refer to a concept for which no word exists in her unmarked code choice of CMI. First, Mimi borrows the German word ÜBERGANG ‘transition’ before she translates the word into Indonesian (see line 7). I think that although Indah does not speak German Mimi still uses a German word to her because they are talking about the winter season and suitable clothing in Europe and Mimi is having trouble finding an appropriate Indonesian translation of the word. Before coming up with Indonesian masa peralihan she uses the German word she remembers to express what she wants to say. Then, because there is no appropriate word in CMI, Mimi uses an Indonesian translation because at least Indah does understand Indonesian. Mimi’s choice of German and Indonesian is a marked code choice practice between them.

Extract 22:

4. Indah: ĉiĉe, Amanda beli jins itu ĉiĉe, hêm jins itu sala lho ĉiĉe, kurang gedê, dalemê ndaq isa diisi.
   [Sis, you, Amanda bought those jeans Sis, that denim shirt is wrong, you know Sis, not big enough, (you) can’t wear anything inside]
   [you know, (you) should not always wear something inside. If not, for the jeans only, it’s possible, isn’t it? it can be for—]
6. Indah: tipisë ĉiĉe
   [it is so thin, Sis]
7. Mimi: keja ÜBERGANG itu APA NAMANYA? MASA PERALIHAN itu isa dipakêq,
   tapi dalem mesti pakêq hêm, nêq aku—
   [for TRANSITION, WHAT-YOU-CALL-IT?, THE TRANSITIONAL PERIOD, you can wear it, but inside (you) should wear (a) shirt, if I—]
8. Indah:— ukuranê jins ini mesti gedêan titik
   [the size for the jeans should be a bit bigger]

8.3.3.5 Marked code with phonological flagging to vent emotions

In the extract below Bobo uses a marked code with strong emphasis to vent her annoyance. From line 48-51 Jenny, Lisa, and Ani are talking about Bobo’s reasons for
wanting to go to Jakarta and they converse in Javanese, their unmarked choice with each other, while Tania is listening to their conversation. To answer Lisa’s question to Bobo (line 50) (said in an angry and irritating tone), Bobo supplies her reason for wanting to go to Jakarta using CMI with a strong emphasis (line 52). The interaction goes on and each time Bobo answers Lisa and Ani’s Javanese in CMI with a strong tone (lines 54, 56, 58). The tone changes when Jenny asks Bobo a question in CMI, their shared unmarked code with Bobo. Bobo answers Jenny in the same mild tone (lines 60 and 61) that Jenny has used. In line (65) Ani gets irritated with Bobo and raises her voice angrily to speak to Bobo in Hakka and Javanese, their shared unmarked codes. To answer Ani and Lisa, Bobo reacts by answering defiantly using emphasis and a very loud voice using CMI. Seeing what is taking place, Tania tries to interfere and appease the situation by reminding Ani, her aunt that Ani is talking to an elderly lady (line 67). The implied message is that Ani should at least show some respect by lowering her voice.

Throughout the dialogue there is marked phonological flagging from Lisa, Ani and Bobo when they either raise their voices or give their answer in emphasized tones and sometimes lengthened vowels (see underlined vowel /a/ in line 52, 54, 56). Even though CMI is one of the codes shared between Bobo, Ani and Lisa, it is generally less preferred than either Hakka or Javanese. Bobo’s use of CMI could be to accommodate her granddaughters, Tania and Jenny, but more likely CMI was used so that Bobo could show her non-compliance and her defiance to her daughters. The annoyed tone she adopts provides more support that the second hypothesis is most likely true.

Extract 23:

48. Lisa: SÉNG MARI, MARI KUPAT LAGÉQ ISA MBALÉQ TOH, GAQ KIRO KUWAT DÉQÉ
   [those who are able to go back (to Jakarta) only after ‘kupat’8, (I) don’t think she’s strong enough]
49. Ani: WONG BOBO PENGÉN NJUPOQ BARANGÉ, APÉ NJUPOQ BARANGÉ
   [of course Bobo wants to collect (her) things, (she) wants to collect (her) things]
50. Lisa: BARANG OPO SÉ MA, MAH? BARANG OPO?! KOQ KOYOQ BARANG OPO!!
   [what kind of things Ma, Mother? What things?! As if what (important) things!]
51. Tania:<$$...$$> (laughing)
52. Bobo: pelu prèksa matag! mata ini!
   [(I) need to have my eyes checked! These eyes!]
53. Ani: Bobo déwél kepénén pulung, KO OPO ÀÉ ÖNOQ-
   [Bobo, herself wants to go home, THAT’S WHY THERE’S ALWAYS SOMETHING-]
54. Bobo: pëngén ámbèq kaca matag!
   [(I) just want to take my eye-glasses]

8 ‘Kupat’ is a Javanese dish eaten on the seventh day after the Moslem New Year (Idul Fitr) by Javanese Moslems. It is also used as a period marking the seventh day of Moslem New Year.
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In short, Bobo’s choice of CMI with an emphasized tone and a loud voice to answer Ani and Lisa indicates her irritation and anger as well as her defensiveness about a perceived ‘attack’.

8.3.3.6 Using a marked choice to be included in the interaction

In this dialogue Bobo uses a marked code to address an interlocutor in order to indicate that she is listening and therefore would like to be included in the conversation. In the dialogue Jon, Lisa and Tania are talking and Tania is trying to find somebody to accompany Bobo on her proposed trip to Jakarta. In line (20) Tania addresses Jon and asks him whether her aunt, Ani, Jon’s wife, is going to Jakarta. She asks him in the unmarked code they share, CMI and in line (21) he answers using the same code. When he tells Tania that Ani is traveling by airplane (line 23), Bobo joins in using CMI and tells Jon (or probably both Jon and Tania) that she wants to go to Jakarta too and this surprises Jon. Since Jon and Tania use CMI to talk about Bobo, Bobo joins in by using CMI too. CMI is the code she shares with Tania and this allows her to be included ‘in
the discussion group’ with Jon and Tania. If Bobo were addressing Jon, CMI would be a marked choice since the unmarked code between them in dyadic interaction is Hakka. It is also possible that Jon repeats Bobo’s CMI statement using CMI himself in order to acknowledge Bobo’s intention to negotiate CMI as their shared unmarked code for this interaction.

Extract 24:

17. Tania: heqe
   [OK]
18. Lisa: A Giu MOSOQ GELEM MAPAQ, repoot
   [Uncle doesn’t want to pick (you) up, (he’s) very busy]
19. Tania: ngaq, gini æ lha () kan A Yie mo ke Jakarta, A Yie mo ke Jakarta toh? iyha Ie Jong, A Yie mau ke Jakarta yha?
   [No, it’s better this way, I think (.) Auntie is going to Jakarta, isn’t she? Auntie is going to Jakarta, right? Is that right Uncle, Auntie is going to Jakarta?]
20. Jon: A Yie mana? bentar, Bobo mo ke Jakarta?
   [Auntie where?!, later, Bobo wants to go to Jakarta?]
22. Tania: <$$hiya$$ > (laughing)
23. Jon: iyha terbang
   [yeah, (she’ll go) by plane]
24. Bobo: yha pigi æ sana
   [yes, let’s just go there]
25. Jon: lho! "pigí æ sana"
   [Oh no! ‘let’s just go there”]

In summary, Bobo renegotiates the use of marked code CMI to be taken as unmarked code for this conversation in her effort to be included in the conversation between Jon and Tania, held in CMI.

8.3.3.7 Marked choice to exclude others

In the examples below, the speakers and their addressees exclude others, either the person who is the subject of discussion, unwanted eavesdroppers, or the rest of the audience by either using a marked code or changing the nature of their code-switching (using their shared code(s) that are not understood by the unwanted audience).

In the extract below, Lisa, Ani, Tugun, Jenny, and Tania are talking to Bobo. Gugun tries to ‘pacify’ Bobo and tell her not to worry. As Gugun is the main speaker, the dialogue is mostly held in CMI, the unmarked code he shares with the audience. Apparently the previous lines spoken in CMI are intended for Bobo to understand what they are discussing, which then is also confirmed by Gugun’s addressing Bobo every now and then in CMI. However, the two English lines uttered by Jenny (line 23) and Tania (30), on the other hand, are meant to exclude Bobo. English is a code Bobo does not understand at all but it is also understood by Gugun, Tania and Jenny as
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obviously displayed by their reaction to Tania’s account (lines 32 and 33). Although the three of them understand English, it is not an unmarked code choice between any of them in dyadic interaction. Using it as a marked choice, Jenny attempts to negotiate a new RO set, namely their agreement to exclude Bobo. Tania accepts Jenny’s offer by also answering partly in English. To this Lisa shows no reaction and Ani just utters ‘hmm’. As English is not a code in either Ani’s or Lisa’s repertoire, Jenny’s using English is surely intended only for Gugun, and Tania.

Extract 25:

17. Gugun: mikiri laén aé Bo
   [please just worry about other things Bo]
18. Lisa: prasaku koq Bobo mékiri Sakun itu gaq terlalu
   [In my opinion, Bobo is not worrying too much over Sakun]
19. Gugun: Gaq cocoq
   [that’s not right]
20. Lisa: gaq terlalu ya an, gaq terlalu
   [not really, you know, not really]
21. Jenny: wong deket aja gaq diórós dulu séq mudané
   [even when they were near to each other she didn’t care about him when she was young]
22. Lisa: lagi sekarang wés tuwéq
   [let alone now, she is old already]
23. Jenny: IT’S ONLY THE REASON, THAT’S HER REASON
   [that’s only her excuse, that’s her excuse]
24. Lisa: dulu séq enomé bebas, sekarang wés tuwéq
   [when she was young, she was free, now she’s old already]
25. Gugun: secara psikologis itu deqé terikat ngéq sana
   [psychologically she is bound there]
26. Jenny: bukan, aku bilang ini deqé sukaq jalan-jalan
   [no, I say she likes traveling]
27. Lisa: heqé iya seneng jalan-jalan
   [that’s right, yes she likes traveling]
28. Jenny: semangat idopé itu tinggi
   [she has a strong spirit for life]
29. Lisa: heqé semangat idopé itu misiq tinggi, isiq kepengan kayak orang muda itu lhó, séq pengen pigi-pigi, pengen gi mana, tapi ya gaq apa-apa leq memang fisiké kuat ya gaq apa-apa. Léq isiq kuat gaq apa-apa
   [that’s right, her spirit for life is still strong, still wants to be like young people, you know, still likes traveling, wishes to go somewhere, but it’s Ok if she is still physically fit. If (she’s) still fit, that’s OK]
30. Tania: DON’T SAY THAT, wong I HEARD FROM Mak Yah Y’KNOW SHE SAID SOMETHING ABOUT YAH VISITING HERE AND VISITING SURABAYA AND THEN RETURNING TO JAKARTA. THEN SHE WON’T COME BACK TO…, SHE WON’T BE ABLE TO COME BACK. In… aku ndaq mau membuat orang menyesel itu ya gitu. Taqékér wés biarno laq—
   [Don’t say that, of course I heard from Mak Yah you know she said something about visiting here and visiting Surabaya and then returning to Jakarta. Then she won’t come back, she won’t be able to come back. This… I don’t want to make people regret, that’s why. (I) think, well let it be if—]  
31. Ani: [hmm
32. Gugun: [gitu?
   [is that so?]
33. Jenny:[NGONÓ Tá?
   [is that so?]
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It can be concluded that in this dialogue, Tania and Jenny are using English, the code shared only by the young generation to exclude Bobo as they are speaking in her presence and possibly also to exclude members of the other older generation such as Ani and Lisa.

8.3.3.8 Marked behaviour to accommodate a welcome guest

The following extract is taken from a longer conversation. It shows how Kong and Mimi choose their code to accommodate another participant in the dialogue. In the conversation discussed in §8.2.3, Kong and Mimi exclude the unwanted audience by employing more Mandarin. In the following dialogue they employ Malay (CMI) more intensively to accommodate their guest, Suni, a real estate agent who is a friend of the family. Kong and Mimi want to ask Suni for help in putting the house on the market, so they try to provide Suni with the information about the house. Since Suni does not speak Mandarin, the conversation involving Suni is held largely in CMI. However later, Kong and Mimi are talking to (arguing with) each other about money matters in some parts, especially the last part, that do not involve Suni, they speak in a mixture of Mandarin and CMI, their unmarked mode of interaction (lines 76-81).

Extract 26:

1. Mimi: heh sapa sëng jaga?
   [well, who guard (the house)?]
2. Kong: heh? Belon dateng
   [what? (he) hasn’t come yet]
   [what? The person hasn’t come yet, so then? What? It is locked (.), call a locksmith then, make a new key then]
4. Kong: iya
   [yes]
5. Suni: lampu-lampué wès diganti Omí?
   [Have you changed the lightbulbs, Uncle?]
6. Kong: cumaq belon kabè
   [(I) haven’t changed all]
7. Mimi: laq lampu mestì ganti kabel yha Pa?
   [do you have to change the light cables too, Dad?]
8. Kong: dak
   [No]
9. Suni: kabel ndaq ganti lampué ganti?
   [the cables are not changed, the lightbulbs are changed?]
10. Kong: lampu?
   [lightbulbs ?]
11. Mimi: bukan kabelè itu suđa dua duapulu a?
    [No, are the cables two hundred twenty already?]
12. Kong: dua dua pulu
    [two hundred twenty]
76. Kong: *yha gampang* (. ) **TIEN HWA yha DAO IKO, TIEN HWA YU, DA NA, NA JI**
[yes, (that’s) easy (. ) **TELEPHONE OK (we’ll) ASK FOR ONE, THERE IS A**
**TELEPHONE, HE TOOK IT, TOOK IT AWAY**]

77. Mimi: **mesti-é BU GO I NA lhó**
[actually, **HE’S NOT ALLOWED TO TAKE (IT)**, y’know]

78. Kong: **DA NA JI** (. ) **lsá (. ) CE-ME-YANG?**
[**HE TAKES IT AWAY** (. ) **he can** (. ) **HOW’S IT?**]

79. Mimi: **tapi TIEN HWA itu punyaqé Telkom lhó**
[but the **TELEPHONE belongs to Telkom**9], y’know]

80. Kong: **YU (. ) CE-KO, TAI GAI SE DA NA**
[**THERE’S ONE (. ) THIS PROBABLY HE TOOK IT AWAY**]

81. Mimi: **TIEN HWA semua naq pasang kan dikasiqi satu, dari Telkom**
[**TELEPHONE all who install telephone will be supplied with one, from Telkom**]

Although CMI is one of their unmarked codes, using only CMI between Kong and Mimi is marked behaviour. Both Kong and Mimi are using CMI as a deferential strategy because they want ‘something’ from Suni, i.e. to market their house. In addition they want to show respect to their guest by speaking only in the code shared by the guest, especially since Suni is involved in the discussion.

To conclude, comparing Kong’ and Mimi’s code choice behaviour in extract 4 and extract 26 above, there are similarities in the way they talk about the same subject ‘a house’ but one is with an unwanted audience around while in the above example there is a welcome participant. This ‘third party’ influences Kong and Mimi’s decision about which code to employ.

### 8.3.3.9 Unclear addressee

The extract below involves Titi and her daughter Cindy who have come to Kong’s house. Kong only greets them in Mandarin but his daughter answers Kong in Mandarin while his granddaughter answers in Malay.

Extract 27:

**Titi:** Pa
Kong: **JEK FAN LEK MÉI-YHU?**
[Have (you) eaten yet?]
**Titi:** **JEK LEQ PA**
[*(I) have, Pa]*

**CINDY:** [Suda **KONG**
[*(I) have **GRANDPA**]]

---

9 Telkom is the telecommunication company owned by the Indonesian government.
It is not clear whether Kong intends to greet only Titi, or both Titi and Cindy. It seems that, out of respect, Cindy acknowledges Kong's greetings by answering in Malay. If Kong also intends to include Cindy in his greetings, then Kong's using Mandarin is a marked code to Cindy while Cindy uses the unmarked code she shares with Kong.

8.3.4 Exploratory choice
In this type of code-switching speakers are not sure which code to employ so they explore a range of possible choices in order to attain the optimum result. In the extracts below Tania uses a range of exploratory choices to address her audience.

The extracts below are taken from a long conversation that takes place in family B. In this family, there are occasions when many generations in the family gather together. One of the occasions is the family gathering to celebrate Christmas and New Year. There were four generations present during the family gathering where the interactions took place. The main concern at that time was Bobo's plan to go to Jakarta after New Year's Day. Since she was already 90 years old, she needed somebody to constantly look after her. However, her plan to go to Jakarta coincided with Moslem New Year, so there was no one to look after her since all the servants will have gone home. Thus, everybody tries to make Bobo realize her predicament if she goes to Jakarta. For the whole week everybody had been trying to discourage Bobo from going, by advising, persuading, cajoling, explaining the situation, giving reasons etc. From the beginning, only Tania supported Bobo's wishes to go to Jakarta and she does this by trying to put forward the reasons for Bobo's wishes to travel to Jakarta. Tania argues vehemently against the audience by gliding along the continuum of Malay codes shared among all the participants.

In the long dialogue, there are ten participants from three different generations, i.e. Bobo, Lisa, Ani, Filip, Jon, Tania, Jenny, Tom, Gugun and one other relative (R). The codes involved in the dialogue are Standard Indonesian, CMI, EJI, Javanese, Hakka and some Mandarin words. In their lines or turns in the dialogue, each participant is trying to either address Bobo or argue with each other using the unmarked code choice they share with their intended addressee. Tania tries to support Bobo by supplying the reasons for Bobo wanting to go to Jakarta. As Tania shares different unmarked codes with those in the audience, she explores and moves along a continuum of codes to attain her communicative goals as illustrated from extract 28 to 30 below in which she chooses different codes to address different interlocutors in the audience.
In lines with asterisks (67, 78, 91, and 125) which are quoted below, Tania is using different codes or a mixture of codes containing a similar message to appeal to her audience and to invoke their approval of Bobo’s going to Jakarta. She uses different words with the same meaning such as ‘ojoq’ (a Javanese word in a CMI context) and ‘jangan’ (Malay word in EJI or SI) meaning ‘don’t’, ‘rumahnya’ (EJI) and ‘rumaé’ (CMI) ‘her house’, ‘orang tua’ (EJI/SI) or ‘orang tuwëq’ (CMI), ‘Jakarta’ (Malay) and ‘Yëq jen’ (Mandarin). There are also words from the same ‘root’ used in active and passive forms in different codes. These are ojoq dipexsa (CMI) or jangan dipaksa (EJI/SI) literally means ‘don’t (let her) be forced’, ‘kita ndak bisa maksara’ or ‘ndak bisa maksara’ (EJI) ‘we can’t force (her)’ or ‘(we) can’t force (her)’.

Extract 28:

66. Tania: Iq. Iq, WONG TUWETQ Iq, yhaa, yhaa
   [Auntie, Auntie, AN ELDERLY PERSON, Auntie, (please y’remember)]

67. Tania: Bóbó, Bóbó ini soqalé kan dëqé MERASA (.) MERASA JAKARTA ITU RUMAHNYA,
   ndaq bólé, ndaq bólé dipexsa*
   [Bobo, Bobo, this is because she FEELS (.) FEELS JAKARTA IS HER HOME, please
don’t, please don’t force (her)]

In line (66) above Tania tries to remind her aunt, Ani that she is talking to an elderly person so she should not be too harsh and angry. Thus in line (67) above, Tania gives her support to Bobo by explaining that Bobo feels Jakarta is her home and asks Ani (and probably the other members of the audience too) not to force Bobo to stay in Malang. In this extract Tania starts her exploration by using CMI with a few Indonesian words which make the sentence a little ‘marked’.

Extract 29:

77. Ani: Lina (.) NSAI OI anter (.), kulaqan (.) ndeq (.) YEQ JEN
   [Lina (.) I will take (.) buy things (.) at Jakarta]

78. Tania: soqalé Bobo tu merasa YEQ JEN itu rumaé, ojoq dipaksa wës**
   [Tania: (it is) because Bobo FEELS JAKARTA is her home, please don’t force (her), OK?]

In line (78) Tania tries to repeat the same thing she said in line 67 (extract 28) above. However, since Ani uses the Mandarin word for Jakarta ‘YEQ JEN’ in the previous line (77), Tania repeats her previous sentence from line 67 by replacing the word ‘Jakarta’ with ‘Yék Jen’ and ‘rumahnya’ with ‘rumaé’ to address Ani. CMI is an unmarked code between Ani and Tania so actually there is no marked code-switching taking place in terms of the code she uses.
Extract 30:
83. Tania: *yha nذاq lab namané ORANG YA SUDAH TUA kepêngén liaq SEBELUM, SEBELUM mbaliq KERUMAH BAPAK**
   [well, it’s not that, let’s say a very old person wants to see before before going back to the Father’s home]

Line (83) is not a repetition. Here, Tania is using an Indonesian phrase ‘*orang ya sudah tua*’ ‘a very old person’ which she later refers to (in line 125 of extract 32 below) by using CMI, as she explores different codes to address the audience.

Extract 31:
91. Tania: *iyha TAPI IKATAN BATINNYA ITU, JAKARTA ITU RUMAHNYA, gitu lho, kita nذاq bisa maksap*
   [yeah, but her heart attachment, Jakarta is her home, like that y’know, we can’t force (her)

Again in line (91) Tania tries to explain to her mother and aunt, Lisa and Ani and all the other members of the audience who have spoken before her. Tania repeats her previous sentences in lines 67 and 78 by using SI phrases and sentences in her CMI and EJI expressions. Her using SI serves as a marked code-switching from her previous line (78), especially her repeated reference to her suggestion that they cannot force Bobo to do what she does not want to do. In line (78) she uses CMI ‘*ojoq dipaksia wés*’ but in line (91) above she says ‘*kita nذاq bisa maksap*’, with a choice of words more towards EJI. In respect to her unmarked code choice with each participant in the audience, her code choice indicates a marked code-switching since she usually either speaks in Javanese or CMI in dyadic interactions with each individual participant in the audience. Again, Tania’s repeated message in different codes illustrates her exploring to try to find the best code to address the particular interlocutor as well as the whole audience.

Extract 32:
124. Lisa: *SEK U GWA KÔ HÔ, NUÑAÑQ-NUNUÑQ, NUÑAÑQ-NUNUÑQ () NDELOQ OPO SÉ?
   (()) NDELOQ PASÉR PUTI?*
   [-*IT’S BETTER TO STAY HOME*, walking step by step, step-by-step with difficulties
   (()) what do you want to see? (()) to see the White Sand beach?]"
125. Tania: *dah, súqala, Ma! BÔBÔ INI POKOKNYA SENANG TINGGAL DI JAKARTAAA!,
   nah, tapi sèng laèn-laèn ini maksap, laq aku bilang ojoq dipaksia, wés, biar, Bóbô suda
tuwaq!!*
   [well, please, that’s it Mum, Grandma principally likes to stay in Jakarta, but, all the others,
   force her, if I may say don’t force (her), OK just let it be, Grandma is old already]

Since in line (124), Lisa tries to oppose Bobo’s wishes, her daughter Tania’s sentence in line (125) is intended for her mother and Tania repeats her previous messages (lines 67, 78 and 91) by using SI in the middle of her sentence. She finishes off by switching to CMI when she addresses the other participants. Using SI itself is a marked code between Lisa and Tania. Tania is using this code to send her strong message to her
mother and to the audience as well. So, the use of SL itself is already a marked medium. In addition her higher pitch to indicate an emphasis is also a marked phonological switch from her previous one.

In short Tania is communicating the same referential message by sliding in and out of the continuum of Malay codes and employing a mixture of these codes in order to explore or negotiate the most suitable unmarked choice to address all participants. Her structural, lexical and phonological flagging shows the marked code-switching instances she uses to appeal to her audience and her implied support for Bobo. Tania’s efforts to speak in different varieties in order to negotiate the unmarked code with her audience (with whom she shares various unmarked codes) refers to what Myers-Scotton (1993c:142) states in her ‘exploratory choice maxim’:

‘speakers may employ codeswitching when they themselves are not sure of the expected or optimal communicative intent, or at least not sure which one will help achieve their social goals’

To support Bobo, she tries to negotiate an RO set by aligning herself to the codes and words used or ideas put forward by participants in the audience (see lines 78, and 83), while still showing support and being polite to Bobo. I suspect since Bobo is in the audience and Tania’s repeated referential messages are projected to Bobo, it motivates her to use the whole continuum of Malay codes. Thus, although she shares Javanese as an unmarked code with some of the audience (Lisa, Ani and Jenny), even when addressing them, she never chooses Javanese. Instead she uses Indonesian/Malay varieties in order to exert ‘authority’ and ‘formality’ in her efforts to put forward her stance for Bobo.

8.4 Summary and Conclusions

The discussion so far has shown that in group interactions, speakers choose to use the unmarked code they share with certain members especially when they want to accommodate or to specify certain speakers, either for turn taking or for addressing them (deference and virtuosity maxims). Marked codes, on the other hand, are used when there are specific motivations or intentions to negotiate new RO sets. Their marked code choice in the presence of other speakers (the third party) signifies a redefinition of a given RO set between those interlocutors, which in turn reflects the speaker’s communicative intention or motivations. Markedness is always defined
relative to some sort of unmarked starting points which are the code choice patterns in
dyadic interactions as discussed in the previous chapter.

Taking into account all of the amendments to Myers-Scotton’s Extended
Markedness Model that have been proposed for the purposes of this study (see §7.1.1),
the subjects’ code choice activities can be summarized as in figure 8.1.
Figure 8.1 Components of Amended Extended Markedness Model for Multilingual Communication
The figure shows four sets of components of the amended Extended Markedness Model: external factors, internal factors, socio-psychological processes and language behaviour. These different sets of factors interact with each other in a variety of different ways to produce either marked or unmarked choices in speech.

At this point, we can move on to make some further more detailed conclusive observations about code-switching that can be derived from the study of code choice presented in §8.3 above.

### 8.4.1 Codeswitching is not identical with a new RO set

Some of the extracts above indicate that most code-switching instances do not negotiate a new RO set. Thus, even in a piece of dialogue in which many codes are used in group interactions, it turns out that each speaker is using his/her own unmarked code choice shared with his/her intended addressee in the dialogue. So, code-switching is taking place without any negotiation of a new RO set. On the other hand, very often the same code, e.g., CMI, is used by all participants and there seems to be no code-switching taking place; however, actually a new RO set is being negotiated as CMI turns out to be not the shared unmarked code between the speaker-interlocutor.

### 8.4.2 Codeswitching signifying code mobility

Giles (1973b) discusses accent mobility which shows the ability of a speaker to modify his/her accent and pronunciation from acrolect to basilect and vice versa in order to accommodate his interlocutor by converging and diverging either upward or downward.

As shown in some examples especially extracts on sequential unmarked code-switching, a speaker glides from one code to another to address different interlocutors using their shared unmarked codes and to move along a continuum of codes in a sequence of unmarked choices. Also, in codeswitching as an exploratory choice, a speaker uses a variety of code choices to accommodate, specify different addressees or find the best alternative to convey his/her messages to the audience. The speaker moves from one code to another along the continuum of codes he or she speaks. Similarly, in codeswitching as a conversational mode, the speaker and any interlocutor constantly employ at least two codes and move between the codes in their interaction. These examples illustrate code mobility on the part of the speaker. Thus, in terms of the purpose behind the mobility, there is a similar kind of behaviour as described by Giles above, namely a speaker converges towards and diverges from one code to the other, in order to accommodate his/her interlocutors and the other audience.
8.4.3 Codeswitching as a reflection of multiple identities

As stated by Myers-Scotton (1983a: 122) there is a type of codeswitching which occurs between bilinguals living in the same era which usually does not have any particular motivation. Myers-Scotton’s states that “as each code is an unmarked realization of an RO set, so codeswitching implicates at least two different rights-and-obligations sets and thus symbolizes the dual identities of the bilingual speakers”. It can be inferred that in these multilingual families, their unmarked code-switching practices as a code of itself or the different codes they allocate for different interlocutors in situational code-switching, symbolizes their multiple identities.

Almost all the speakers discussed in this study are multilingual and they utilize their code choice to index a particular identity—especially in group interactions involving intergenerational members. Since this multilingual family is in its extended circle like a microcosmic multilingual society, with different generations having different repertoires and different unmarked choices, each member has to consider their code-choice activities when talking with each other. Hence, the variation of multilinguality and mobility in the various codes involved becomes especially rampant when members of three generations are involved in the interactions as seen in the examples above.

Among the third generation in particular, the host codes serve as their salient social identity as members of a speech community in which Malay and Javanese varieties are dominant. Malay and Javanese varieties are the codes found in almost all of the domains in society and these codes are the active codes in their repertoire. The use of Hakka and Mandarin here and there, on the other hand, is to identify themselves as part of the family, a ‘we-ness’. Hence, their use of the Hakka and/or Mandarin words or phrases in their conversation is to signify this sense of belonging, membership of a family, in addition to being members of society. English and/or German are used to show their identity as part of the international community, and at the same time to indicate that their knowledge and education is different from the previous generation.

On the other hand, for G1 and G2, the use of Malay signifies their efforts to go along and keep pace with the changes that take place in the society in general and within the family in particular. This is especially so with regard to family B in which the G4 member speaks an Indonesian variety that is close to the national standard. Since Indonesian is associated with authority/rising social status, prestige, and being updated and accommodative to social changes, this choice is made to index an identity as part of
this change. Mandarin is identified with education and their belonging to a certain era in the history of Indonesia, while their ancestral dialect marks their identity as part of a Hakka or Foochow family or community.

In short, speakers make use of their ability to switch from one code to another not only to display their linguistic repertoire but also to show themselves as multidimensional individuals (Myers-Scotton, 1998c: 26) reflecting their multiple identities (see Myers-Scotton, 1998a: 101) These things often happen in third world countries in post colonial times like those in South East Asia, including Indonesia as described in this study.

8.4.4 Codeswitching as a strategy of indirectness

Javanese society is hierarchical in its structure as is mirrored in the speech levels in its language. In this kind of society, indirectness is usually more prevalent (Trudgill, 1995: 119) and indirectness serves as a frequently used conversational strategy. This is also seen in the subjects’ language behaviour in projecting their messages in some dialogues. This practice is found in some examples as delayed or ambiguous/disguised unmarked/marked code (§8.3.1.4 and §8.3.1.5) in which the speakers employ the shared unmarked code with their interlocutor, but actually intend the message for other participants in the audience. Other instances are in the speakers’ effort to personify or disidentify themselves in their efforts to distance themselves from the real intended addressee. By doing such things, people can still send or insinuate their messages and stay on safe ground. In a way they are making exploratory choices in which they indirectly negotiate a marked code to be accepted by the intended addressee as a new unmarked choice for that particular speech event.

It can be concluded that as each speaker knows each family member well (especially in terms of their language ability and facility), the main purpose of interaction is to keep the conversation going by utilizing both their marked and unmarked code choices to meet different purposes. These are, among others, to change topics, to accommodate turns, to quote, to switch situations, to insist or persist in their efforts to get the message across, to clarify, to insinuate, to comply, to signify their multilinguality which reflects their multiple identities and to gain others’ approval. Some of them do these to the point of gliding from one code to another within the same dialogue. Above all, they want to participate in the dialogue and to exercise their sense
of belonging in the family (their 'we-ness') by their presence and their contribution in the conversation. As demonstrated in the examples, very often a code’s markedness and the speaker’s contribution in the dialogue can only be gauged or assessed after several successive turns or a sequence of turns has passed. As has been illustrated through examples and presented in the discussion, all these instances can be clearly and adequately accounted for by Myers-Scotton’s Markedness Model.
Chapter 9

A Variety of Codes as Speech levels

9.0 Introduction

As discussed earlier, the subjects' language repertoires contain many different codes used in different domains both private and public, in the wider multilingual society. Within the family domain in particular, the subjects' code choice behaviour discussed in the last two chapters shows that different age cohorts employ different codes to different interlocutors for different reasons. The speakers consider that some particular codes are more polite for use with particular speakers of particular generations. Taking into account the age distance between interlocutors, their family status (role-relations), their language behaviour and attitude towards their addressees from different generations, their code choice behaviour reflects degrees of formality which exist between different pairs of speakers-interlocutors. I argue that in their interpersonal interaction, speakers choose codes that are associated with high formality and prestige to index a high degree of politeness towards some addressees. On the other hand, speakers choose codes identified with relative informality to index solidarity and familiarity with addressees. This use of different codes to index degrees of politeness to different interlocutors can be seen as directly analogous with the use of speech levels in a language like Javanese. In this chapter, I present the subjects' practice of using different codes as speech levels, mostly concentrating on interactions within the family domain. I also pay attention to the domains of work and friendship for some members of the transitional generation.

In this study, I have drawn a distinction between multilingualism and multilinguality as referring to societal and individual language use respectively. Polyglossia can be seen as akin to multilingualism in that it is something that operates at a societal level but speakers have the ability to exploit their multilinguality in order to interact politely with different individuals. In this chapter, I compare the polyglossic

---

1A similar practice of using linguistic means to express politeness is also found in languages such as Thai, and Japanese. However, none exhibit as complex and extensive a system of politeness as that of Javanese speech levels.
functions of the codes at a societal level with their functions in the subjects' individual interactions and attempt to draw links between them. Such a comparison reveals that while there might be an overlap in the societal and individual interactional functions of the different codes, they also have some distinctive functions at a societal and individual interactional level.

For these purpose, section 9.1 gives a brief overview of the concept of face and politeness in both Chinese and Javanese culture, and provides some background on the use of speech levels in standard Javanese and a somewhat 'simpler' version of Javanese speech levels used among the peranakan Chinese. The next sections discuss the use of multilingual speech levels and formality among the subjects in the family domain. Each subject has a set of codes which function as different speech levels and these vary across age cohorts and across generations. Additional examples from two domains outside the family are given for some subjects, to show that codes may function in different ways as speech levels for the same individual in different domains. The next section presents a polyglossic classification of the codes found in each cohort's language repertoire using Ferguson's (1959, 1972) and Platt's (1976a, 1977, 1977b) criteria. Finally, a comparison is drawn between formality in the public and private domains while addressing how the subjects manipulate the concept of formality at an interpersonal level.

9.1 Chinese and Javanese culture

In societies where power differences between older and younger generations are normatively great, almost always adhered to and highly salient, the implementation of politeness and/or respect is highly expected in everyone's language behaviour. Being Chinese by origin but living amongst Javanese people and speaking local codes makes the subjects inevitably prone to the influence of the norms and values embraced by both cultures. Thus, the influence of both cultures can help shape the subjects' way of life, language, culture, behaviour and patterns of thought. Such influences are then manifested in daily interpersonal conduct including language use and interactions, be it in society, community or family spheres. Therefore, the language choice practices of the subjects in individual interactions in the family domain can be related to and analysed from the perspectives of both Chinese and Javanese politeness norms.
9.1.1 Chinese politeness and the notion of face

Chinese people are renowned for their esteem for hierarchy. This derives at least in part from ancient philosophies (such as Confucianism) which respect an ethical hierarchy in human relations (Nakamura, 1964: 259). Some of the practices still widely embraced by overseas Chinese are the ethic of Li which gives value to the order of rank and social position of an individual. Li can be roughly glossed as ‘politeness’ and it is typically seen to have manifestations in the need for respect for family and age including relationships between parents-children, younger and older siblings, husband-wife etc. (Hariyono, 1993:25-30). Similarly, Nakamura (1964:266) explains the meaning of ‘Li’ by providing an example of the gradations of children born to the same parents. In Chinese, children are divided into four categories by age: hsiung ‘elder brother’, tī ‘younger brother’, tzu ‘elder sister’, and mei ‘younger sister’. Furthermore, in an old-fashioned family in China, the younger generations are expected to obey their elders. Chinese people also place high value on patriarchal kinship wherein the family serves as the centre of the life of an individual. Nakamura (1964: 268) posits that “relations among family members provided the human basis for the moral virtues of the Chinese, and filial piety was the most important among them”. Nakamura goes on to point out that this filial piety demanded a one-sided obedience from children, the younger people, to their parents, the venerated elders. Even though these values seem to be no longer strictly observed in China, especially since the reign of the Communist Party, the same values are still very much adhered to by overseas Chinese, including those in East Java. This explains the background reasons the young generations show respect and politeness to their elderly family members through their behaviour, including in the language they choose and speak to these family members.

The concept of ‘face’ is Chinese in provenance, and has been used since at least the fourth century B.C. (Ho, 1976, Hu, 1944, Tracy, 1990). ‘Face’ is very tangible in Chinese culture. One can have face, lose face, give face, maintain face or salvage face. The Chinese distinguish different kinds of ‘face’: lién is a person’s good moral character, while mien-tzū refers to one’s social prestige or “reputation achieved through getting on in life, through success and ostentation” which can be “borrowed, struggled for, added to, padded” through “initial high position, wealth power, ability, cleverly establishing social ties to a number of prominent people as well as through avoidance of acts that would cause unfavourable comment” (Hu, 1944: 45, 61). Lien serves as one of the basic prerequisites for determining one’s amount of mien-tzū (Hu, 1944: 62) which
varies according to the social situation in which interactions take place (Ho, 1976: 869). Although the two terms are interchangeable in some linguistic contexts, their meanings are always context-related. Hu postulates further that all persons growing up in the community are entitled to the same honest and decent lien, but their mien-tzū depends on family standing, personal ties, and one's ability to impress people etc. A person can maintain his self-respect, thus ensuring his lien by fulfilling his responsibilities associated with his roles and duties in the community (Hu, 1944: 62). In other words, in Chinese culture it is important to maintain one's face by performing one's duties and responsibilities, to save others' face by asking for approval, and to give face to others by giving approval. One might lose face or cause others to lose face if these conditions are not fulfilled (see Ho, 1976, Hu, 1944, Tracy, 1990). In brief, 'face' has something to do with one's self-respect, self-esteem and how one and others react or respond to it.

To conclude, in order to maintain one's self respect and not to lose face, either lien or mien-tzū, one has to operate within the ethic of li by conforming to the values embraced by the society. This can be achieved by performing one's duties and responsibilities, showing respect to family and age (in relationship between parents-children, younger and older siblings, husband and wife etc.) and through observing the appropriate use of kinship terms. The Chinese concept of face is also found in the works of western scholars (e.g., Brown and Levinson, 1978, 1987, Goffman, 1963) who discuss 'face' in relation to politeness in conversational interaction.

9.1.2 Face and politeness theory in conversation
With regard to conversational interaction, Goffman (1963: 5) defines 'face' as "the positive social value a person effectively claims for himself by the line others assume he has taken during a particular contact. Face is an image of self delineated in terms of approved social attributes" not a specific identity but successful presentation of any identity expressed through "a pattern of verbal and nonverbal acts by which he expresses his view of the situation and through this his evaluation of the participants, especially himself". So face is a social phenomenon which comes into being when one person comes into the presence of others; it is created through the communicative moves of the interlocutors (Tracy, 1990: 210 ) who expect each other to show respect in social encounters. Face must be managed and maintained via face management or 'face-work' which are communications designed to create, support, and maintain interactional order between self serving individuals. Face-work is cooperative; face can only be given by others, and it is in everyone's best interest to maintain his/her face and that of others.
Brown and Levinson's Politeness Theory extends Goffman's notion of face to comprise two universal 'wants', a negative face and positive face. Brown and Levinson (1978, 1987) define face as "the public image every one wants to claim". Negative face is associated with autonomy, freedom from imposition while positive face is related to the connection with others. Both negative face and positive face are related to politeness strategy, negative politeness and positive politeness.

Negative Politeness is oriented to the recipient's negative face (desire for autonomy) by lessening the imposition a speaker makes on an interlocutor and/or providing options to the person concerned. In negative politeness strategies, inference is often required. The following are some examples of negative politeness strategies: "Will you shut the door?", "Can you shut the door?" (Literally the person requesting for the door to be closed in these examples is asking the addressee if they are desirous or capable of performing the intended act. If taken literally, no request has been made at all. However, these kinds of questions have become conventionalised in English where negative politeness strategies are more common than positive ones. In other languages, the literal translations of these English utterances might not be seen as a request at all.) Questions such as "Close the window if you can" and "Turn up the heat if you want" use hedges to reduce the level of the imposition and to avoid presumptions. A request framed along the lines of "I don't want to bother you, but could you give me a hand" communicates explicitly that one does not want to impose on the other. All the above examples illustrate how a speaker respects his interlocutor's desire for autonomy and his sentences are meant to lessen the imposition by politely providing the addressee with options. All are examples of negative politeness strategies.

Positive Politeness on the other hand is approach-based and no inference is required. It is a stake of a claim for some degree of familiarity with one's interlocutor. Language of intimacy can be employed to mark the positive politeness that is being conveyed. One way of using positive politeness strategies would be to claim common ground through the use of in-group markers such as familiar address terms (honey, luv, mate, pal, bud, etc.) and/or slang ("Lend me a couple of bucks, OK?"). Other ways would be to express similarity of interests by commenting on the other's appearance, belongings and so on ("Oh, I see you got a new haircut"), or to find agreement with one another at some level using non-controversial topics (e.g., the weather, sports, etc.), small talk and gossip, as well as token agreement (e.g., "Yes, but...."). One can hedge one's opinions (e.g., "I kinda think that abortion is wrong" vs. "Abortion is wrong") or
indicate awareness and concern for the hearer’s positive face wants explicitly (e.g., "I hope you don’t think me rude, but your tie is hideous"). People can also make promises that address the hearer’s positive face ("I’ll stop by next week"), etc.

To conclude, Brown and Levinson’s positive and negative politeness theory illustrates how a speaker expresses his wants and wishes in individual interaction by manipulating his language to save his face or to manage his face by showing politeness.

9.1.3 Politeness and Javanese speech levels

According to Poedjosoedarmo (1968: 54), politeness within the Javanese culture involves

“showing the proper degree of respect to those who are of high rank and using the proper degree of formality in addressing those of an older generation and those with whom one is not on intimate terms. It is expressed by the Javanese in their gestures as well as through their speech. A complicated etiquette dictates the way a person sits, stands, directs his eyes, holds his hands, points, greets people, laughs, walks, dresses, and so on. There is a close association between the rigor with which the etiquette of movement is observed and the degree of refinement in speech. The more polite a person’s language, the more elaborate are his other behavioural patterns; the more informal his speech, the more relaxed and simplified his gestures”.

Thus, in Javanese, speech levels are used to show the degree of formality and the degree of respect felt by the speaker towards his addressee. The greater the degree of respect and formality in an utterance, the greater is the politeness shown (Poedjosoedarmo, 1968: 56-57).

Speech levels are not social dialects used by people of social class. Every speaker of Javanese regardless of his social status or geographical origin is expected to employ all of the speech levels by choosing a certain level appropriate for the person he is addressing, although not all Javanese speakers have full control over all these speech levels. As discussed in chapter five, the differences between speech levels are expressed mainly through lexical, morphological, and phonological means.

Poedjosoedarmo explains further politeness in Javanese is expressed in many ways, such as intonation, indirect phrasing, choice of personal pronouns (like in French vous rather than tu), using certain particles such as mangga ‘please’ or nuwun or nyuwun (lit. ‘ask’) to be added to words like inggeh ‘yes’. These particles are used to make the request or expression more polite. Politeness is also expressed through two distinctive speaking tones, alus ‘polite’ which is slower, softer, more tender and monotonous and kasar ‘crude’ which involves loud, rough, rapid and with greater extremes in intonation.
The degree of politeness is also expressed through the choice of first and second personal pronouns which abound in Javanese. The choice of personal pronouns is also closely associated with terms of address which might indicate the person of high or low ranking of an interlocutor, Kang (brother) is used for lower ranking people, while Mas (also literally ‘brother’) is used for higher ranking persons. Titles of nobility, profession, and academic achievement are also used by many people to express respect. Besides all these linguistic devices, the Javanese (and also in other languages such as Balinese, Sasak, Madurese and Sundanese) use a complex system of speech levels to express various degrees of politeness.

As mentioned in chapter 5 (see §5.1.1.2.2.1), basically there are three major speech levels in Javanese: Krama, Madya and Ngókó. Krama is used to show a high level of politeness and formality, and Krama words are used in addressing someone toward whom the speaker must be distant and formal. Madya (lit. middle) is used to show a moderate level of politeness so it is semi-polite and semi-formal. Madya words are used when addressing a person toward whom one must express a formality of intermediate degree, such as a neighbour who is not a close friend or sometimes a relative of an older generation. Ngókó is used to show a low level of politeness so it is informal. Ngókó vocabulary is used only in addressing someone with whom the speaker is very close and familiar. Ngókó words alone do not express any respect. Ngókó words exist for all concepts, while the other vocabulary types (Krama and Madya) have a smaller lexical inventory and accordingly are more restricted in scope (Poedjosoedarmo, 1968:57, 1979). ‘Ngókó’ is usually the ‘basic’ language one thinks in, speaks to intimates and inferiors, and loses one’s temper in. On the other hand, Krama and Madya are spoken to those with whom one feels reserved, whose sensibilities one is fearful of offending, whom one does not know well, or whom one feels to be worthy of respect and of higher status (Errington, 1988). Wolff and Poedjosoedarmo (1982) report that in ‘Madya’ there are ‘innumerable varieties of Medium on a continuum between ‘Low’ and ‘High’’. Usually the Javanese features borrowed by other languages, such as Peranakan Malay or Chinese Malay/Indonesian are elements of ‘Ngókó’—the lowest (basic) code in Javanese speech levels.

2 Each of these levels can be further broken down into three sub-levels which altogether make up nine speech levels (see Poedjosoedarmo, 1968).
As described in chapter five, factors that help to determine the choice of a particular level include the relative ages of speaker and addressee, to what degree speaker and addressee are acquainted, and the relative generations of speaker and addressee within a family (Poedjosoedarmo, 1982: 131). So, in Javanese “it is nearly impossible to say anything without indicating the social relationship between the speaker and the listener in terms of status and familiarity” (Geertz, 1960: 248-253). For these reasons, among Javanese speakers, making the correct choice of speech level in conversations and using appropriate behavioural styles is a normal, accepted and expected practice in social relations and interactions, whether intra-ethnic or with non Javanese (Errington, 1988, Poedjosoedarmo, 1982, Wolfowitz, 1991).

In short, among the Javanese, formality in interpersonal interaction is manifested through the choice of different speech levels, *Krama, Madya* or *Ngókó* which signify high, mid, and low levels respectively. The formality is determined by the relative status, relative age, relative relationship and, within families, the relative generations that exist between the interlocutors.

### 9.1.4 Similarities between Chinese and Javanese cultures

Comparing the social value systems embraced by those of ethnic Chinese (either *peranakan* or *totok*) and Javanese living in Java, Hariyono (1993: 53-55) is of the opinion that there are significant similarities between the two of them especially their values of peaceful harmony, respect and solidarity. In terms of the principle of peaceful harmony, both cultures always try to avoid interpersonal or social conflicts, whereas regarding the principle of respect and solidarity both societies value these principles but with slightly different perspectives as described below.

In Javanese society, respect is gained through social hierarchy, status and position in the society in which the inferior respects the superior in higher ranks and expresses it with the proper degree of formality. This degree of formality is shown through behaviour and gestures, as well as through speech. Using both verbal and non-verbal acts to indicate politeness is similar to Goffman’s ideas of how ‘face’ as a self-image is maintained or expressed. As stated earlier “the more polite a person's language, the more elaborate are his other behavioural patterns; the more informal his speech, the

---

3 Status constitutes wealth, descent, education, occupation, age, kinship, and nationality, among others, but more importantly the choice of linguistic forms and speech styles are partly determined by the familiarity (relative status) between the speakers (Geertz 1960:248).
more relaxed and simplified his gestures”. In other words, degrees of politeness are expressed through the use of different levels of speech in interpersonal interactions. Relating Javanese speech levels to the notion of face (Goffman, 1967) and the politeness strategy (Brown and Levinson, 1978, 1987), speech levels in Javanese operate as a politeness strategy in interpersonal interactions in order to show respect and also to protect the face of both speakers and the addressees.

In Chinese society, on the other hand, respect is due mainly to age and kinship relations. Thus, respect is displayed by the younger party to the older one: children to parents, younger brother to the older brother, younger friend to older one, etc. as is embodied by the concept of ‘Li’ above. This ethic of politeness is adhered to by performing one’s duties and responsibilities in order to preserve and maintain one’s face and that of others too. The expression of politeness is shown through filial piety, behaviour and using proper terms of address and kinship terms within the family. Unlike Javanese, the Chinese language has no such thing as elaborate speech levels to express politeness. Yet, some scholars (Kartawinata, 1990, Oetomo, 1987b, Wolff and Poedjosoedarmo, 1982) have reported that among the ethnic Chinese peranakan in Java, there is a practice of using different languages or language varieties to perform functions similar to those of speech levels in Javanese. It seems that among the ethnic Chinese in Java, there is a blend of Chinese and Javanese culture as reflected among other things in their use of speech levels in their interactions.

9.1.5 Ethnic Chinese speech levels in Java

Wolff & Poedjosoedarmo (1982) write that peranakan speech in Central Java consists of Ngóko Javanese and Indonesian as the low level (basilect) and the high level (acrolect) respectively. They further state that the speech levels used by peranakan speakers in Central Java have no special medium (mesolectal) forms, but only a continuum between the low and high ones. However, unlike native Javanese speech, in peranakan speech there seems to be “no restrictions of occurrence”, in the sense that the highest level may contain words or forms from the lowest level and vice versa”. In Javanese speech, on the other hand, the lexical items which belong to Krama (high) level must not be used in the Ngóko (lowest) level and vice versa.

The peranakan speakers of East Java, like those of Central Java, also live among Javanese speakers. Kartawinata (1990: 343) wrote that the peranakan in Surabaya, East
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Java, use Indonesian as a high language and the peranakan dialect and Ngókó Javanese as their low languages. According to Kartawinata, this portrays a diglossic situation taking place in formal communication between peranakan Chinese and other ethnic groups. Reporting on peranakan speech in Pasuruan, East Java, Oetomo (1987b:72) states a similar view

“the Chinese do use speech levels albeit in a different way from that used by Javanese. Where among the Javanese the levels are part of the same language, among the Chinese it is the use of Malay/Indonesian forms that indicates a more polite speech variant or a higher level, so to speak”.

So there is a continuum of formality ranging from more informal forms to more formal ones which are characterised by the use of more Indonesian.

“For upper class Peranakan, the use of Javanese grammatical affixes and function words as well as a few roots from Javanese indicates low level, non-polite speech. For the Totok and lower-class Peranakan, this level is manifested by the use of mostly Javanese forms with a very few Malay/Indonesian forms.”

I observe that both peranakan and totok speakers nowadays use CMI as the high level in intra-group communications and use Indonesian in inter-group communications to show respect, distance etc. to their interlocutors. They may use Javanese in intra-group interactions to show solidarity and close relationship. Influenced by their surroundings and due to the similarities in their social values, especially with regard to peaceful harmony, respect and solidarity, the ethnic Chinese in Java implement the Chinese concept of face lien and mien-tzü and the ethic concept of li ‘politeness’ in their interpersonal communications through the use of something like Javanese speech levels. They use speech levels to show respect and to protect others’ face as well as their own self-esteem. However, since the ethnic Chinese usually only master the basic Ngókó level of Javanese, they create their own higher speech levels by using different codes, each of which is perceived as being of a different level. One’s choice of a particular level (high, mid and low) is determined by the interlocutors’ social status, relative ages, the nature of their relationship etc. Within families it is usually the generational differences between interlocutors which therefore motivates and triggers the necessity to show respect for older generations and people of higher status.

So, it seems the Chinese notion of face lien and mien-tzü and politeness li are the motivational factors driving a variety of different language behaviours. Combined with the Javanese concept of respect, politeness and solidarity, the realization of this notion of face is manifested through the choosing of different codes from the subjects’
language repertoires. These codes operate like Javanese speech levels, namely to function as Krama, Madya and Ngókó respectively or in many cases simply with two levels: Krama (acrolect or high level) and Ngókó (basilect or low level).

Due to its status as the national language, and its function as the language of education, standard Indonesian is considered more prestigious than any other host code. Indonesian earns the position of the high and formal code and has similar characteristics to Krama in Javanese. It is used to speak to the elderly and to people of high rank status etc. Among less educated speakers, even employing its colloquial varieties is regarded as more ‘formal’ than employing Ngókó Javanese, especially in interpersonal relationships involving a much older person. Politeness observed does not lie so much in the formation or structure of the sentences of one language as found in the examples of positive and negative politeness described in Brown and Levinson above, but more in the status and prestige of the code chosen and how the codes are perceived by society and by the speakers in particular in relation to the intended addressees.

Complementing the code choice behaviour of the subjects of this study as discussed in the previous two chapters, it seems clear that a similar phenomenon of speech level practice is in operation in the speech of totok Chinese.

9.2 Formality and speech levels in the family domain

The following tables illustrate the subjects’ code choice behaviour with different family members of various ages and statuses in the family. As discussed in §7.2.2.1.7, age differences and role relations (family membership) in the family are some of the social factors behind people's code choice behaviour. The greater the age distance between the interlocutors, the more formal and distant the conversation will be.

Code alignment reflects degrees of politeness between a particular S-I pair. As discussed in chapter five, Standard Indonesian is considered as a high and prestigious code. As EJI is closer to Standard Indonesian than CMI is, EJI is considered as having higher status than CMI. Similarly, as a Malay variety having Indonesian lexical items, CMI is perceived by the subjects as higher in status than Javanese. (Octomo 1984, 1987b says the same sort of thing about peranakan speech). Hence, choosing one of these codes signals degrees of formality between a pair of S-I (polite/formal, semi polite/semi-formal or the least polite/formal). In addition to speech behaviour (code choice patterns and intonation), the formality and degrees of respect between
interlocutors are also observable through their behaviour and attitude towards each other.

The following tables 9.1 and 9.2 are converted from the subjects’ code choice patterns, in chapter seven, which as mentioned, also imply their language attitude and behaviour towards their interlocutors. They are also constructed based on the criteria of Javanese speech levels discussed in section 9.1.3 and Chinese formality and politeness found in section 9.1.1. To differentiate the codes at an interactional level from those at the societal level, the codes in these tables are identified with small caps as high (acrolectal level), mid (mesolectal level) and low (basilectal level).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code and name of Subject</th>
<th>Speech levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>high (s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandpa/Kong 1MCT-P</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                         |              | in or *Mandar /
|                         |              | CMI          |
| Mimi 2FCT-Pa            | *Mandar & CMI| CMI          | CMI          |
| Titi 2FCT-Pb            | *Mandar & CMI| CMI          | CMI, Javanese|
| Indah 2FAT-Pd           | CMI          | CMI          | CMI          |
| Jade 2FCT-Pe            | EJI          | CMI          | CMI, Javanese|
| Denny 3MCT-Pc           | EJI          | CMI          | CMI          |
| Cindy 3FCT-Pb           | EJI          | CMI          | CMI          |
| Amanda 3FCT-Pd          | EJI          | CMI          | CMI          |

Table 9.1 shows that for some subjects there is no special medium level code. For these individuals (Denny, Cindy and Amanda), the codes used for medium (mesolectal) and low (basilectal) levels are the same. This situation is similar to that found among the peranakan speakers studied by Oetomo (1987b) and Wolff and Poedjosoedarmo (1982) in which the speakers only have high and low varieties. All subjects in the table have CMI as their mid code.

Mimi and Titi have a mixture of Mandarin and CMI and CMI as the codes they use with Kong, so it is their high code. CMI serves as their mid and low code to be used with other family members4. Titi also has Javanese as her low code. She uses it with her younger sibling and cousin, Jade, and also with her domestic at home (see §7 extract 9).

4 See §7 Table 7.1 for patterns of unmarked code choice in family A.
Indah is the only member who only has one code for all levels. Jade, on the other hand, has a different code in each level: EJI as high, CMI as mid, CMI mixed with Javanese as her low code. She uses EJI to speak to Kong, CMI to her sister-in-law, and CMI and Javanese to her cousins and younger family members (see §7 extract 14, §8 extract 19).

For other family members, especially the 1970-1980s age cohorts like Denny, Cindy and Amanda, EJI serves as the high code as shown in the interactions between Kong and Denny (see §7 extract 3) or Kong and Amanda (see §7 extract 1). Both Denny and Amanda use EJI to speak to Kong and employ CMI between themselves (see §7 extract 2). Cindy, Denny and Amanda also employ CMI to their aunts, Titi and Mimi (see §8 extracts 12, 18 and examples in appendix 5). For this age cohort, EJI is the high code, while CMI can be used as either mid or low code. No high code is entered into the table for Kong, since I do not observe any high formality displayed by Kong to his other family members. (Given his role as the patriarch of the family, this is not surprising). Although no high code would be felicitously used with any of the younger family members, I have observed him using Mandarin and/or Fookchow as a high code to greet acquaintances he met in his organizations. However, that practice is outside the family domain. Thus, for Kong's high code in the family domain, I leave the box blank.

In short, a mixture of Mandarin and CMI serves as a high code for some subjects (the 1920s and 1940s age cohorts), while for others the high code is either EJI or CMI. For most subjects CMI also serves as a mid code and a low code, while for Jade and Titi, Javanese and CMI serve as low codes.

What takes place in family B is similar but with more codes involved. This makes the situation more complicated. The following table illustrates the continuum of speech levels found in family B.
Table 9.2: The codes functioning as speech levels in family B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code and name of Subject</th>
<th>Speech levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>high (s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandma/Bobo 1FCT</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filip 2MATa</td>
<td>Hakka, CMI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa 2FCTa</td>
<td>EJI, CMI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon 2MATb</td>
<td>Hakka, EJI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ani 2FCTb</td>
<td>EJI, CMI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tania 3FCTa</td>
<td>EJI, CMI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom 3MATa</td>
<td>EJI, CMI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenny 3FCTb</td>
<td>EJI, CMI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gugun 3MCt</td>
<td>EJI, CMI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rina 4FCTa</td>
<td>EJI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
- the asterisk indicates that the codes are used interchangeably (mixed)

As Kong is the patriarch of family A, Bobo is the matriarch of family B and in some ways their linguistic behaviour is similar. I do not observe any high formality displayed by Bobo/Grandma to her other family members, except for her choice of Hakka, which she usually reserves to speak to her sons-in-law, Filip and Jon (see e.g. §8 extract 15). Thus, for both men, Hakka in addition to EJI, are the codes used to speak to Bobo. These codes are their high codes. For Filip, CMI serves as his mid code which he uses with his son-in-law, while a mixture of Hakka, CMI and Javanese or just Javanese are the codes he uses to speak to his wife and daughters. These codes are his low codes. As for Jon, he uses a mixture of Hakka, and Mandarin with his in-laws, Filip and Lisa, and CMI with his nephew-in-law. A mixture of CMI and Javanese serves as Jon’s low code.

EJI and CMI serve as the high code for Lisa, Ani and all family members, except for Jon and Filip and Rina. A mixture of Javanese and Hakka serves as low codes for Ani, Grandma and Filip. CMI mixed with Javanese is found as a mid code in Tania’s and Jenny’s repertoires, while Javanese serves as their low (basilectal) code. Tom uses different varieties of Malay to serve as different speech levels. As for Gugun,

---

5 See table 7.2 for detailed reference of family B’s patterns of unmarked code choice.
CMI serves as his mid code and Javanese as his low code. For Rina from G4, there is only one code in her repertoire, namely EJI. Thus, it serves at all speech levels for her.

It can be concluded then that Hakka and EJI are the high codes for some subjects in family B. CMI can serve as high for G2 and mid (mesolectal) code for G3, while Ngökó Javanese is the basilectal code showing solidarity and intimacy for almost all of the subjects except Tom and Rina. A mixture of Hakka and Ngökó Javanese serves in mesolectal and basilectal level and occurs in the communication between siblings, spouses and mother-daughter pairings.

For all subjects from both families, except for the youngest members of the 1970s to 1990s age cohorts, Ngökó Javanese serves as one of the low level codes, EJM and CMI are used together with Ngökó Javanese at the mesolectal or basilectal level. EJI, Mandarin and Hakka, on the other hand, serve at the high level. For the elder generations, Mandarin is the high code in family interaction. For the younger generations who attended Indonesian schools EJI serves as a high code and CMI as a low code in the family domain. It can be inferred here that CMI, being a Malay variety, is considered more polite than Ngökó Javanese.

In terms of the codes found in each individual set of speech levels, there is a considerable variety ranging from the migrant codes to host codes. For example, the age cohorts before the 1950s have both migrant and host codes in their speech levels and most of them have more than one code in each level. Mandarin is one of the high codes of the 1940s age cohorts while Hakka is for the 1930s age cohorts. Mandarin is the language of education for the 1930s and 1940s age cohorts, thus, it is indexed with formality and all that education/school entails. Similarly, Hakka is the family language associated with the patriarch or matriarch of the family who denotes ‘respect’. For these reasons, these codes earn for themselves the position as high code. The 1950s age cohorts and thereafter, on the other hand, seem to have a set of Malay varieties in their speech levels. For them the range of codes lies in a continuum of Javanese, CMI, EJM, and EJI just as what Octomo (1987b) reported among the Peranakan who have Javanese and Malay varieties. The subjects’ perceptions of the codes, along with societal

---

6 At Rina’s age, she has not reached the stage of language acquisition where anyone would expect her to have full command over sociolinguistic nuances such as speech levels and their appropriate use.

7 As explained in chapter 5, CMI is considered as ‘taboo’ for public use which places a higher value on EJI, while Ngökó Javanese, even though it is a code used in public, is considered as inappropriate to be spoken to elderly speakers like Bobo/Grandma or Kong/Grandpa.
perceptions and the typical sources for elements of each code’s vocabulary help to place all of these codes along a continuum. EJI as the code closest to Standard Indonesian is chosen as their high code while CMI and/or Javanese are chosen as their low code.

Since each age cohort or even different individual has different codes in their repertoire and different levels of language proficiency in the codes they speak, some subjects might not have significantly sufficient proficiency to apply the variation of formality in terms of forms of address and choice of lexicon within the same code. Moeliono et al (1993: 12) reported something similar in their study of the use of Indonesian by politicians and other prominent figures who went through Indonesian independence. Not all of those born between late the 1920s and late 1940s got the chance to master enough speech styles taught at schools. Some of the subjects of this study were part of the same age cohorts and hence went through similar experiences. Therefore, for most subjects the level of formality is manifested in the different code choices which the subjects admit as most proper and appropriate to particular addressees, especially when the youngest speak to the oldest generation (from G3 to G1).

Comparing the degrees of formality between interlocutors from different generations, the codes employed by G3 to address G1 are classified as high. These include the codes used by Tania (G3) to speak to Grandma, what Denny (G3) chooses to speak to Grandpa, what the sons-in-law speak to their mother-in-law (Jon/Filip to Grandma), and what a daughter-in-law speaks to her father-in-law (Indah to Grandpa). Where there is less formality than in the situations described above, semi formal and semi polite, mid level codes are used. Instances of this are seen in the interactions between aunts/uncles and nieces/nephews. This includes the interactions between Tania/ Gugun (G3) and Ani (G2), between Denny/ Amanda (G3) and Mimi/ Titi (G2), or between the older and younger siblings such as between Mimi and Jade (both G2), or between parents and children (G1 and G2).

It is revealed in tables 9.1 and 9.2 that there are also ‘innumerable varieties’ of medium (mid codes) on a continuum between ‘low’ and ‘high’ as was reported by Wolff and Poedjosoedarmo (1982) on peranakan speech. These varieties at the medium level might be varieties of the same or different languages. In most instances, however, the subjects are observed to have either high or low codes only. According to Poejosoedarmo’s (1968) classification, madya is usually used towards the older generation. In this study, from G3 or G4 perspectives, there are two older generations,
G1 and G2, and the data reveal the codes used by G3 towards G1 and G2 are different. Moreover, the observed behaviour and attitude accompanying the codes chosen to address those different generations are also different. Some members, though, display distinctive language behaviour towards their addressees indicating the codes they choose as high, mid and low, such as Tania who chooses EJI to speak to Bobo, CMI with Jon and Ani (her uncle and aunt), and Javanese with parents and siblings (except Gugun).

In summary the two tables above show that each subject has certain codes or a mixture of codes that function as high, mid, and low codes in their interactions in the family domain. The actual codes used to serve as different speech levels vary between cohorts. These speech levels are employed by the subjects as part of politeness strategies to show respect to the elderly family members, or intimacy to spouse, siblings etc. These different codes function in a very similar way to speech levels in Javanese with its high (krama), mid (madya) and low (ngoko) levels. While the notion of speech levels has been traditionally applied to varieties of the same language, it is clear from the subjects of this study that the notion can easily be extended to include different codes originating from different language groups. The complexity of the speech level system of multiple codes can be seen to be usually more complex amongst older speakers and to become simpler, with a fewer number of codes in the younger generation. However, the most complex of all is found among G2 and the transitional generations (of both families) who also have the most extensive language repertoire and complex code choice practices. Table 9.1 and 9.2 show that this generation has more than one code serving as high, mid or low code in the family domain. As will be discussed in the following section, the codes used as speech levels in the family domain are not necessarily the same as those used in other domains. Generally speaking, the concept of using codes as speech levels applies with respect to all the subjects' interactions in the society.

9.3 Speech levels in other domains

Tables (9.3 and 9.4) below list the codes used to serve at different speech levels for some of the subjects in a couple of other domains not so far discussed, namely work and friendship. The information comes from some additional data, which mostly are notes from participant observation, that was collected from Mimi (1940s cohort), and Tania (late 1950s cohort) for both the work and friendship domains and from Cindy (1970s-
1980s cohort) only for the friendship domain. Mimi and Tania are from the transitional generation who went to both Chinese and Indonesian schools while Cindy only went to Indonesian schools. Their interlocutors in the domains under discussion can come from all sorts of different language backgrounds.

In the work domain (see table 9.3 below), high codes are usually used in formal situations such as meetings, and some work-related interactions. Mid codes are used in semi-formal situations and low codes are used on more informal occasions. The same interlocutors may be addressed using different levels, depending on the occasion. I observed that in front of a client Mimi used EJI to speak to her colleague who comes from the same ethnic background, but when she was at lunch (and the client was not present) she used CMI with the same person. With colleagues who went to Chinese schools, Mimi used a mixture of Mandarin and EJI in their meetings and also outside the meeting room. With other colleagues from non-ethnic Chinese background Mimi used EJI both inside and outside the meeting rooms, while with her inferiors who are mostly from a Javanese background, she used EJI in formal situations and Ngókó Javanese in informal situations. As Mimi went to both Chinese and Indonesian schools, she seems to have at least two codes functioning as high codes. These are Indonesian and Mandarin and she chooses between them according to whom she is communicating with. Although in most meetings Indonesian is used, in other formal discussions with interlocutors who have similar backgrounds, Mandarin is thecode employed. Mandarin might also be the code employed to show politeness as well for fulfilling honorific functions for these colleagues, some of whom are older than Mimi.

Tania spoke SFI (Semi Formal Indonesian) and in other instances she used English with colleagues during a formal meeting with a big audience. As soon as they came out of the meeting, she used EJI with a non-Chinese colleague but CMI with a colleague of ethnic Chinese background with whom she has a close relationship. Yet, I observed that with another colleague of the same ethnic background, but with whom Tania has no close relationship, EJI is employed even outside the meeting room.

I notice that Tania’s and Mimi’s code choice practices are determined, among other things, by the ethnicity of their interlocutors. CMI and Mandarin are never employed to interlocutors from non-Chinese backgrounds. For the non-Chinese speakers they usually employ either EJI if it is formal or Ngókó Javanese if they have an informal relationship and they are found together in an informal situation. (see Oetomo 1987b for further discussion on language and ethnicity among the peranakan Chinese).
Thus, the code choice behaviour of both Tania and Mimi indexes the interlocutors’ ethnicity and, the existing formality between them, as well as the formality of the situation in which they find themselves.

**Table 9.3 Codes function as speech levels in the work domain of two subjects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code and name of Subject</th>
<th>Speech levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>high (s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mimi 2PCT-Pa</td>
<td>EJ, Mandarin,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tania 3PCTa</td>
<td>SFI, English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the domain of friendship as seen in table 9.4 below, Mimi uses Mandarin to some friends or acquaintances from a Chinese background who also went to Chinese school and German to friends and acquaintances who also have extensive experience of German or both codes to friends who speak both languages (see e.g. §8 extract 11). She speaks CMI to friends of ethnic Chinese background who do not speak Mandarin, whether they are of the same age or a younger generation (see §8 extract 27). She usually uses EJI to speak to acquaintances or friends of non-Chinese background in both formal and non-formal situations. She also uses EJI with elderly Chinese people. She sometimes uses Ngökó Javanese with close friends of both ethnic Chinese background and Javanese background. The high, mid and low levels are determined by the formality displayed in these subjects’ behaviour towards the addressees which is usually due to ethnicity, age differences, status and the familiarity of their friendship.

Tania uses EJI with a friend from a different ethnic background (non-ethnic Chinese) in both formal and informal situations. With some *peranakan* friends, Tania employs CMI, while CMI and Javanese are used with her friends from both *totok* and *peranakan* background with whom she is very close.

For Cindy, one of the codes she uses with her acquaintances is Jakarta Indonesian which is described earlier as a ‘prestigious’ code among the youth in Jakarta and also in Surabaya. She also uses CMI with friends of ethnic Chinese background. Cindy uses Ngökó Javanese to both ethnic Chinese and non-ethnic Chinese with whom she has a close relationship and solidarity is shared.
Table 9.4 Codes function as speech levels in the friendship domain of three subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code and name of Subject</th>
<th>Speech levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>high code(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mimi 2FC-T-Pa</td>
<td>EJI, Mandarin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tania 3FC- Fa</td>
<td>EJI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cindy 3FC-T-Pa</td>
<td>EJI, JI, CMI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
- CMI and Mandarin appear together and are used interchangeably in Mimi’s sentences.

To summarize, CMI and/or Javanese are found as low codes in both domains, while various codes such as EJI, SFI, Mandarin and English are found as high codes. The mid codes vary from EJI, JI, CMI, German and a mixture of CMI & Mandarin. EJI is used as a mid code in the friendship domain by Mimi, Tania and Cindy. Similar to the conclusion drawn on table 9.3, code choice in the friendship domain is determined, among others, by the interlocutor’s ethnicity and the code chosen is to denote the level of formality between S-I. Javanese is used to signal a close and minimally formal relationship between S-I. Hence, it is a low code.

9.4 Multiple sets of speech levels

Based on the examples just given, it is apparent that the subjects have slightly different codes functioning as high, mid and low in different domains, at least to some extent. Those who had different codes as languages of instruction are privileged to have different codes functioning as high codes albeit dependent on the domains and interlocutors. For example, Mimi uses a mixture of Mandarin and CMI as a high code in the home domain but a mixture of Mandarin and EJI or just EJI as the high code in the work and friendship domains. Mimi’s low code in the family domain is CMI while in the friendship and work domains her low codes are CMI and Javanese. Tania, on the other hand, has English and SFI as her high codes in the work domain. She uses CMI and Javanese as her low code at work and in friendship but solely Javanese at home. As for Cindy she uses EJI, JI, CMI and Javanese within the friendship domain but only EJI and CMI in the home domain. In both domains her high code is EJI.

I think that similar behaviour is probably found among other subjects too. Each age cohort or possibly each individual of the older generation has a slightly different
continuum of codes from different origins which function as their sets of speech levels in each domain. These codes operate as different speech levels depending on their interlocutors. In other words, what this study shows is that while general principles emerge, each family set-up will engender special/unique choices dependent on the background and ethnicity of the interlocutors. This is especially obvious for the older generations who still speak migrant codes and have more than one code as their high code in their set of speech levels, while the younger ones have only Indonesian or one of its varieties as their high code, and varieties of Malay or Javanese as the low code. Oetomo (1987b) also reported a continuum of Malay/Indonesian mixed with Javanese that served as different speech levels for those in his study. It could be clearly argued that the two families in my study serve as a microcosm of the larger community in which they live, especially given the parallels found with the subjects of other studies.

It can be concluded that some subjects have more than one code functioning as their high code and also their low code depending on their language background experience. Those having extensive language experience usually have more than one set of codes as different speech levels. These different codes functioning as different speech levels have an analogue in the speech levels of Javanese from whom the system is modelled. Much the same purpose is fulfilled by the different codes used by these subjects.

The following section discusses the polyglossic and multilingual situation where the subjects live.

9.5 The polyglossic and multilingual situation

As already discussed in chapter two, Ferguson’s (1959) concept of diglossia refers to a situation where ‘two varieties of language exist side by side throughout the community’ while bilingualism (Fishman, 1967) usually refers to an individual’s ability to speak two languages. Later Fishman (1971) extended this concept of diglossia to include not only the standard and vernacular varieties of a language or two different languages but also ‘functionally differentiated language varieties of whatever kind’. He redefined diglossia as ‘a characterization of the social allocation of functions to different languages and varieties’ and bilingualism as ‘essentially a characterization of individual linguistic versatility’ and points out that in a number of speech communities there exists both diglossia and bilingualism. Platt (1976a, 1977, 1977b) extends this idea and postulates that there can be polyglossia with multilingualism and presents the examples of English-
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educated Singaporeans and Malaysians as coming from polyglossic societies with multilingual speakers who choose different codes for different situations.

High (H) variety according to Ferguson (1959, 1972) is a ‘superposed variety’ which means that ‘the variety is not the speakers’ primary, ‘native’ variety but may be learned in addition to it. Thus, High varieties are acquired later than the Low (L) varieties. In terms of their uses, H variety is usually used in the fields of education, religion, law courts, mass media, administration, government etc. while Low varieties are usually used at home, among friends, during daily activities etc. Mid (M) varieties according to Platt (1976a:118) are those codes spoken by educated speakers in school, in business, in the higher sub-domains of the transaction domain such as in department stores etc.

As the subjects of this study come from different age cohorts ranging from the 1910s to the 1990s, they could be seen as displaying a microcosmic portrait of the polyglossic state of their speech communities. Although the present subjects may have some differences in language and educational background from others of totok descent in Surabaya, enough commonalities exist that we may be comfortable in seeing them as at least representative in some respects. Considering the subjects’ multilinguality and their use of different codes in different domains, the societal situation the subjects are in is similar to the polyglossic situations described by Platt and mentioned above. The codes they employ in different domains offer a glimpse of the various polyglossic situations in their society which vary across age cohorts.

In this study, I adapt the criteria proposed by Platt and Ferguson in the following way. I interpret the domain of workplace (office) as part of ‘administration’, thus belonging to the superposed or High variety. I interpret the language of the ‘schoolgrounds’ as belonging to the Mid variety, since even though the codes are spoken by friends during recess, they belong to the educated speakers’ interaction. Those codes used in the domains of neighbourhood, workplace (non-office), and organizations are also Mid varieties. The codes used in interactions at the traditional marketplace, and business deals in retail shops belong to the Low varieties. On the other hand, the codes used in department stores belong to the Mid variety, which is usually EJI. As for the language of education in particular, I include all the codes found in the subjects’ schooling from primary to tertiary level including foreign codes when these have been used.
Employing the criteria and model for polyglossia with multilingualism proposed by Platt (1977: 367) as introduced in chapter two, I classify the codes found in the language repertoire of each age cohort in this study into High, Mid and Low codes. The table below shows that the H-L codes are found among different age cohorts. With regard to the codes used in education, the codes in the High box are listed according to the order in which they are learned by the subjects.

Table 9.5 Continuum of H-L codes of different age cohorts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age cohorts</th>
<th>High code(s)</th>
<th>Mid code(s)</th>
<th>Low code(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H1, H2, H3, ..., Hn</td>
<td>M1, M2, M3, ..., Mn</td>
<td>L1, L2, L3, ..., Ln</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910s</td>
<td>Hakka, Indonesian</td>
<td>EJM'I, JI, Ngókó Javanese, Hakka</td>
<td>EJM'I, JI, Ngókó Javanese, Mandarin, Hakka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920s</td>
<td>Foochow, Mandarin, EJM'I</td>
<td>EJM'I, Mandarin, Foochow</td>
<td>EJM'I, Mandarin, Hokkien, Foochow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930s</td>
<td>Mandarin, Indonesian, Hakka</td>
<td>EJM, EJI, Ngókó Javanese, Madurese, Mandarin, Hakka</td>
<td>EJM, EJI, Ngókó Javanese, Madurese, Mandarin, Hakka, CMI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940s (in transition)</td>
<td>Mandarin, Indonesian, (German), EJI</td>
<td>EJI, Ngókó Javanese, Mandarin, (German, English), CMI</td>
<td>EJI, Ngókó Javanese, Mandarin, Foochow, CMI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early 1950s</td>
<td>Mandarin, SI, EJI</td>
<td>EJI, Javanese, CMI</td>
<td>EJI, Javanese, Mandarin, CMI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late 1950s</td>
<td>SI, English, EJI</td>
<td>EJI, Javanese, CMI</td>
<td>CMI, SI, Javanese, Mandarin, English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late 1950s (in transition)</td>
<td>Mandarin, (English), EJI</td>
<td>EJI, Javanese, CMI</td>
<td>EJI, Javanese, Hakka, Mandarin, CMI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early 1960s</td>
<td>SI, EJI</td>
<td>EJI, Javanese</td>
<td>EJI, Javanese, CMI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late 1970s-early 1980s</td>
<td>SI, (English and/or German), EJI</td>
<td>EJI</td>
<td>EJI, Javanese, CMI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early 1990s</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>EJI</td>
<td>EJI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9.5 above shows that different age cohorts have different codes in their continuum of H-L codes and that their High varieties in particular are determined by educational background. Regarding societal polyglossic codes, Platt (1980b) and Hurriez (1975) include one or more codes as High and one or more as Mid and Low codes. As seen above, there can be more than one code occupying each level. For those age cohorts having different codes as their language of instruction, either Mandarin and SI or SI and English may serve as high codes, while other codes serve as Mid and Low. For those who only attended Indonesian schools, an array of Malay varieties only is

---

8 The table is adapted from Platt's model for (1980a:69, 1977:367) polyglossia and multilingualism.
found in their continuum of H-L codes.  

I would suggest that at each level of the domains analysed here, the various codes listed are to be used with different interlocutors in accordance with the interlocutors' ethnic and language background. So there are sub-domains in each of these domains. For instance, migrant codes are used with ethnic Chinese who speak these codes. Mandarin is used with other tolok Chinese and those speaking the code, while Hakka and Foochow are found among family members and friends in their speech group community. The host codes are used with both ethnic Chinese and non-ethnic Chinese. For instance, EJI and Javanese are usually found in interactions with both ethnic Chinese and non-ethnic Chinese speakers, especially in public domains, while CMI is found among ethnic Chinese speakers but only in private domains. In this context, classic stable polyglossia is only found in certain age cohorts, namely the 1910s and 1920s and to some extent the 1930s and 1940s age cohorts. The rest of the age cohorts, on the other hand, show a different kind of polyglossia with host codes becoming more dominant as ancestral dialects have become more or less extinct for some speakers.

Based on this classification, across domains, each age cohort has a range of codes as High, Mid and Low codes and these appear as a continuum of codes. For those age cohorts having different languages in their schooling and living in different societies—the wider society in general and their own speech group community—there is more than one code serving as High, Mid and/or Low codes. Different H codes are associated with different languages of instruction, Indonesian, Mandarin, English or German. Different M and L codes are related to the different speech communities the individual subjects belong to, Hakka or Foochow. They also relate to the people of different ethnicity they interact with. These subjects choose between EJI, Javanese or CMI as Mid and Low codes. Similarly, Mandarin, Hakka and Foochow are found in

---

9 Although Standard Indonesian is the language of education for some subjects and is part of their H code, SI is not actively used in interactions in any domains as is reflected in their repertoire. This situation is similar to what Platt (1980a: 78) refers to as 'Dummy High' (DH) which he explains as "speech varieties of which some of the members have a certain knowledge, and which are given prestige ratings by the speakers and are even recognized by government authorities, media, or prestige groups within the speech community, but which are not in fact utilized extensively in any domain". In Platt's case the concept of 'DH' is applicable to Malay and Tamil in the speech repertoires of Singaporean Chinese. Among the subjects under study the concept of 'DH' is applicable to SI, the standard Indonesian which is only found at schools or in books and is very seldom found in any conversations in the data (neither the family domain nor other domains such as work and friendship). The closest variety to SI is found in the language domains of the 1990s age cohort.
domains associated with High, Mid and Low codes. The migrant codes (Hakka, Foochow and Mandarin in particular) are found as Low codes in the 1910s up to the late 1950s age cohorts (being some of the codes used in the family domain) but also as a Mid code for those in up to the 1940s cohort.

In brief, different age cohorts are all multilingual, and the codes they have at their disposal have different polyglossic functions depending on whether they are used in the wider society or just among the ethnic Chinese communities. Unlike the subjects of Platt’s studies in Singapore and Malaysia, in this study there is an overlap of the polyglossic functions of the codes at a societal level since one code can function as both a Mid and a Low variety in society.

In this context I move on to compare formality in the societal domain and in the family domain.

9.6 Formality in the societal domain vs the family domain

Ferguson’s and Platt’s classification of H, M, L codes discussed above are based on domains in society, whereas Javanese speech levels are especially used in the spoken interactions between different individuals of different relative status. Hence, they can operate as sub-domains within one domain.

Comparing the codes associated with public and private domains in the society and the codes used in the family domains by family members, it is seen that there are similarities in the classification of the functions/uses of H-L codes in society and n speech levels (high-low codes) which are based on individual interactions. Both are classified into three levels, high, mid and low codes but their functions and domains are different. One distinct similarity is that the polyglossic classification considers the codes used in public domains, such as school, religion and government, as having high formality, so these are considered as having high status and a prestigious role in society. Codes used in private domains such as in business and department stores are considered as less formal, and the least formality is found in domains such as the home, friendship, the traditional market place etc. In these domains the codes used are typically associated with low prestige, solidarity, familiarity or intimacy.

The difference between Ferguson’s (1959, 1972) and Platt’s (1976a, 1977, 1977b) classification with the subjects’ code choice behaviour is that none of the High codes
associated with education, religion, the mass media etc. are used in interpersonal interaction analogous to a high or Krama speech level. Instead, the codes found in the Mid and/or Low domains in society at large may be used as a high speech level in interpersonal interactions. In the same vein, a code considered as ‘low’ (such as CMI) or even one that has ‘no status at all’ (like Mandarin and Hakka) in society in general, might be used in the mesolectal or acrolectal level respectively in interpersonal interactions.

For example, as discussed in previous chapters, Denny and Amanda (who went to Indonesian schools) employ EJI, the colloquial variety of their language of education, SI, to speak to Kong, their grandfather, and they choose CMI to use among themselves and with their parents and aunts. For Denny, Amanda and Cindy, EJI is considered more prestigious and thus more polite than CMI. Thus, for Denny and Amanda, EJI, instead of SI which is their school language, serves as an acrolectal code within the family domain while CMI serves as both mesolectal and basilectal code in the same domain. In society in general, however, SI is considered more prestigious than EJI, while CMI as a ‘salad language’ is a low code or has no prestige at all. Another example is Titi’s use of Mandarin, her school language, with Kong, but mixed with CMI. She uses CMI with her siblings, daughter and nieces/nephews but Javanese with domestics and cousins of the same age. For Titi using Mandarin and CMI with Kong is more polite than using Ngókó Javanese. Hence, for Titi, her acrolectal code in the family domain is Mandarin and CMI, although both codes have no prestigious status in society in general. Her mesolectal code is CMI and her basilectal code is Javanese.

One more example is Jon’s code choice behaviour. According to the domain classification for Jon, Mandarin as his language of education might serve as his High code. However, together with EJI, Jon considers Hakka as the codes having high and prestigious status appropriate for his interaction with certain people or family members worthy of respect. So, in his interpersonal interaction in the family domain Jon employs Hakka and also EJI, not SI. Hakka is the language he employs to talk to Grandma. Hakka is the code preferred by his in-laws, so he uses Hakka as the high code in interpersonal interaction with his brother and sister-in-law. Mandarin, is also one of the codes he uses with his in-laws. As with other subjects such as Mimi and Titi, for Jon the use of migrant codes is usually confined to limited circles of friends and acquaintances. Thus, a speaker’s high level for other family members might not be the code used in
society at large as a High code, or the language of education as High codes as delineated by Ferguson.

The examples above illustrate that varieties of a High code in the societal domain can be used to serve as a high speech level in interpersonal interactions. As seen in the examples, standard Indonesian is a High code at the societal level. Although it is not used in interpersonal interactions, its closest varieties (SFI or FJI) are used in formal situations to serve as the high speech level. Which variety is employed varies across generations.

Considering the status, role and prestige of the chosen code(s) as perceived by the subjects and/or the wider society, their code choice practices reflect or exhibit degrees of politeness or formality. The subjects employ certain codes associated with high formality to be applied to particular family members worthy of respect. The more a code is perceived as of higher status, the more probable is its use to show a high degree of politeness or formality in their speech level, thus indicating an acrolect level in interpersonal interactions. However, on an interactional level, the code chosen to show a high degree of politeness is not necessarily the code seen as most prestigious across the whole of society. Judgements about this vary to some extent.

It seems that what matters is how the subjects or the society perceive the codes involved. This perception is then used as a basis for deciding whether the codes they choose will be high, mid and low in interpersonal interactions. In addition, the codes chosen that have closer association with the codes used in the public domain, such as education and religion, are considered as more prestigious than those found in private domains such as the market etc. However, the prestigious code(s) in the society are not always chosen to function as high (acrolectal) code(s) in the interpersonal interactions. Similar illustrations with the same rationale can be given for the code choices of other subjects in the family.

In short, in terms of the concept of formality there is a similarity between the societal domain and the family domain. However, in terms of the particular codes chosen as High, Mid and Low codes at the societal level and high, mid and low codes at an individual level, there can be important distinctions.
9.7 Conclusion

It can be concluded that the status, role and prestige of the codes which are reflected in their use in domains associated with H(igh), M(id) and L(ow) codes at a societal level might influence their being chosen as high, mid and low levels for interpersonal interactions within the family domain.

Comparing the codes the subjects use in family interactions, apparently each age cohort or possibly each individual has a slightly different continuum of codes functioning as their set of speech levels operating within the sub-domains of the family domain. This is especially obvious for the older generations. These older generations who still speak migrant codes have both migrant and host codes in their set of speech levels and there might be more than one code that can function at a particular level. The transitional generation has more than one set of codes functioning as their high, mid and low levels in different domains. The younger generations usually have one code in each level consisting of one code from Malay or Javanese varieties. However, unlike both Malay and Javanese speech levels which consist of the vocabulary operating within/from the same language, the continuum of formality employed by peranakan and the tokok subjects in this study consists of different sets of codes from various origins perceived as having prestigious or less prestigious status. Also, their application is not as vigorous, intricate and complex as that of Javanese in which each level has its own set of lexical items, affixes, different morphological patterns as well as different phonological structures.

All in all, it can be concluded that although there seems to be an overlap in the code choice behaviour of the subjects, the polyglossic functions of the codes are found between domains and operate at a societal level, while speech levels operate at the level of individual interaction within a particular domain. Thus, they are distinct. The relations between the societal and interpersonal levels illustrate that individual language behaviour reflects and is influenced by the societal linguistic phenomenon.

Regarding the Malay varieties used, there seems to be a phenomenon similar to what is referred to as leaking diglossia by Fasold (1984: 54) in which a creole variety co-exist with the standard language in a diglossic situation and the creole variety has substantially drawn its lexicon from the standard language. In this study, the standard language, standard Indonesian co-exists with its varieties: EJI and CMI; and these latter two derive their lexicon from standard Indonesian, especially the varieties spoken by the
young generations. It is reasonable to suggest that there might be a 'leaking polyglossia' among the subjects under study. However, considering that standard Indonesian has actually been (at least partially) developed from creole varieties and has drawn much of its vocabulary from creole Malay, this is a much more complex situation than that described by Fasold as leaking diglossia. There seems to be a kind of 'vocabulary laundering process' here in which the vocabulary from the Malay varieties is borrowed, assimilated and standardized. Later these creole varieties draw their vocabulary from this standard code which originally derived its lexicon from them.
Chapter 10

Summary and Conclusion

10.0 Summary

The aim of this study was to investigate the sociolinguistic behavioural patterns of two multilingual ethnic Chinese families from *totok* background who live in Surabaya, East Java. In particular, the study looked at intergenerational multilingual code choice practices of people with different educational experiences and different language backgrounds. It also examined intergenerational changes in linguistic repertoire and linguistic practice. The motivations behind the different subjects' code choice behaviour with particular family members in both dyadic and group interactions were analysed and discussed within the framework of the extended version of Myers-Scotton’s (1993b) Markedness Model.

10.1 The multi-competence of multilingual speakers in a multilingual environment

As was described in chapter 6, the first generation migrants of this study migrated from one multilingual situation to another multilingual situation, whereas most of the published studies on migrant language use discussed in §2.7.1 focus on situations where migrants coming from largely monolingual communities have migrated to other largely monolingual communities. To complicate the already complex situation, subjects from different age cohorts in this study went to schools with different languages of instruction as a result of changes in the educational policy in Indonesia.

Changes in educational policy, together with other changes that have taken place in the country, such as the government campaign to use good and proper Indonesian (*Bahasa Indonesia yang baik dan benar*) which was promulgated in 1974, the wider spread of mass media, the prohibition of the use of Mandarin in public, the discrimination against Chinese (as discussed in chapter 2), had indelible effects on the ethnic Chinese in Indonesia, especially with respect to the language behaviour of the *totok* Chinese. Most of the ethnic Chinese Indonesians from the *totok* community who
went to Chinese language schools are Mandarin speakers. These *totok* families generally maintained the active use of Mandarin and/or their ancestral dialects as their home languages for a period of time. However, since the closing of most Chinese schools in 1966 and the prohibition against using Chinese languages in public in 1967, competence in Mandarin among the ethnic Chinese has diminished rapidly. Post-1966 generations have all gone to Indonesian schools and begun to use Indonesian and/or varieties of Indonesian/Malay as their home language, too.

All of these historical facts have had their impact on the varieties of codes constituting each generation’s language repertoire. Although most age cohorts under study are multilingual, the variety of codes available to individual subjects differs from generation to generation, especially in informal domains such as friendship, home, and business transactions. The generation who went to both Chinese and Indonesian schools are mostly more competent than their immigrant parents in using Indonesian, but they are less competent than the following generation who only attended Indonesian schools and were brought up in a more ‘Indonesianized’ way. Mandarin competence declines markedly amongst younger members of the transitional generation (some of the 1950s cohort) and basically ceases to exist amongst those from the 1960s age cohorts. Some subjects have also learnt western codes such as English and German as part of their education.

All of the subjects are multilingual, but they have varying degrees of proficiency in different sets of languages, and their patterns of code choice reflect this diversity of abilities. The second generation—the sandwich generation, i.e., the 1930s and 1940s and especially those who went through the transitional period, the 1940s age cohort, has the richest repertoire of codes. They tend to be highly multilingual speakers and employ two or more languages as their mode of interaction in many domains. Together with the first generation (the immigrant generations) these subjects in both families apply code-switching as a code of its own as their conversational strategy in the family domain. Mimi is the most stable multilingual within the family, in the sense that the domains of using different languages in her repertoire are clearly defined and code-switching and code-mixing are mainly for peer group interactions as well as for interactions with the older generation. Their multilinguality, the term used in this study, has parallels with the bilingual/multilingual first born immigrant generations examined in other studies (Detaramani and Lock, 2003, Gupta and Siew, 1995, LiWei, 1994, Ng and He, 2004). In spite of their multilinguality, some of them (the 1930s age cohort) have no full native
competence in any of the codes from their repertoire. Instead they possess what Cook (1992, 1995, 1996) calls 'multi-competence'.

10.2 Multilingualism in transition

The intergenerational differences in the subjects’ language repertoires, language proficiency, and code choice practices signify a shift in the nature of the subjects’ multilingualism. The subjects’ code choice practices also reflect this transition. Different codes are chosen by different generations in the family interactions and they might use two or more codes together. However, there is a practice of using code-switching as a code of its own which is found among the 1910s, 1920s and especially 1930s, 1940s age cohorts and this involves the use of both migrant codes and host codes. For family A, the codes are Mandarin and CMI while for family B they are Hakka and Javanese. Among the 1950s and 1960s age cohorts, the practice of code-switching as a code of its own is not as intense. If they do code-switch they usually glide along a continuum of host codes, Javanese and Malay varieties. Among the 1970s, 1980s and 1990s age cohorts the practice of code-switching in the family domain has declined. These subjects usually choose one of the Malay varieties in their interaction. CMI predominates among the 1970s and 1980s cohorts and EJI dominates for the 1990s cohort. Some instances of code-switching among the 1970s and 1980s cohorts are conducted in CMI and EJI. The 1990s age cohort only speaks varieties of Indonesian so far. The first generation prefers some variety or varieties of Chinese, while younger generations prefer varieties of Malay. The second generation (the first Indonesian-born generation) have taken up both Chinese as well as Malay varieties as their codes of preference.

All the data discussed up until now illustrates the fact that at present there is an ongoing language shift and a transition in the state of multilingualism of different family members. There is also a move towards the use of more Indonesian in all aspects of life, which might signify ‘acculturation’.

In earlier Chinese Indonesian history, the descendants of Chinese immigrants were peranakanized by marriage. Today, however, Chinese Indonesians are peranakanized and Indonesianized by education. Together with the shifts in language repertoire and language proficiency, there has been a shift in language attitude and perceptions about ethnicity among the subjects. The younger generations identify themselves more with Indonesian. Similar to the observation by Oetomo (1988) on
peranakan, the older generation in this study uses different languages to signify different identities. The younger generations use the same language, Indonesian, as a language of literacy, a language of intimacy, and a language of the public domain. Thus, there is no longer a language to signify Chinese solidarity.

While Chinese dialects have declined in use and Indonesian has grown in use, there is also a growing uptake of western codes such as English and German by some of the younger subjects. Given current circumstances in Indonesia where many people, including those of the younger generations, have taken a new interest in learning Mandarin, it is possible that Mandarin may re-emerge as a 'foreign' code rather than a migrant code for some younger Indonesians.

10.3 Some observations on code-switching practices

It was found that some amendments needed to be made to Myers-Scotton's (1998c, 2000) Extended Markedness Model in order to properly deal with the conversational data gathered for this study. Myers-Scotton's first filter recognised language repertoire as an important opportunity set. It was necessary to develop a finer scaling conception of language proficiency rather than a simple binary choice between competence in a language and non-competence; for example, passive ability in a language would enable someone to speak to an interlocutor but would not enable that interlocutor to respond in the same language. Myers-Scotton's conception of the second filters, involving somatic markers and markedness evaluator also had to be modified and an appropriateness evaluator was also deemed necessary. Finally, Myers-Scotton's third rationality filter included the speaker's intentionality and social norms. It was considered important for this study to adopt a richer conception of social norms to include family norms as well. These family norms are manifested in a variety of ways including the subjects' unmarked choice patterns with other family members. These unmarked patterns of code choice are based not only on the frequency of occurrence in the data but also through interviews with the subjects and participant observation. The unmarked patterns then serve as a basis for further data analysis. With these amendments, Myers-Scotton's (Extended) Markedness Model worked well in analysing the complex multilingual data in this study. It helped determine the markedness of the subjects' code choice and unravel the motivations behind their code choice behaviour.

It can be observed that the subjects use their code choice and code switching behaviour in order to among others help preserve their relationships, to accommodate
others, to project their identities, to demonstrate their family membership and to present themselves well (as discussed in chapters 7 and 8). All the subjects seem to manipulate their multilinguality and manifest their ‘we-ness’ or identity as members of a multilingual family through the codes they choose in their interactions. In many previous studies of immigrants (e.g. Gupta and Siew, 1995, Ng and He, 2004) a phenomenon of disjuncture was noted whereby the intermediate generation bridges the gap between G1 and G3 who do not necessarily have common codes in their repertoires. In this study, however, the first generation members are mostly the ones accommodating the third or the fourth generation by using local codes.

It has emerged from this study that what is a ‘marked’ choice for one interlocutor can be an ‘unmarked’ choice for the other. This is in accordance with what Myers-Scotton (2002) found among her data corpus. The codes serving as marked or unmarked choices vary within age cohorts and/or generations and even among individuals. The markedness of the codes depends on the addressees and the nature of the relationship between speaker and interlocutor.

Another finding of this study is that many instances of code-switching do not necessarily entail the negotiation of a new RO set. Very often in a piece of dialogue in which many codes are used, each speaker turns out to be using his/her own unmarked code choice shared with his/her intended addressee in the dialogue. Code-switching is thus taking place without any negotiation of a new RO set. This is especially so among certain age cohorts in which code-switching serves as their mode of interaction. On the other hand, in many cases CMI is chosen by all participants to be used as a code throughout the interaction and there seems to be no code-switching taking place. Actually a new RO set can be negotiated without code-switching when CMI turns out not to be the shared unmarked code between a certain pair of speakers-interlocutors (e.g. the use of CMI among the 1930s age cohort).

10.4 Using codes as (multiple) speech levels

One of the most important findings of this study has been the way in which using multiple codes can be seen as functionally equivalent to the use of speech levels in a language like Javanese. As with linguistic repertoires more generally, there are also intergenerational differences in the codes employed to function as acrolect, mesolect and basilect in this system of speech levels. These codes that have polyglossic functions in society are found in the family domain to function as speech levels similar to that of
Javanese *krama* (acrolect), *madya* (mesolect) and Ngókó (basilect) levels. The codes or their varieties found in public domains such as schools, and government offices are being used as an acrolectal code in the subjects’ system of speech level. On the other hand, codes found in private domains such as friendship, and business transactions in the markets etc. are used as basilectal codes in individual interactions. Each subject has a set of codes that function as acrolect, mesolect and basilect, and which are used to index different degrees of formality with different speakers. These different codes function together in a similar way to speech levels in Javanese, i.e. they show politeness and respect.

As has been pointed out in many parts of this thesis, the subjects are multilingual with multicompetence, and often they have no full native competence in any of the codes in their repertoire. Such multilinguals seem to have made up their own system of ‘speech levels’ by making use of a selection of the different codes in their repertoire. Thus, some codes such as standard Indonesian and its colloquial varieties are considered to be more formal than CMI or Ngókó Javanese. Additional data on some subjects display that they have different sets of codes functioning as different speech levels in different domains (work and friendship). Hence, these subjects, who are usually from the second generation, utilise multiple sets of codes as their high, mid and low levels. They employ these different sets in different situations in accordance with their interlocutors’ language background and ethnicity. It can be inferred that other subjects, and especially those with extensive numbers of codes in their repertoire, might also be able to use multiple sets of codes as speech levels in different domains too. Among the younger generations who are less multilingual, one set of codes may serve for all domains.

### 10.5 A final caveat

This thesis has been a case study of two *totok* Chinese families from Surabaya, and it is still an open question about how many of the findings of this study can be generalised to the wider *totok* community in Indonesia. Further research involving larger numbers of *totok* people from across the archipelago is needed before we can be sure how much can be generalised.
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Appendices

Appendix 1

Key dates in the history of Chinese Indonesians

The anthropological and archaeological remnants discovered indicate that the first Chinese came to the archipelago some time before Christ (Hall, 1958).

1293: First record of Chinese people in Surabaya. In 1293 the Emperor Kublai Khan from the Yuan dynasty (1280-1367) sent his troops to Java to punish King Kertanegara from Singosari. The soldiers lost the battle and some settled around Surabaya.

14th century: Chinese were believed to have established first permanent settlements in the Indonesian archipelago (Skinner, 1958:1).

By 1411: Permanent Chinese settlements developed in Gresik and Surabaya.

1602: Arrival of Verenigde Oost-Indische Compagnie (VOC) or ‘Dutch East Indies Company’

1737: VOC founded a school for poor Chinese children only for it to be closed in 1740.

1740: Chinezenmord ‘the Chinese massacre’ took place in Batavia (October) (Engelfriet, 2000, Purcell, 1951)
1740: Closure of first VOC founded school for poor Chinese children.

1753: Chinese community began to establish schools for their own children, with Hokkien as language of instruction. (Mestoko et al., 1986, Suryadinata, 1972).


By late 19th century: Increase in Chinese female migration to Indonesia.

17 March 1901: Peranakan Chinese community in Batavia (now Jakarta) founded Tioung Hoa Hwee Koan ‘All Chinese Associations’. Later they founded schools with the same name. The language of instruction was classical Chinese.

1908: Dutch built first HCS Hollandsch-Chineesche Scholen Dutch-Chinese schools.

1914: MULO ‘Meer Uitgebreid Lager Onderwijs’ or ‘advanced primary education’ ‘Junior High School’ were founded.


By 1915: The basis for a stable totok community in all major cities in Java has been formed (Skinner, 1961:358).
1928: Important gathering of independence-seeking youth from across Dutch East Indies results in 'Youth Pledge Day' wherein the motto of 'Indonesian' language in slogan of “One Country: Indonesia. One nation: Indonesia. And One Language: Indonesian” was introduced.

1930s: Dutch Indies government stopped the influx of Chinese immigrants. The last arrivals were later known as *totok*.

**By the late 1930s:** Most THHK schools were run by *totok* and were catering mostly for *totok* children.

1942: Japanese invasion of Indonesia. All Dutch and Dutch-Chinese schools were closed (Skinner, 1958: 4).

**From 1942 to 1945:** The Japanese occupation. Many *peranakan* children attended the then already *totok*-operated Chinese-language schools (Skinner, 1963: 109). During this time, an Indonesian-oriented curriculum was introduced with some Japanese language taught.

**Early in 1945:** Japanese losing control in the war. Japanese occupiers encouraged Indonesian to be used as language of instruction at schools. So in 1940s: Indonesian began to be seriously and widely implemented in schools as well as in the administration (Lee, 1995: 23).

17 August 1945: Proclamation of Indonesian Independence.

10 November 1945: Battle broke out between the Surabayan youth and the English together with its allies (among others was Dutch).

27 December 1949: Transfer of Sovereignty from the Dutch West Indies to Indonesian government.

1950: New Indonesian educational system established throughout the archipelago.

1950s: The rise of anti Chinese feelings.


01 January 1955: Decreed that all Indonesian citizens must go to Indonesian schools (Liem, 1968: 211). Indonesian made a compulsory subject in these schools.

1957: Decree prohibiting Indonesian citizens from attending Chinese language schools

16 October 1958: All schools with Chinese as the medium of instruction, and all schools operated by countries having no diplomatic relationship with the Indonesian government, were closed down (Greif, 1991: xvii, Suryadinata, 1978: 149).

1965: The alleged coup d’etat of the Indonesian Communist Party in which Chinese Communist Party was allegedly involved. There was anti-Chinese violence and killings in the months after this ‘coup’.
1966: Closure of Chinese schools which marks the starting of Indonesian as the only language of instruction throughout Indonesia in all educational levels (with the exception of the first three years of primary which can use the regional languages), and the prohibition of using Mandarin and Chinese printed matter in public.


1967: Issue of the Presidential Decree known as Impres No. 14/1967 on Chinese religion, beliefs and tradition. This curbed all public expression or activities that were manifestations of Chinese cultural traditions.

1968: Students from Chinese-language schools were allowed to enter Indonesian language schools as long as they had a special study permit from the Indonesian Minister of Education and Culture (Heidues, 1988, Hering, 1982, Suryadinata, 1972, 1976). They could also go to special schools called Sekolah National Project Chusus (SNPC) ‘Special Project National Schools’ which were established by presidential decree no. B 12/Pres./1/1968. The language of instruction was Indonesian although Chinese was also taught for a few hours.

1972: Reform in spelling of Indonesian known as Ejaaan Yang Disempurnakan introduced. Government also declares English to be the only compulsory foreign language to be taught at all educational levels including secondary and tertiary levels.

1974: Government begins campaign to promote the use of Indonesian nation-wide.

By 1975: Sekolah National Project Chusus (SNPC) ‘Special Project National Schools’ converted into regular Indonesian schools or Sekolah National Swasta ‘Private National Schools’.

1978: Minister of Trade and Cooperation issued decree No. 286/KP/XII/78 that prohibited the import, distribution and trade of all printed matter in Chinese characters (Suara Baru, 2001). Up to 2003 having these materials in one’s possession was a crime equivalent to possessing narcotics/drugs as written in the Disembarkation Card given on entry to Indonesia.

1990: Presidential Decree no. 28 determines that English should be taught from fourth year of primary school (Dardjowidjojo, 1998).

1998: Fall of New Order government and resignation of Soeharto

7 January 2000: President Abdulrahman Wachid annulled presidential decree no. 14/1967, thus lifting the prohibition on practicing Chinese culture in public

2001: Indonesian Minister of Religion decrees Chinese New Year to be an optional holiday, permitting all ethnic Chinese students and workers who celebrate Chinese New Year to have a holiday on that day (Kompas, 14 March 2001).

2003: Chinese Lunar New Year observed as a national public holiday in Indonesia, and ethnic Chinese people were able to celebrate their New Year openly (Kustiman, 2004).
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Time table for data collection activities

Table A4.1 Timetable for data collection activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time of activities</th>
<th>Family A</th>
<th>Family B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recording</td>
<td>Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/12/00</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/12/00</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23/12/00</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/12/00</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/01/01</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/01/01</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/01/01</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/01/01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/01/01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/01/01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29/01/01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/02/01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/02/01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/02/01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/02/01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/03/01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/03/01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/03/01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/03/01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/03/01</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/03/01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/03/01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/04/01</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/04/01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/04/01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/04/01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/05/01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/05/01</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/05/01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/06/01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29/06/01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/11/01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/2002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/2003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/2004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
Activities included under the label 'gathering' might be just attending a family gathering, making a social visit to cross-check data with the subjects, or just paying a social visit. The latter occurred especially in November 2002, December 2003, March 2004 and March 2005. In addition to recording, interviewing and making social visits and phone conversations during the data collection (to cross-check the recorded data with the subjects), I have also conducted long
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distant correspondence with some subjects through e-mail, regular mail and text messages since the official data collection activities ended in 2001.
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Appendix 3

Ethnographic Questionnaire Interview

The interview contains five types of questions. They are questions about:

- the subjects' personal data
- the subjects' language repertoire
- language use in different domains
- language proficiency
- opinions and/or attitudes about personal language behaviour

The interviews concerning parts B and D of the questionnaires were sometimes conducted in Chinese Malay/Indonesian. Thus, a Chinese Malay/Indonesian translation of these parts of the questionnaire is provided below. Three versions of the questionnaire are given here:

- The original Indonesian version
- A partial translation into Chinese Malay/Indonesian
- A complete English translation
The Indonesian version

A. Data pribadi: (personal data was asked during the interview)
1. Nama (Indonesia dan Tionghoa kalau ada):
2. Jenis kelamin:
3. Tempat/tanggal lahir:
4. Usia:
5. Alamat:
   a. Sekarang:
   b. Lama:
   c. Alamat lain:
6. Agama:..........bahasa yang dipakai ditempat ibadah (dulu, sekarang kalau ada perbedaan)
7. Daerah asal:
8. Pendidikan:
   Jenis/nama sekolah:
   a. SD (atau yang sederajat): dari.....s/d........Bahasa Pengantar:.............
      -Bahasa di luar kelas waktu bermain.....
      -Bahasa yang dipakai dengan guru dalam kelas.....
      -Bahasa-bahasa lain yang diajarkan/dipelajari ...
   b. SMP (atau yang sederajat): dari.....s/d........Bahasa Pengantar:....
      -Bahasa di luar kelas waktu istirahat.....
      -Bahasa yang dipakai dengan guru dalam kelas.....
      -Bahasa-bahasa lain yang diajarkan/dipelajari ...
   c. SMA (atau yang sederajat): dari.....s/d........Bahasa Pengantar: ...
      - Bahasa di luar kelas waktu istirahat...
      -Bahasa yang dipakai dengan guru dalam kelas.....
      -Bahasa-bahasa lain yang diajarkan/dipelajari ...
   d. Perguruan Tinggi (atau yang sederajat):.....
      - Bahasa di luar kelas waktu istirahat.....
      - Bahasa yang dipakai dengan dosen dalam kelas.....
      - Bahasa-bahasa lain yang diajarkan/dipelajari ...
   e. Lain-lain (kursus, les dan sebagainya):...
9. Komposisi populasi etnis di sekolah secara keseluruhan (berapa etnik Tionghoa and lain-lain)
   a. SD (atau yang sederajat):....
b. SMP (atau yang sederajat):....
c. SMA (atau yang sederajat):.....
d. Perguruan Tinggi (atau yang sederajat):....
e. Lain-lain:....

10. Komposisi populasi kelas sendiri:
   a. SD (atau yang sederajat):.....
   b. SMP (atau yang sederajat):.....
   c. SMA (atau yang sederajat):.....
   d. Perguruan Tinggi (atau yang sederajat):....
   e. Lain-lain:.....

11. Pekerjaan/kedudukan/profesi sekarang:

12. Bahasa yang dipakai di tempat kerja:.....bahasa dengan dengan teman sekerja, klien:.....

13. Komposisi kolega/teman sekerja:

14. Hobi/kegiatan waktu luang:.....bahasa yang digunakan.....

15. Berapa lama tinggal di Surabaya/di luar Surabaya:

16. Status sosial:

17. Daerah asal suami/istri:

18. Bahasa suami/istri:

19. Jumlah anak:

20. Jumlah saudara/saudari:

21. Bahasa yang digunakan di rumah/bahasa rumah waktu anak-anak/remaja:

22. Bahasa yang dipakai di rumah sekarang dengan anak dan suami/istri:

23. Bahasa-bahasa lain yang dikuasai dan digunakan dirumah dengan anggota-anggota keluarga lain:

24. Bahasa yang dipakai Ibu:

25. Bahasa yang dipakai Ayah:

26. Bahasa yang dipakai kakek dan nenek:

27. Bahasa yang dipakai anak-anak:

28. Bahasa yang dipakai anggota keluarga yang lain:

29. Komposisi rumah ketika anak-anak/remaja:

30. Komposisi rumah sekarang:

31. Jumlah waktu yang dilewati di tempat kerja/sekolah:

32. Jumlah waktu bersama teman sekelas/teman sekerja/teman-teman lain:

33. Jumlah waktu bersama anggota keluarga yang lain and bahasa yang digunakan dengan mereka:
   a. Kakek-nenek:
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b. Orang tua:
c. Saudara:
d. Saudara sepupu:
e. Anak-anak:

34. Keanggotaan dalam organisasi/klub: bahasa yang dipakai dalam organisasi...
35. Bahasa yang dipakai dengan tetangga:....
36. Bahasa yang dipakai di kantor-kantor pemerintah dan ditempat umum:....
37. Bahasa yang dipakai dengan pembantu, supir, babysitter, suster perawat:....
38. Bahasa yang dipakai di pasar/tempat-tempat shopping:
39. Bahasa lain....(kalau ada)
40. Menurut Anda, Anda termasuk kelompok Peranakan atau Totok?(*)

(*) pilih salah satu

B. Pilihan bahasa dalam ranah keluarga

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lawan bicara* (dalam keluarga)</th>
<th>Topik (Apa)</th>
<th>Bahasa Yang dipakai</th>
<th>Alasan</th>
<th>Bahasa yang dipakai oleh lawan bicara</th>
<th>Alasan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emak/Bobo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engkong/Kungkung</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mama</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kakak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adik</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suami/isteri</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saudara Ipar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keponakan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sepupu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mertua</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anak-anak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anak menantu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tante</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Famili-famili lain (kalau ada)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pertanyaan:
1. Bahasa apa yang Anda gunakan dengan ayah dan sebaliknya (ayah terhadap kamu)?
2. Bahasa apa yang Anda gunakan dengan Ibu dan sebaliknya?
3. Bahasa apa yang Anda gunakan dengan saudara yang lebih tua dan sebaliknya?
4. Bahasa apa yang Anda gunakan dengan saudara yang lebih muda dan sebaliknya?
5. Bahasa apa yang Anda gunakan dengan suami/istri dan sebaliknya?
6. Bahasa apa yang Anda gunakan dengan anak-anak dan sebaliknya?
7. Bahasa apa yang Anda gunakan dengan saudara sepupu seusia? lebih tua? dan sebaliknya?
8. Bahasa apa yang Anda gunakan dengan kakek/nenek (Oma/Opa/Emak/Engkong) dan sebaliknya?
9. Bahasa apa yang Anda gunakan dengan Oom/Tante (saudara Mami/Papi) dan sebaliknya?
10. Bahasa apa yang Anda gunakan dengan keponakan (laki-laki/perempuan), menantu keponakan (laki-laki/perempuan) dan sebaliknya?
11. Bahasa apa yang Anda gunakan dengan menantu (laki-laki/perempuan) dan sebaliknya?
12. Bahasa apa yang Anda gunakan dengan saudara ipar (laki-laki/perempuan) yang lebih muda/lebih tua dan sebaliknya?
13. Bahasa apa yang Anda gunakan dengan cucu (laki-laki/perempuan), cucu menantu (laki-laki/perempuan) dan sebaliknya?
14. Bahasa apa yang Anda gunakan dengan mertua (laki-laki/perempuan) dan sebaliknya?
15. Bahasa apa yang Anda gunakan dengan pembantu yang lebih muda dan sebaliknya?
16. Bahasa apa yang Anda gunakan dengan pembantu yang lebih tua dan sebaliknya?
17. Bahasa apa yang Anda gunakan dengan pembantu yang sesuia dan sebaliknya?
18. Bahasa apa yang Anda gunakan dengan perawat, sopir, baby-sitter dsb. dan sebaliknya?
22. Bahasa apa yang Anda gunakan dengan orang yang dihormati dan sebaliknya?
23. Bahasa apa yang Anda gunakan dengan teman sekerja/teman/kenalan dan sebaliknya?

Notes:
*Bila lebih dari satu anggota dan ada perbedaan pilihan bahasa tolol sebutkan

Contoh pilihan Bahasa (kalau lebih dari satu pilihan sebutkan juga dengan urutan pemakaian)
1. Mandarin
2. Foochow/Hakka
3. Bahasa Jawa (Ngoko, Madyo, Kromo sebutkan)
4. Bahasa Indonesia sehari-hari
5. Bahasa Indonesia sekolah/radio/televiisi
6. Bahasa Melayu Peranakan/tenglang (Cindo)
7. Bahasa Melayu
8. Bahasa Inggris
9. Bahasa Jerman
10. Lain-lain (sebutkan)

C. Kemampuan berbahasa:
Menurut Anda bagaimana kemampuan Anda dalam bahasa-bahasa dibawah ini berdasarkan criteria yang diberikan:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mandarin</th>
<th>Fuchow/Hakka</th>
<th>Bahasa Jawa</th>
<th>Bahasa Indonesia sehari-hari</th>
<th>Bahasa Indonesia sekolah</th>
<th>Bahasa Cina Peranakan</th>
<th>Bahasa Inggris</th>
<th>Bahasa Melayu</th>
<th>Bahasa Jerman</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Skala 0-6 untuk pemakaian bahasa:

0: tidak mengerti sama sekali
1: dapat mengerti dan berbicara dengan kata-kata yang terbatas pada rutin sehari-hari, seperti misalnya teguran, pamitan, terimakasih, pertanyaan sederhana yang berhubungan dengan nomer, nama-nama hari, nama-nama konsep yang biasa dipakai, ucapan selamat and kata-kata yang biasa dipakai sehari-hari lainnya.
2: dapat mengerti dan bertanya jawab dengan ungkapan-ungkapan pendek dan kalimat-kalimat sendiri yang sederhana untuk komunikasi dasar sehari-hari
3: dapat mengerti dan ikut serta dalam semua pembicaraan di masyarakat, komunitas, ngobrol dengan teman tentang topik sehari-hari yang tidak terlalu sulit
4: dapat mengerti warta berita di radio, televisi, film, kuliah, kotbah and dapat menggunakan kosakata yang lanjut (sulit)
5: dapat mengerti dan berbicara dengan sangat efektif hampir di semua situasi di masyarakat dengan menggunakan kata-kata yang sulit dan jarang dipakai sekalipun yang berhubungan dengan dagang, rekreasi dan pekerjaan
6: dapat mengerti dan berbicara di semua situasi resmi dan tak resmi tanpa terkecuali dengan kemampuan dan pengertian seperti yang dimiliki penutur asli (memiliki social budaya yang sama)

D. Sikap dan pendapat Anda tentang perilaku berbahasa Anda:

1. Berapa jumlah bahasa, variasi bahasa atau dialek yang Anda kuasai? Apa saja?
2. Bagaimana Anda dapat menguasai bahasa-bahasa tersebut? Mengapa?
4. Di antara bahasa-bahasa dan dialek yang Anda kuasai, mana yang Anda anggap paling bergengsi? Mengapa?
5. Yang mana dari bahasa-bahasa tersebut yang merupakan bahasa yang Anda pakai sebagai bentuk sopan-santun? Contoh?
6. Dalam suasana resmi, bahasa atau dialek mana yang Anda pakai? Contoh?
8. Apakah Anda akan menggunakan Bahasa Peranakan/Totok dalam situasi-situasi diatas? Mengapa/mengapa tidak?
9. Bilamana, dimana, dan kepada/dengan siapa Anda menggunakan bahasa itu? Mengapa?
10. Apakah Anda atau anggota keluarga Anda pernah mengalami diskriminasi atau dilarang menggunakan bahasa Peranakan/Totok di tempat umum?
11. Kalau jawabannya ‘ya’, bagaimana perasaan Anda?
12. Apakah Anda atau keluarga Anda pernah membicarakan hal itu?
15. Menurut Anda apakah anggota keluarga Anda harus menggunakan panggilan kekeluargaan itu? Mengapa/mengapa tidak?
16. Bagaimana Anda menyapa kakek-nenek, orang tua, saudara-saudari, bibi/paman, kemenakan, saudara sepupu, dan famili Anda?
18. Apa pendapat Anda tentang kebijakan-kebijakan yang dikeluarkan pemerintah yang lama berkarena dengan bahasa-bahasa yang dipakai para WNI keturunan Tionghoa?
19. Apakah Anda atau anggota keluarga, saudara atau teman-teman Anda pernah terkena secara pribadi oleh kebijakan-kebijakan ini? Apakah Anda pernah membicarakannya diantara keluarga dan teman-teman Anda?
20. Apakah Anda atau anggota keluarga, saudara atau teman-teman Anda pernah merasakan sendiri sikap tidak bersahabat/bermusuhan atau terkena akibat langsung dari keresahan/tindak kekerasan terhadap orang-orang Tionghoa di Indonesia? Tolong ceritakan!
21. Apa pendapat Anda tentang rasa bermusuhan terhadap kaum Tionghoa?
22. Apa pendapat Anda tentang perubahan kebijakan pemerintah akhir-akhir ini berkarena dengan diperbolehkannya WNI keturunan Tionghoa merayakan Hari Raya Imlek misalnya?
23. Apakah Anda berminat belajar bahasa Mandarin? (terutama untuk generasi muda peranakan dan toto)
24. Maukah Anda bersekolah di sekolah dengan bahasa perantara bahasa Mandarin? (untuk generasi muda bangsa Tionghoa)
25. Menurut Anda bagaimana masa depan Bahasa Indonesia, bahasa cina peranakan, dialek-dialek Tionghoa serta bahasa Mandarin di Indonesia?
27. Apakah Anda tidak berkeberatan orang lain mengetahui Anda keturunan Tionghoa? mengapa? mengapa tidak?
A partial translation of the Indonesian version into Chinese Malay/Indonesian

Bagian B: Pemakaian bahasa.

Pertanyaan:

Pada omomnya/biasanya:

1. Bahasa apa yang dipakèq omong sama Papi dan sebaléqnya?
2. Bahasa apa yang dipakèq omong sama Mami/Mama dan sebaléqnya?
3. Bahasa apa yang dipakèq omong sama saudara yang lebi tua dan sebaléqnya?
4. Bahasa apa yang dipakèq omong sama saudara yang lebi muda dan sebaléqnya?
5. Bahasa apa yang dipakèq omong sama suami/istri dan sebaléqnya?
6. Bahasa apa yang dipakèq omong sama anaq-anaq dan sebaléqnya?
7. Bahasa apa yang dipakèq omong sama saudara seputu seomor? lebi tua? dan sebaléqnya?
8. Bahasa apa yang dipakèq omong sama Oma/Opa (Emak/Engkong) dan sebaléqnya?
9. Bahasa apa yang dipakèq omong sama Oom/Tante (saudara (Mami/Papi) dan sebaléqnya?
10. Bahasa apa yang dipakèq omong sama keponakan (laki/prempuan) dan sebaléqnya?
11. Bahasa apa yang dipakèq omong sama menantu (laki/prempuan) dan sebaléqnya?
12. Bahasa apa yang dipakèq omong sama saudara ipar (laki/perempuan) dan sebaléqnya?
13. Bahasa apa yang dipakèq omong sama cucuk (laki/prempuan), cucuk mantu (laki/perempuan) dan sebaléqnya?
14. Bahasa apa yang dipakèq omong sama mertua (laki/perempuan) dan sebaléqnya?
15. Bahasa apa yang dipakèq omong sama pembantu yang lebi muda dan sebaléqnya?
16. Bahasa apa yang dipakèq omong sama pembantu yang lebi tua dan sebaléqnya?
17. Bahasa apa yang dipakèq omong sama pembantu yang seomor dan sebaléqnya?
18. Bahasa apa yang dipakèq omong sama prawat, sopér, baby-sitter, dsb. dan sebaléqnya


22. Bahasa apa yang dipakêq omong sama orang yang dihormati? dan sebaléqnya?

23. Bahasa apa yang dipakêq omong sama temen sekerja/ temen/kenala dan sebaléqnya?

Bagian D: Tentang Sikap berbahasa

1. Bisa ngomong berapa bahasa/dialèk? Apa aja?

2. Koq bisa omong bahasa-bahasa itu? kenapa?


4. Dari semua bahasa atau dialèk itu mana yang paling hebat, bergengsi? kenapa?


6. Kaloq ngomong di kantor, sama orang pemerintah dan semacemnya, di sekola, pakêq bahasa atau dialèk yang mana? conto?


8. Menurut kamu (Oom/Tante/ Suksuk/ leie dsb) bahasa seng dipakêq sehari-hari sama orang Cina Tenglang atau Cina totok itu bisa apa ndaq dipakêq di acara resmi? kenapa? kenapa ndaq?


10. Apa pernah didiskriminasi atau dilarang pakêq bahasa itu di tempat umum?

11. Kalo ya, gimana perasaan kamu (Oom/Tante/Suksuk/ leie dsb)?

12. Apa pernah dibicarakakan antar keluarga?

13. Bahasa apa yang diajarkan atau akan diajarkan pada anak-anak? kenapa?


15. Apa menurut kamu (Oom/Tante/Suksuk/ leie dsb) anggota-anggota keluarga harus pakêq istilah panggilan itu? Kenapa/kenapa ndaq?

16. Kamu (Oom/Tante/Suksuk/ leie dsb.) manggil, emak-engkong, orang tua, saudara-saudara atau sepupu, Tante, Oom pakêq istilah apa? Apa mesti pakêq istilah itu?


18. Larangan pemerintah tentang dipakênya bahasa Tionghoa menurut kamu (Oom/Tante/Suksuk/ leie dsb) gimana?
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19. Apa kamu atau keluarga kamu pernah kena langsung/ndaq langsung peraturan/larangan ini? Apa masalah ini pernah dibicarakan dalam keluarga atau antar temen?

20. Apa kamu atau keluarga kamu, teman, kenalan dsb. pernah ngalami sikap bermusuhan atau kena akibat kerusuhan/tindak kekerasan terhadap orang Tionghoa akhir-akhir ini? Coba terangkan!

21. Apa pendapat kamu (Oom/Tante/Suksuk/ Ieie, dsb.) tentang kerusuhan/sikap ndaq bersahabat terhadap orang Tionghoa ini?

22. Akhir-akhir ini suđa bolé ngrayaken Hari Raya Imlek dsb. apa pendapat kamu (Oom/Tante/Suksuk/ Ieie dsb.)?

23. Apa ada minat belajar bahasa Mandarin? (terutama untuk generasi muda peranakan dan totok)


26. Menurut kamu (Oom/Tante/Suksuk/ Ieie dsb) termasuk bangsa apa? Tionghoa atau Indonesia? Jadi mesti pakèq bahasa apa?

27. Apa ndaq keberatan kalo orang tau kamu orang Tionghoa atau keturunan Tionghoa? Kenapa? kenapa ndaq?
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English translation

A. Personal data:
1. Name (Indonesian and Chinese names if applicable):
2. Sex:
3. Age:
4. Place and date of birth:
5. Address(es):
   a. Present:
   b. Previous:
   c. other:
6. Religion:... language used at place of worship (in the past and at present if they are different)
7. Origin:
8. Education:
   a. Primary: from ... to ........ Language of instruction ........
      Language outside the class (recess): ...
      Language used with teacher in class...
      other languages used/learnt...
   b. Secondary: from ... to ........ Language of instruction: ........
      Language outside the class (recess): ...
      Language used with teacher in class...
      other languages used/learnt...
   c. Tertiary: from ........ to ........ Language of instruction: ........
      Language outside the class (recess): ...
      Language used with teacher in class...
      other languages used/learnt...
   d. Others (private lesson/class, etc): ...
9. Ethnic composition of school population as a whole (how much ethnic Chinese was there):
   a. Primary:
   b. Secondary:
   c. Tertiary:
   d. Others
10. Ethnic composition of population within own class:
    a. Primary:
    b. Secondary:
    c. Tertiary:
11. Occupation/profession now:
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12. Language(s) spoken at work:... language(s) spoken with colleagues, clients at work...
13. Ethnic composition of colleagues/workmates:
14. Hobbies/leisure time activities:
15. Time spent in Surabaya/outside Surabaya:
16. Marital status:
17. Spouse’s origin:
18. Spouse’s language:
19. Number of children:
20. Number of siblings:
21. Main language at home when growing up (with parents and siblings):
22. Main language at home now with spouse and children:
23. Other language(s) spoken with other household members (if any):
24. Language(s) spoken by mother:
25. Language(s) spoken by father:
26. Language(s) spoken by grandparents:
27. Language(s) spoken by children:
28. Language(s) spoken by other family members:
29. The composition of your household when you were growing up:
30. The composition of your household now:
31. Amount of time spent at work/school:
32. Amount of time spent with classmates/workmates/other friends:
33. Amount of time spent with members of family and extended family:
   a. Grandparents:
   b. Parents:
   c. Siblings:
   d. Cousins:
   e. Children:
34. Organisation/club membership:....the language used there...
35. Language(s) used with neighbours:....
36. Language(s) used in government offices and in public places: ...
37. Language(s) used with domestics, driver, baby-sitter, carer:....
38. Language(s) used at the market/shopping malls/ other shopping places:...
39. Other languages... (please specify, if there is any)
40. According to you, do you belong to the group of Peranakan or Totok (*):
   (*) choose one


**Appendices**

B. Language choice in family domain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Addressee</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Language chosen</th>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Language chosen by addressee</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grandma/Bobo/Emak&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandpa/Kungkung/Kong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older sister/brother*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younger sister/brother*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sister/brother-in-law*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nephew/niece*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cousin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father/mother-in-law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Son/daughter-in-law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aunt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other family members (if any)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

* Specify

**Questions:**

1. What language/language variety do you use to speak to/with your father and what language/language variety does he use with you?
2. What language/language variety do you use to speak to/with your mother and what language/language variety does she use with you?
3. What language/language variety do you use to speak to/with your older brothers/sisters and what language/language varieties do they use with you?
4. What language/language variety do you use to speak to/with your younger brothers/sisters and what language/language varieties do they use with you?
5. What language/language variety do you use to speak to/with your children and what language/language varieties do they use with you?
6. What language/language variety do you use to speak to/with your spouse and what language/language varieties does (s)he use with you?
7. What language/language variety do you use to speak to/with your cousins of the same age and what language/language varieties do they use with you?

<sup>1</sup> For the Hakka family the kinship term for ‘grandpa’ is ‘Kungkung’, while grandma is ‘Bobo’. For the Foochow family the terms are ‘Engkong’ and ‘Emak’ for grandpa and grandma respectively.
8. What language/language variety do you use to speak to/with your grandparents and what language/language varieties do they use with you?

9. What language/language variety do you use to speak to/with your aunts and uncles and what language/language varieties do they use with you?

10. What language/language variety do you use to speak to/with your nephews/nieces and what language/language varieties do they use with you?

11. What language/language variety do you use to speak to/with your sons/daughters-in-law and what language/language varieties do they use with you?

12. What language/language variety do you use to speak to/with your sisters/brothers-in-law and what language/language varieties do they use with you?

13. What language/language variety do you use to speak to/with your grandchildren/grandchildren-in-law and what language/language varieties do they use with you?

14. What language/language variety do you use to speak to/with your parents-in-law and what language/language varieties do they use with you?

15. What language/language variety do you use to speak to/with your servants younger than you are and what language/language varieties do they use with you?

16. What language/language variety do you use to speak to/with your servants older than you are and what language/language varieties do they use with you?

17. What language/language variety do you use to speak to/with your servants of the same age as you and what language/language varieties do they use with you?

18. What language/language variety do you use to speak to/with your care-givers, domestics, baby-sitter, etc. and what language/language varieties do they use with you?

19. What language/language variety do you use to speak to/with your Chinese peranakan friends of the same age? Older? younger than you are? and what language/language varieties do they use with you?

20. What language/language variety do you use to speak to/with your totok friends of the same age? older? younger than you are? and what language/language varieties do they use with you?

21. What language/language variety do you use to speak to/with your non-Chinese friends/acquaintances/neighbors who are of your age? Older? Younger? and what language/language varieties do they use with you?

22. What language/language variety do you use to speak to/with the people you owe respect to? and what language/language varieties do they use with you?
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23. What language/language variety do you use to speak to/with your friends/acquaintances at work and what language/language varieties do they use with you?

*If there is more than one family member and there is more than one language chosen, please mention all.

1. Mandarin
2. Foochow/Hakka
3. Javanese (Ngoko, Madyo, Kromo please specify)
4. Colloquial Indonesian (East Java Indonesian)
5. School/radio/television Indonesian
6. Chinese Malay/Indonesian
7. East Java Malay
8. English
9. German
10. Others (please specify)

C. Language Proficiency:
What do you think your language ability is based on the scales given?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mandarin</th>
<th>Foochow/ Hakka</th>
<th>Ngoko Javanese</th>
<th>East Java Indonesian</th>
<th>Standard Indonesian</th>
<th>Chinese Malay/Indonesian</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>East Java Malay</th>
<th>German</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The following are the conditions of the scales:

0: no knowledge of the language
1: can understand singly occurring words for daily routines such as greetings, leave-takings, showing gratitude, simple questions and statements related to numbers, names of the days, weather, shopping matters etc
2: can ask and answer questions using own stretches of simple phrases/clauses/sentences and formulaic forms for basic daily needs and social transactional needs.
3: can engage in almost all social and community conversations in family gatherings, chatting with friends etc on familiar daily topics that are linguistically undemanding
4: can understand news on radio and television, films, lectures, speeches, sermons and so forth and perform effectively using more advanced vocabulary
5: can perform very effectively in all daily social and communal situational contexts related to commerce, recreation and own vocational fields
6: can perform very effectively in all formal and informal social and communal situations with the equivalent proficiency and sensitivity of a native speaker of the language speech community (same socio-cultural variety).

D. Miscellaneous questions on language behaviour, attitude etc.:

1. How many languages, language varieties or dialects do you speak? What are they?
2. How did you come to learn or master them? Why?
3. When, where, and to/with whom do you usually speak them? Why?
4. Among the languages, language varieties or dialects you speak which one do you think is the most prestigious? Why?
5. Which one is the polite form/variety to be used? Examples?
6. In formal situations which languages, varieties or dialects do you use? Example?
7. When, where and to/with whom do you usually speak in Indonesian? Why? Example?
8. Would you use peranakan/totok dialect in those situations above? Why/why not?
9. So when, where and to/with whom do you speak it? Why?
10. Have you or your family members ever been discriminated against or discouraged from speaking your peranakan/totok dialect or language variety in public?
11. If the answer is yes, how did it make you feel?
12. Do you or your family ever discuss this?
13. What language or variety would you teach your children? Why?
14. Are you still using the traditional kinship terms to address each other in your family and your extended family? Why/Why not?
15. How do you address your grandparents, parents, siblings, aunts/uncles, cousins, nieces/nephews and other relatives?
16. Do you think that the members of your family should use those kinship terms? Why/Why not?
18. What do you think of the former government language policies for Chinese people?
19. Have you or any of your family members, relatives, friends or family friends been personally affected by these policies? Have you ever discussed this among your family or friends?
20. Have you or any of your family members, relatives, friends or family friends been personally affected by the hostile attitudes or recent outbreaks of violence towards Chinese people in Indonesia? Please explain!
21. What do you feel about this hostility against Chinese?
22. What do you think of the recent changes in government policies with regard to the practice of cultural events for Chinese communities?
23. Would you consider learning Mandarin Chinese? (especially for young generations of peranakan and totok)
24. How about going to Chinese schools? (for young generations of *peranakan* and *totok*)

25. What do you think about the future of Bahasa Indonesia, *peranakan* Chinese variety, *totok* Chinese languages/dialects, and Mandarin Chinese in Indonesia?


27. Do you want others to know that you are Chinese or of Chinese descent? Why/Why not?
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Language Repertoire in all domains

Platt (1980a: 71) postulates that societal domains can be ranged along a scale of public to more private. In addition, a degree of formality ranging from very formal to the most informal can be assigned to each domain, private and public alike. The formality usually depends on variations in locale and topic as well as the relationship between interlocutors and even the numbers of interlocutors present. These variations can be understood as constituting sub-domains within a general domain.

The subjects were asked about their code choices in the nine domains listed in the table below as well as in any subdomains of these major domains. The first code listed is the code they perceived as the main code they use in each of the nine domains. In public domains such as religion (churches or temples), government bureaucracy or neighbourhood association meetings, most subjects usually nominated only one code. In other domains, though, alternative codes usually mean that different codes were preferred for different sub-domains, i.e. in different encounters with different interlocutors for different reasons. Multiple codes are especially found in domains such as work, school grounds, business transactions, friendship, and home. For example, a subject might work in a company where the clients are of different cultural and language backgrounds, so although Indonesian is the expected code to be employed between agent-client, other codes may also be used depending on the clients' language ability, preference or simply for convenience. Similarly, the codes used in interactions in the traditional marketplace, and business deals in retail shops vary from Javanese, Madurese, CMI, to Mandarin and Hokkien depending on the ethnicity of the shop owner, the shop assistant and the customers. In department stores, the code usually used is EJI.

The tables below illustrate the subjects' language repertoire and language use in different domains. Table A.1 provides an overview of language use in different domains according to age cohort for all the subjects of the study. Table A.2 provides details of language use in each of nine different domains for each subject. Table A.3 lists all the individual subjects of the study and provides details of language use at school, in the home, a summary of language use in other domains, as well as an overview of language repertoire/proficiency for each subject.
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The following are symbols and abbreviations found in the tables with an indication of what they signify.

CMI: Chinese Malay/Indonesian
EJI: East Java Indonesian
EJM/I: East Java Malay/Indonesian is a code having mostly Malay lexical items and some Indonesian lexical items spoken by the 1910s, 1920s age cohorts and to some extent 1930s age cohort
EJM: East Java Malay
Gen.: Generation
Ju: Junior
NO: Non Office
O: Office
Pri: Primary
Se: Senior
Sec.: Secondary level which consists of Junior (year 7-9) and Senior (year 10-12)
SFI: Semi Formal Indonesian
SI: Standard Indonesian
Ter: tertiary
* Malay varieties consist of EJM, EJI, CMI and Jakarta Indonesian
** Malay varieties limited to East Java Malay (Bahasa Melayu) and East Java Indonesian
*** Malay varieties consist of EJM, CMI and EJI
**** Malay varieties consist of CMI, EJI, Jakarta Indonesian
\$ Malay varieties consist of Chinese Malay/Indonesian and East Java Indonesian
# All Malay varieties including Jakarta Indonesian

+: The school grounds are actually part of the school domain postulated by Schmidt-Rohr (1932). Even though SI serves as the language of instruction at all educational levels, the use of SI outside the classroom is not strictly enforced. Thus, besides SI as the language of instruction, there are other regional codes that might be spoken between peers e.g. in the school grounds.

%: This only covers places such as traditional markets, small retail shops and other business deals the subjects perform outside places such as modern shopping centres, malls and banks. Transactions in these last mentioned places all apparently involved the use of Indonesian or in this case, East Java Indonesian.

\(^\wedge\): Others: the non informal educational institutions an individual may have attended—night schools, courses, or even informal institutions such as home schools where a particular language was used as a medium of instruction

@: Since it was only after the Fifth Indonesian National Language Congress in 1988 that Pusat Bahasa publicised the new standard of Tata Bahasa Baku Bahasa Indonesia (Standard Grammar Of Indonesia) (Sneddon, 2003:134), the term "Indonesian" is used to refer to the language of instruction. Only later is it referred to as SI. However, the publication of Tata Bahasa Baku Bahasa Indonesia did not really have a direct practical effect on classroom teaching. My personal observation is that even years later, teachers of Bahasa Indonesia still did not use it as a reference for the 'good and correct grammar' of Indonesian in their teaching.

(…) the code put in brackets indicates that it is not applicable to all members of that particular age cohort

{…} the parentheses around Hokkien and Mandarin indicate only limited use of the particular code/s are being used (e.g. related to daily routines, school matters, and especially the numerical and/or transactional functions for buying things in shops or markets). As for Madurese, it indicates that greetings, daily use and especially transactional functions are used.
### Table A6.1: Code-domain relations for all 10 age cohorts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age cohorts</th>
<th>Gen</th>
<th>Language of instruction</th>
<th>Schoolgrounds (up to secondary level)</th>
<th>Home</th>
<th>Neighborhood</th>
<th>Friendship</th>
<th>Work (Office and Non-Office)</th>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Government / National Bureaucracy</th>
<th>Organization / Clubs</th>
<th>Economic Transactions (Markets/Business deals) %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1910s</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hakka</td>
<td>Hakka, Javanese, Malay*</td>
<td>EJ/M, Javanese, JI, Hakka, Mandarin, JI, EJ/M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Hakka, Indonesian</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Javanese Mandarin EJ/M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Javanese Mandarin EJ/M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920s</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Foochow</td>
<td>Foochow, Mandarin, Malay**</td>
<td>EJ/M, Mandarin</td>
<td>Foochow Mandarin, EJ/M</td>
<td>Foochow Mandarin, EJ/M</td>
<td>(NO) Mandarin EJ/M</td>
<td>Mandarin Indonesian</td>
<td>Foochow, Mandarin</td>
<td>Mandarin (Hokkien), EJ/M</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930s</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td>Javanese Mandarin</td>
<td>Hakka, Javanese Malay***</td>
<td>Javanese EJ/M (Madurese)</td>
<td>Hakka, Javanese Mandarin (Madurese)</td>
<td>(NO) EJ/M (Mandarin), (Hakka) (Javanese) (German), (Madurese)</td>
<td>Indonesian Mandarin Hakka</td>
<td>EJ/M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>EJ/M, Foochow Mandarin, Javanese Mandarin (Hokkien) (Hakka) (Madurese)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940s</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mandarin, Mandarin, Mandarin, Javanese, CMI, Foochow, Mandarin, CMI, Javanese</td>
<td>EJ, Mandarin Javanese</td>
<td>Mandarin, CMI, EJ (Javanese) (German), (Madurese)</td>
<td>(NO) Mandarin, EJ, CMI, Javanese</td>
<td>Mandarin, EJ (Javanese) (German), (Madurese)</td>
<td>Indonesian Mandarin Javanese</td>
<td>EJ</td>
<td>EJ (German)</td>
<td>Mandarin CMI Mandarin, Javanese (Hokkien)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>early 1950s</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mandarin, Mandarin, Mandarin, Javanese, CMI</td>
<td>Javanese CMI</td>
<td>EJ, Mandarin Javanese,</td>
<td>EJ, CMI, Javanese</td>
<td>(NO) EJ, CMI, Javanese (Hokkien), (Mandarin), (Madurese)</td>
<td>Indonesian Mandarin Javanese</td>
<td>EJ</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>EJ, CMI Javanese, Mandarin, Javanese (Hokkien), (Madurese)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>late 1950s</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mandarin, Mandarin, Mandarin, Javanese, CMI, English</td>
<td>Malay English</td>
<td>Mandarin, Javanese</td>
<td>Mandarin, Javanese</td>
<td>(NO) EJ, Mandarin, JI (Mandarin) (Madurese)</td>
<td>Indonesian Mandarin Javanese</td>
<td>EJ</td>
<td>EJ</td>
<td>Mandarin Javanese, Mandarin, Javanese (Hokkien)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>late 1950s (transition)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mandarin, Mandarin, Mandarin, Javanese, CMI, Mandarin</td>
<td>Javanese Malay$</td>
<td>Javanese, CMI EJ</td>
<td>(NO) EJ, Mandarin, JI (Mandarin) (Madurese)</td>
<td>Indonesian Mandarin Javanese</td>
<td>EJ</td>
<td>EJ</td>
<td>Mandarin Javanese, Mandarin, Javanese (Hokkien)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 Home Language includes the codes spoken to non-family members such as domestics, care-givers and drivers who work and stay with the family
3 Occasionally Mimi also uses Javanese with domestics and the driver.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age cohorts</th>
<th>Gen</th>
<th>Language of instruction</th>
<th>Schoolgrounds (up to secondary level)*</th>
<th>Home</th>
<th>Neighborhood</th>
<th>Friendship</th>
<th>Work (Office and Non-Office)</th>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Government/ National Bureaucracy</th>
<th>Organization /Clubs</th>
<th>Economic Transactions (Markets/Business deals) %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>early 1960s</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Javanese, EJII, CMI</td>
<td>MalayS Javanese</td>
<td>EJII, Javanese</td>
<td>Javanese CMI EJII</td>
<td>(O) SFI, EJII (English)</td>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>EJII</td>
<td>EJII</td>
<td>EJII, CMI, Javanese, (Mandarin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>late 1970s to early 1980s</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>SI (English) (German)</td>
<td>EJII</td>
<td>CMI</td>
<td>EJII</td>
<td>CMI, EJII Javanese (JII)</td>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>EJII</td>
<td>EJII (JI)</td>
<td>EJII, CMI, Javanese</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>early 1990s</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>EJII, SFI</td>
<td>EJII</td>
<td>EJII</td>
<td>EJII SFI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A6. 2: Codes in the nine domains of all the 18 subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and code of Subject</th>
<th>Gen</th>
<th>Year of Birth</th>
<th>Language of Instruction</th>
<th>School grounds (up to secondary level)*</th>
<th>Home Language</th>
<th>Neighborhood</th>
<th>Friendship</th>
<th>Workplace (Office and Non-Office)</th>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Government/ National Bureaucracy</th>
<th>Organization/ Clubs</th>
<th>Business Transactions (markets, business deals)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grandma/Bobo 1FCT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>early 1910s</td>
<td>Hakka, Javanese, Malay*</td>
<td>Hakka</td>
<td>Hakka, Javanese, Malay*</td>
<td>EJM/I, Javanese, JI</td>
<td>Hakka, Mandarin, JI, EJM/I</td>
<td>Hakka, Indonesian</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Javanese Mandarin, EJM/I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandpa/Kong 1MCT-P</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>early 1920s</td>
<td>Foochow, Mandarin, Malay**</td>
<td>Foochow</td>
<td>Foochow, Mandarin, Malay**</td>
<td>EJM/I, Mandarin</td>
<td>Foochow, Mandarin, EJM</td>
<td>(NO) Mandarin, EJM/I</td>
<td>Mandarin Indonesian</td>
<td>EJM/I</td>
<td>Foochow, Mandarin</td>
<td>Mandarin, (Hokkien), EJM/I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filip 2MATA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>early 1930s</td>
<td>Mandarin, Javanese, Mandarin</td>
<td>Hakka, Javanese, Malay***</td>
<td>Javanese, EJM/I</td>
<td>Hakka, Javanese, EJM/I, CMI</td>
<td>Hakka, Javanese, EJM/I, CMI</td>
<td>Indonesian Mandarin, Hakka</td>
<td>EJII</td>
<td>EJII</td>
<td>EJII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa 2FCTa</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Late 1930s</td>
<td>Mandarin, Javanese, Mandarin</td>
<td>Hakka, Javanese, Malay***</td>
<td>Javanese, EJM/I</td>
<td>Hakka, Javanese, EJM/I, CMI</td>
<td>Hakka, Javanese, EJM/I, CMI</td>
<td>Indonesian Mandarin, Hakka</td>
<td>EJII</td>
<td>EJII</td>
<td>EJII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon 2MATAB</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Late 1930s</td>
<td>Mandarin, Javanese, Mandarin</td>
<td>Hakka, Javanese, Malay***</td>
<td>Javanese, Mandarin, EJM/I</td>
<td>Hakka, Mandarin, EJM/I, CMI</td>
<td>Hakka, Mandarin, EJM/I, CMI</td>
<td>Indonesian Mandarin, Hakka</td>
<td>EJII</td>
<td>EJII</td>
<td>EJII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ani 2FCTb</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Late 1930s</td>
<td>Mandarin, Javanese, Mandarin</td>
<td>Hakka, Javanese, Malay***</td>
<td>Javanese, EJM/I</td>
<td>Hakka, Mandarin, EJM/I, CMI</td>
<td>Hakka, Mandarin, EJM/I, CMI</td>
<td>Indonesian Mandarin, Hakka</td>
<td>EJII</td>
<td>EJII</td>
<td>EJII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mimi 2FCT-Pa</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Late 1940s</td>
<td>Mandarin, Javanese, CMI</td>
<td>Mandarin, Javanese, CMI</td>
<td>Mandarin, Foochow, CMI</td>
<td>Javanese</td>
<td>Mandarin, German, English, EJII, CMI</td>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>EJII</td>
<td>EJII, Mandarin, CMI, Javanese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titi 2FCT-Pb</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Late 1940s</td>
<td>Mandarin, Javanese, CMI</td>
<td>Mandarin, Javanese, CMI</td>
<td>Mandarin, Foochow, CMI</td>
<td>Javanese</td>
<td>Mandarin, CMI, EJII, Javanese</td>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>EJII</td>
<td>EJII, Mandarin, CMI, Javanese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 Occasionally Mimi also uses Javanese with domestics and driver.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and code of Subject</th>
<th>Gen</th>
<th>Year of Birth</th>
<th>Language of Instruction</th>
<th>School grounds (up to secondary level)*</th>
<th>Home Language</th>
<th>Neighborhood</th>
<th>Friendship</th>
<th>Workplace (Office and Non-Office)</th>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Government/ National Bureaucracy</th>
<th>Organization/ Clubs</th>
<th>Business Transactions (markets, business deals)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indah 2FAT-Pd (Family A)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>early 1950s</td>
<td>Mandarin, SI</td>
<td>Javanese, CMI</td>
<td>Javanese, CMI</td>
<td>EJ, Javanese</td>
<td>EJ, CMI, Javanese</td>
<td>(NO) EJ, CMI, Javanese, (Hokkien), (Mandarin), Madurese</td>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>EJ</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>EJ, CMI, Javanese, (Hokkien), (Mandarin), Madurese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jade 2FCT-Pe (Family A)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Late 1950s</td>
<td>SI, English</td>
<td>Javanese, EJI</td>
<td>Malay**** English</td>
<td>EJ</td>
<td>EJ, CMI, JI, Javanese</td>
<td>(NO) EJ, JI, (Mandarin) (Hokkien)</td>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>EJ</td>
<td>EJ</td>
<td>EJ, CMI, Javanese, (Mandarin), (Hokkien)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tania 3FCTa (Family B)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Late 1950s</td>
<td>Mandarin, SI, English</td>
<td>Javanese, (Mandarin), EJ, CMI</td>
<td>Javanese, Malay$ Javanese</td>
<td>EJ, Javanese</td>
<td>Javanese, CMI, EJ</td>
<td>(O) SFI English, EJ</td>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>EJ</td>
<td>EJ</td>
<td>EJ, CMI, Javanese, (Mandarin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom 3MATa (Family B)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Late 1950s</td>
<td>Mandarin, SI</td>
<td>Javanese, Mandarin, EJ, CMI</td>
<td>Malay$, Javanese</td>
<td>EJ</td>
<td>Javanese, CMI, EJ</td>
<td>(O) EJ</td>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>EJ</td>
<td>EJ</td>
<td>EJ, CMI, Javanese, (Mandarin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenny 3FCTb (Family B)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>early 1960s</td>
<td>SI, English</td>
<td>Javanese EJ, CMI</td>
<td>Javanese, Malay$ Javanese</td>
<td>EJ, Javanese</td>
<td>Javanese, CMI, EJ</td>
<td>(O) EJ, English</td>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>EJ</td>
<td>EJ</td>
<td>EJ, CMI, Javanese, (Mandarin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gugun 3MCItc (Family B)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>early 1960s</td>
<td>SI, English</td>
<td>Javanese EJ, CMI</td>
<td>Malay$, Javanese</td>
<td>EJ, Javanese</td>
<td>Javanese, CMI, EJ</td>
<td>(O) EJ</td>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>EJ</td>
<td>EJ</td>
<td>EJ, CMI, Javanese, (Mandarin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denny 3MCT-Pc (Family A)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Late 1970s</td>
<td>SI, English, German</td>
<td>EJ, CMI</td>
<td>EJ</td>
<td>CMI, EJ, Javanese</td>
<td>EJ, CMI, Javanese</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>EJ</td>
<td>EJ</td>
<td>EJ, CMI, Javanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cindy 3FCT-Pb (Family A)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>early 1980s</td>
<td>SI, English, German</td>
<td>EJ, CMI</td>
<td>EJ</td>
<td>CMI, JI, Javanese</td>
<td>EJ, Javanese</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>EJ</td>
<td>EJ</td>
<td>EJ, CMI, Javanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanda 3FCT-Pd (Family A)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>early 1980s</td>
<td>SI, German, English</td>
<td>EJ, CMI</td>
<td>EJ</td>
<td>CMI, EJ, Javanese</td>
<td>EJ, Javanese</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>EJ</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rina 4FCTa (Family B)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>early 1990s</td>
<td>SI, English</td>
<td>EJ, SFI</td>
<td>EJ</td>
<td>SFI, EJ</td>
<td>EJ, SFI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and code of Subject</td>
<td>Gen</td>
<td>Year of Birth</td>
<td>Language of instruction</td>
<td>Home language*</td>
<td>‘other domains’</td>
<td>Language repertoire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen and family</td>
<td>Pri</td>
<td>Sec</td>
<td>Ter</td>
<td>Others*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ju</td>
<td>Se</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandma/Bobo 1FCT (Family B)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>early 1910s</td>
<td>Hakka</td>
<td>Hakka, Javanese, Malay*</td>
<td>Hakka, Mandarin, Javanese, Malay*</td>
<td>Hakka, Mandarin, Javanese, Malay*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandpa/Kong 1MCT-P (Family A)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>early 1920s</td>
<td>Foochow</td>
<td>Mandarin, Malay**</td>
<td>Foochow, Mandarin, Malay**</td>
<td>Foochow, Mandarin, Malay**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filip 2MATa (Family B)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>early 1930s</td>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td>Hakka, Javanese, Malay***</td>
<td>Hakka, Javanese, Malay***</td>
<td>Hakka, Javanese, Malay***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa 2FCTa (Family B)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Late 1930s</td>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td>Hakka, Javanese, Malay***</td>
<td>Hakka, Javanese, Malay***</td>
<td>Hakka, Javanese, Malay***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon 2MATb (Family B)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Late 1930s</td>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td>Hakka, Javanese, Malay***</td>
<td>Hakka, Javanese, Malay***</td>
<td>Hakka, Javanese, Malay***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ani 2FCTb (Family B)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Late 1930s</td>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td>Hakka, Javanese, Malay***</td>
<td>Hakka, Javanese, Malay***</td>
<td>Hakka, Javanese, Malay***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mimi 2FCT-Pa (Family A)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Late 1940s</td>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td>Mandarin, English</td>
<td>Mandarin, Foochow, CMI, Javanese</td>
<td>Mandarin, Foochow, CMI, Javanese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Home Language includes the codes spoken to non-family members such as domestics, care-givers and drivers who work and stay with the family.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and code of Subject</th>
<th>Gen</th>
<th>Year of Birth</th>
<th>Language of Instruction</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Home Language</th>
<th>‘Other domains’</th>
<th>Language Repertoire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Titi</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Late 1940s</td>
<td>Mandarin, Mandarin, Mandarin, SI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Mandarin, Foochow, CMI</td>
<td>Malay**, Javanese, Mandarin (Hokkien)</td>
<td>Malay**, Foochow, (Hokkien), SI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jade</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Late 1950s</td>
<td>SI, SI, SI, SI, English</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Malay***, English</td>
<td>Malay, English, Javanese, Mandarin (Hokkien)</td>
<td>Malay, English, Javanese, Mandarin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tania</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Late 1950s</td>
<td>Mandarin, SI, SI, SI, English</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Javanese, Malay$</td>
<td>Malay, Javanese, English</td>
<td>Javanese, Malay, English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Late 1950s</td>
<td>Mandarin, SI, SI, SI, SI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Malay$, Javanese</td>
<td>Malay, Javanese, English</td>
<td>Malay, Javanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenny</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Early 1960s</td>
<td>SI, SI, SI, SI, English</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Javanese, Malay$</td>
<td>Malay, Javanese, English</td>
<td>Javanese, Malay, English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denny</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Late 1970s</td>
<td>SI, English, SI, English, SI, English</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>CMI</td>
<td>Malay, Javanese, German, English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cindy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Early 1980s</td>
<td>SI, SI, SI, English</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>CMI</td>
<td>Malay$, Javanese, English</td>
<td>Malay, Javanese, Mandarin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanda</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Early 1980s</td>
<td>SI, SI, SI, German</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>CMI</td>
<td>Malay, Javanese, German</td>
<td>Malay, Javanese, English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rina</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Early 1990s</td>
<td>SI, SI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>English, EJI, SFI</td>
<td>EJI, SFI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6 Occasionally Mimi also uses Javanese with domestics and driver.
Appendix 5
Samples of conversations

This appendix contains samples of family interactions involving two or more participants. The conversations are of varying lengths. In some long interactions, there is a main conversational sequence with side sequences. There are usually more than three participants involved in the main sequence, and some of these participants typically converse among themselves in side sequences. In the main sequence, there is a main topic of discussion, and in the side sequences sub-topics emerge. With the change of topics typically found in the side sequences, the codes chosen often change too. With a return to the main conversational topic there is usually a change back to the main code as well. The motivations for these side sequences can be of different kinds: a change of topic, the arrival of new participants in the conversation, exclusion of other participants, etc. The subjects contextualize side sequences and open or close new sequences by switching between codes. The stretches of interactions in the side sequences are indicated by an additional lower case letter (a, b, c etc.).

Conversation One (Family A): Chatting in Kong’s bedroom

This long dialogue provides a good illustration of how subjects – and particularly the main speakers in a conversation – move from one code to another to specify and accommodate addressees. Code switching can also be used in these circumstances to manage turns in the dialogue.

The following interaction took place between three generations of family members in family A: Kong (1MCT-P), Mimi (2FCT-Pa), Titi (2FCT-Pb), Jade (2FCT-Pc), Indah (2FCT-Pd) and Amanda (3FCT-Pd). Kong had just been discharged from the hospital and the protagonists were talking in Kong’s bedroom. In this stretch of dialogue, many different topics are discussed, e.g., Kong’s experience at the hospital, his health, Titi and Mimi’s dresses, Titi’s new hairstyle and the expense of having a hair cut and perm overseas. The languages employed are CMI and a mixture of Mandarin and CMI, as well as some Javanese. The main speaker in this dialogue is Titi who addresses the other participants, Kong, Mimi, Amanda, Jade and Indah. The codes chosen vary in accordance with whom Titi addresses. In general, the codes chosen are the unmarked codes that speakers share with their interlocutors.
Appendices

One feature worth pointing out of this interaction is that Titi’s code-switching is employed to specify the addressees. Kong also uses code-switching to indicate who his primary intended addressee is.

In general, no marked code choices are being made in this dialogue except for Mimi’s snippet of Javanese in line 14. Each speaker makes use of the unmarked code with s/he shares with his/her interlocutor. Titi, as the main speaker, switches from a mixture of Mandarin and CMI to speak to Kong then to CMI to talk to others before moving back to a mixture of Mandarin and CMI again with Kong. Kong does the same sort of thing. He uses Mandarin and CMI to speak to Titi then CMI to Amanda (line 40) and others (line 56) before returning to Mandarin and CMI again to speak to Titi.

1. 2FCT-Pb: **Papa ini lhó Pa, kakàtè Soster lêq marî **SI SIÈQ bau apa isa muntah?
   [Daddy y’know what Dad, Nurse said that after ‘cleaning the blood’ (haemodyalisis) (you) smell what (you) vomit]
2. 1MCT-P: **iya sontéq**
   [yes, the injection]
3. 1MCT-P: **he apané sontéq?**
   [what’s wrong with the injection?]
4. 1MCT-P: **SI SIÈK HAU LIAU sontéq I KO, bau dari PI ZHE JUK LAI**
   [AFTER THE DIALYSIS FINISHED (I) was given AN injection, the smell WENT OUT OF (my) NOSE]
5. 1MCT-P: **oh lyha memang bau kayak besi gitu lhó**
   [well that’s right it smells something like iron, y’know]
6. 1MCT-P: **oh**
   [oh]
7. 2FCT-Pb: **kan dari obaté, vitamin itu**
   [it’s from the medicine, that’s the vitamin]
8. 2FCT-Pb: **vitamin itu kayak besi?**
   [the vitamin is like iron?]
9. 2FCT-Pb: **bau kayak besi gitu**
   [it smells like iron]
10. 1MCT-P: **tha koq keja, keja maken isa DU DU JUK LAI**
    [so how can when (he) eats (he) CAN THROW OUT]
11. 2FCT-Pb: **ndaq, ada memang sontéqané bau besi.**
    [no, there is a particular injection that… well… smells like iron]
12. 2FCT-Pb: **baju LU kayak gini mana CIÈ? bajé, éléng ndaq? ⁷**
    [where is YOUR dress which is like this, OLDER SIS? The dress, do you remember?]
13. 2FCT-Pb: **GAQ ONOQ**
    [there isn’t (one like that)]
14. 2FCT-Pb: **ada, LU ada, Indah ada, Mama seng mbeliquo ⁸**
    [yes there is, YOU have (one), Indah has one, (it was) Mother who bought them]

---

⁷ Titi addresses her older sister using all CMI. Compare this with line 9 in which she uses a mixture of CMI and Mandarin to speak to her father, Kong.

⁸ Titi also addresses Indah, so Indah answers in line 15.
15. 2FCT-Pd: gaq perna kétoq, ndëq lemarí ndaq perna kétoq ih
   [(I’ve) never seen one, (I’ve) never seen one in the wardrobe y’know]
16. 2FCT-Pb: jamané Mama ini
   [it was Mother’s time then]
17. 1MCT-P: CING DYEN DANG YAO I PAI SE SEK U
   [today my diabetes (level) is one hundred forty five]
18. 2FCT-Pb: DANG YAO I PAI SE SEQ U?9
   [diabetes one hundred forty five?]
19. 1MCT-P: tórón, cu ci DANG YAO ilang
   [(it) decreases, dialysis DIABETES gone]
20. 2FCT-Pb: iyha mari gitu besóq baléq lagi
   [yeah after that tomorrow it comes back]
21. 1MCT-P: dak tentu
   [not always]
22. 2FCT-Pe: dikréteng ya CIE idepe10
   [OLDER SISTER did you have your eye-lashes perm ed?]
23. 2FCT-Pb: iyha, apa—
   [yes, what—]
24. 2FCT-Pe:—CIE Mimi daq dikréteng?
   [OLDER SISTER Mimi, would you have your eyelashes perm ed?]
25. 2FCT-Pb: oh léq téqé dëqé apiq tambahan, baru saqbulan wés kenceng, barusan potong
   rambut “Lina, Lina liaqen idepku mosq saqbulan wés kenceng”, “ayo suru nganu lagi”
   “gaq gaq mbélani aku, saqjim”, njiq aé léq kenceng-kenceng dadi gaq usah mbayar aku
   hahaha, gaq eroé Jade ya kréteng “SCHÉaku ya kréteng idep CIES
   [oh, hers will look better, only one month mine is already straight, (I) have just had my hair
   cut “Lina, Lina have a look my eyelashes only lasted for a month and now they are straight
   already”, “c’mon do them again” “no, no I can’t stand it, an hour”, later when they are all
   straight so I don’t have to pay, he he he he, it turns out Jade also has hers perm ed “OLDER
   SISTER I also have my eyelashes perm ed OLDER SISTER he he he
26. 2FCT-Pe: osom, koncocku Magda ya kréteng idep
   [it is in fashion now, my friend Magda also has her eyelashes perm ed]
27. 2FCT-Pb: iyha?
   [really?]
28. 2FCT-Pa: diapaqno sé?
   [what was done actually?]
29. 2FCT-Pe: mbol dikéqi opo, dikéqi obat gitu lhó
   [Don’t know what was applied, they were given some stuff, like that y’know]
30. 2FCT-Pb: tapi aku ndaq kétoq, kataé pakéq—kan orang dikréteng gak kétoq kyak apa—
   [but I didn’t see, it is said they use—y’know when people (have theirs) perm ed (they) can’t
   really see how it is—]
31. 2FCT-Pa: rol-rolan gitu—
   [kind of rollers like that—]
32. 2FCT-Pb and 2FCT-Pe—bukanann
   [—no, not that]
33. 2FCT-Pb: pakéq anué gigi atau apa gitu, bukan, gaq tahu aku, gaq kétoq CIE wong merem
   terós koq saqjim lhó ngrénteng gitu Ndah, yha kayaq orang ngrénteng rambut, lha aku
   tepaq—

---

9 In this line Titi switches to Mandarin to answer Kong who addresses her in Mandarin (line 17).
10 jade addresses Titi in CMI, so the conversation continues in CMI with Mimi, Indah and Amanda participating.
[they] use what’s for teeth or what’s it you know, no, I don’t know, (I) didn’t see OLDER SISTER because (I) closed my eyes then you know it took an hour to perm, Ndah, well just like perming hair, and it so happened that I--

34. 2FCT-Pd:--obaté tapi bukan obat itu?
   [the perming substance is not that one?]

   [no, not that, it’s OK for eyes, HAIR PERMING, HAIR PERMING takes one hour, you know, “instead of waiting for one hour, please have my eyelashes permned”, that’s it, “Ma’am how will you wash your hair? “WELL, IT’S OK” so I was like a blind person Y’KNOW from the Ghost Cave, to wash my hair, WELL (I was) led by the hands because I did like this all the time OLDER SISTER he he he he (I) was led by the hands.

37. 2FCT-Pb: ha ha aha ha
36. 2FCT-Pb: cući rambut, lha ini yha ngenténi saqjam, ini ya saqjam oh gitu
   [hair washing, this also waited for an hour, this also took an hour that’s it]
37. 3FCT-Pd: KU Mimi lèq diklènténg apiq lho
   [AUNTIE Mimi, if you) have yours permed will also look good, you know]
38. 1MCT-P: Amanda la di di luar negeri mosok di anu rambut diklènténg? daq toh? 11
   [Amanda if you are abroad do you also have, well, your hair permed? Of course not?]
41. 2FCT-Pb: ha ha aha ha
42. 2FCT-Pa: ha ha aha ha
32. 2FCT-Pb: larang Pa njèq sana
   [Overthere it’s expensive Dad]
44. 3FCT-Pd: ndaq kuat bayar, Kong
   [I can’t afford it Grandpa]
45. 2FCT-Pb: itu lho Nda ndaq lho, kamu mesti cariq ndèq ada spesial kayaq ndèq Melben KOWE boq nyariq ndèq
   [you know Nda, it’s not y’know, you have to look for one special like in Melbourne, you don’t look for (one) at--]
46. 2FCT-Pa: STUDENT?
   [student]
47. 2FCT-Pb: ndaq CIÉ, cina-cina mura
   [No, OLDER SISTER, the Chinese, (it’s) cheap]
48. 3FCT-Pd: oh gitu ta?
   [oh, is that so?]
49. 2FCT-Pb: lho engsoku lèq krénténg itu ngggèq orang cina
   [you know my sister-in-law always goes to a Chinese to have her hair permed]
50. 2FCT-Pa: ndaq onog ndèq Hanover, itu bulé kabèh, lèq Melben laq akèh encèné
   [there’s none in Hannover, all whites, if in Melbourne there are really lots (of Chinese people)]
51. 2FCT-Pb: oh LIOQ SEQ GWAI Jade
   [oh SIXTY DOLLARS Jade]
52. 3FCT-Pd: oh iyha ta?
   [oh, is that true?] 12
53. 2FCT-Pa: biasané piro?
   [how much is it usually?]
54. 2FCT-Pb: PÈQ-PÈQ-an CIÉ
   [HUNDREDS Older sister]
55. 3FCT-Pd: PÈQ-PÈQ-an, isa gaq kuat mbayar, lèq dianuqno sini isa lima ratós, tuju ratós

11 Kong addresses Amanda in CMI and Amanda answers in the same code (line 44).
12 From this line up to line 60 the Mandarin words used all refer to money.

422
[HUNDREDS, well (!) won’t be able to pay, if it is well here, it can be five hundred, seven hundred (thousand rupiah)]

56. 2FCT-Pb: heqi PÈQ-PÈQ-an
[that’s right HUNDREDS]

57. 3FCT-Pd: YHO gaq mbèlsni, KU
[I won’t ever do it AUNTIE]

58. 2FCT-Pb: itu ngèq China town, mura
[that’s in Chinatown, cheap]

59. 3FCT-Pd: nذاq ada
[None]

60. 2FCT-Pb: LIOK SÈQ GWAI đèqè
[it’s SIXTY DOLLARS]

61. 3FCT-Pd: iyha Melben kan akèh orang cinaé ngèq Hanover ndàq ada
[yeah, there are lots of Chinese in Melbourne while there are none in Hannover]

62. 2FCT-Pb: tapi bukan CONG KWOK REN-è sèng teko Vietnam iku lhó, Vietnam ato apa itu lhó
[but they’re not the CHINESE PEOPLE who came from Vietnam y’know, Vietnam or what is it y’know]

63. 2FCT-Pc: oh iyha heqi
[oh yeah that’s true]

64. 2FCT-Pa: Viêtnam sèng anu, pengungsi
[that Vietnamese who were eh well, refugees]

65. 2FCT-Pe: tapi pengungsinè sèng CONG KWOK REN dadi isa ngomong KWÔ IE, iyha ada sèng isa sampèq dua—
[but those refugees who are CHINESE so (they) can speak Mandarin, yeah there are some that can be two—]

66. 1MCT-P: iyha Viêt Nam kaya
[—yeah the rich Vietnamese]

67. 2FCT-Pb: dulu sèq Veni TI Î JE pigi sana, LIOQ TVÈN, ndàq ada orang TO LU A, sudah totop kabèh, sekarang İK KO LIPAI JIQ DYÈN DA MEN TU GAI\(^{13}\)
[Formerly when Veni went there FOR THE FIRST TIME, SIX O’CLOCK, there were no people on the street, y’know, all were closed, nowadays one week seven days they are all open]

68. 1MCT-P: NA KO, NA KO CONG KWOK REN?
[are they, are they Chinese people?]

69. 2FCT-Pb: CONG KWOQ LAI TEQ
[they come from mainland China]

70. 1MCT-P: CE KO PUK SE LAI MING A?, PU SE ngungsi?
[THEY ARE NOT REFUGEES, ARE THEY? NOT fleeing away from their country?]

71. 2FCT-Pb: iyha DA MEN JYÈN PU pengungsi
[yeah, THEY ARE ALL refugees]

In short, both Titi and Kong are moving along a sequence of unmarked code(s) in this dialogue to specify their interlocutors. The other participants, Indah, Jade and Amanda, employ CMI throughout the interaction.

\(^{13}\) Again Titi speaks to Kong, and she uses a mixture of Mandarin and CMI. Kong answers in Mandarin. It goes on like that until the end of the conversation.
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Conversation Two (Family A): Discussing a solution for house problems

In the extract below, Kong (1MCT) and Mimi (2FCT-Pa) are talking about the problem they have with the tenant of their house. This tenant hasn’t paid rent for years but they cannot evict him because he is a ‘man of power’. Therefore, the participants in this conversation are discussing the possibility of asking for the help of the tenant’s boss who is of a higher rank. For this purpose they have to pay some money. They have consulted people about how much money they would have to pay to ask for that high officer’s help. In the conversation, Kong calls some of these people and Mimi calls her brother-in-law who has been helping them as mediator. Along with the active participants in this conversation there are also the domestics who do not take part in the conversation but serve as ‘passive’ participants.14

The codes used in this dialogue are Mandarin, CMI, and EJM/I (also in lower case bold Times New Roman). There is also a phrase of Foochow in line 17 uttered by Mimi to Kong and a Hokkien word used by Mimi to her bother-in-law (line 45).


---

14 I use pseudonyms in this conversation to protect the identity of people involved in this excerpt.
Appendices

[—Dad, some time ago Swantek called, Darman said that they definitely didn’t want ten million, because Sayoko said how about twenty million, twenty million then he will go to the mosque tomorrow to go and look for Edo’s lawyer, to meet the commander because Edo realized it might not be sincere, y’know it seems not right, they want to use power, the commander’s power so this eviction is not successful. So Edo said he would see what the police officer would do, so if (they) want peace how it is, if you agree with twenty million, twenty million will do, maybe Monday they can give (the money) to that(. ) who is it, ‘koramil’. Maybe if (they) want twenty million, then (they) don’t have to share with ‘koramil’, so there’s peace and the key (of the house) will come. Then if you agree with twenty million, so tomorrow you tell Darman that (you) agree to twenty million, tomorrow he will see them all at the mosque over there, tomorrow night. He will see them at the mosque. Darman said if they agree with twenty million, then ‘peace’ and the key will come, so on Monday, he’ll go to court, so don’t share that five million, OK—]

2. 1MCT-P: yha
3. 2FCT-Pa: iyha?
4. 1MCT-P: heqe
5. 2FCT-Pa: Jadi Swantek SWOQ YA NIE MING DYÈN CAO SANG TA TYÈN HWA KEQ

Darman. NIE KAO SU DA, NIE osol, NIE osol, SE BU SE gééé osol NA KO OL SE DIAO

[So, Swantek said OK, tomorrow afternoon you call Darman. You told him, you suggest, you suggest, not him who suggested that twenty million]

6. 1MCT-P: heqe, TING SIA, TA TYÈN HWA

[OK, later, (I’ll) make a phone call

7. 2FCT-Pa: Yha léq Papa CANG JEN, yha uda HOBING CYÈQ CYÈQ OL SE DIAO, NA MEK PAI I DA CIU BU PIK FEN HONG PAO lho, yha CE KO U DIAO SYÈN CYÈQ SEN I SIA...

[yes, if Papa agrees, well, that’s it ‘peace’ and twenty millions, so on Monday don’t give him a red pocket (tip), OK?, yes for the moment (you) save this five million first]

8. 1MCT-P: iyha
9. 2FCT-Pa: na nèq NIE CANG JEN, DA SWOQ YA MING TYÈN WAN SANG YAO KEN

DA MEN CYÈN MYÈN CAY mesjid NA PÆYÈN.

[and if you agree, he said Ok tomorrow afternoon (he) will see them personally at the mosque there]

10. 1MCT-P: heqe
11. 2FCT-Pa: yha NIE MING TYÈN CAO SANG TA TYÈN HWA-

[yes, tomorrow afternoon you make a phone call]

12. 1MCT-P: DA CE KO Darman TA TYÈN HWA KEQ Swantek

[He, this Darman will call Swantek]

13. 2FCT-Pa: DA TYÈN HWA KEQ Swantek (.) DA CWO DYÈN DA SWOK WO GAN CE

KO JING KWANG HAO SIANG komandan SE ME YEQ YU CAY DA MEN YAO YUNG

SE LIK, SE DE CEKO eksekusi nggak jadi. YUNG SE LIK kan MA FAN. NIE YU I

CANG CE tapi NIE BU NEN KO CO YU SE MOQ YUNG—SEQ DIAO BU PIK CHYANG

LEK, NA I JE CAY pengadilan CHYIANG LEK SE DIAO DA MEN TU PIK YAO, YAO

OL SE DIAO CE ME YANG? NA MEQ WO MING TYÈN SIANG CYÈN DA MEN.

Kaloq NIE OL SE DIAO YAO CYÈN DA MEN, DA MEN YAO HO BING CYÈQ CYÈQ

YOK SE NA LAI NA MEK PAI IK DA BU PIK FEN HONG PAO lho, HOBING CYÈQ

CYÈQ YOK SE NA LAI—

[He called Swantek (.) yesterday he said we saw this police officer like a commander will ask them to use power, so this eviction will be cancelled. Using power is y’know troublesome. You have the documents but you can’t use them, they are useless—ten million (you) don’t need to say anything. Last time at the court (they) already said ten million, they didn’t want to, (they) want twenty million, how is it? So tomorrow I’ll meet them. If you want twenty million, see them, they want ‘peace’, then key comes so Monday he doesn’t need to be given a tip, OK? Peace and the key will come]

14. 1MCT-P: ya NI KAU SU DA—

[yes, you tell him—]

15. 2FCT-Pa: (();)
16. 1MCT-P: DA MEI YHU GAN CIA
[they haven’t seen the house]  
17. 2FCT-Pa: soae DA KEN Swantek DA CIA JYÈN GO NEN DA HAIBA, ING WEI LI MIEN COK DIEN DA YU GAI HWEI KEN DA MEN DE REN, TWE DA CE YANG CIANG, NIE kan pengancara, NIE YEK YHU NA TAO JYÈN LHO, NIE DE JYÈN SUNG KE WO MEN, WO MEN CE KO MEI YHU JYÈN, DA CIU SE SWOQ CE KO HAI CUIN NA MO CIENG A

[The problem is he and Swantek maybe he’s afraid with that price, because yesterday they had meetings with their own men, it’s true they said this 'you are a lawyer, if you have got the money Ok, you give the money to us, we don’t have money'. He said that this naval officer HAS NO MONEY.]

18. 1MCT-P: HAI CUIN GAI GAI—  
[this naval officer—]
19. 2FCT-Pa: CE YANG CE KEN CE KO Darman GAI GO—  
[If that’s so, let this Darman speak—]


[In fact we don’t have money, then Darman also thinks, that commander said after all we don’t allow them to go in, don’t let the eviction take place. So if the commander also interferes, the problem will be more complicated. Towards us he has nothing against us so Darman suggested, he doesn’t know if (they) want to, if you agree then tomorrow he will offer twenty million, (if it’s) possible, if it’s agreed that’s good, (if) not well (I) don’t know. He suggested, he will suggest twenty million, whether they’ll eat that twenty million, (I) also don’t know.]

21. 1MCT-P: DA MEI YHU, MEI YU GAI CIA JYÈN
[He hasn’t, hasn’t mentioned the price yet]
22. 2FCT-Pa: MEI YHU GAI CIA JYÈN, BU KO SE Darman CE CI SIANG, CE ME YANG YAO SE OL SE DIAO, NA MEK WO KEN DA MEN CIANG, 60 NEN YEK DA MEN YAO, YHA GO NEN DA MEN BU YAO. Yha NIE MING TYÈN CAO SANG TA TYÈN HWA KEK Darman

[(they) haven’t yet mentioned the price, but Darman himself thinks what about twenty million, so we can let them speak, maybe if they they want to, well maybe they don’t want to. Well, then tomorrow morning you call Darman]

23. 1MCT-P: TING SIA WO TA TYÈN HWA
[I will call later]
24. 2FCT-Pa: yha? WEN DA NIE osol CE ME YANG NIE cobaq WEN DA, NIE osol CE ME YANG. NIE osol, DA osol OL SE DIAO. OL SE DIAO itu HAI SE osol lho, BU I TING JEN KUNG lho

[OK? Ask him you suggest how is it? You try asking him, if you suggest how is it?. You suggest, he suggested twenty million, that twenty million is only a suggestion, y’know, it’s not yet confirmed, OK?]

25. 1MCT-P: lyha (!) tau BU I TING
[yes (!) know, it’s not confirmed yet]

They went into Kong’s room where the phone is located

On the Phone

26. 1MCT-P: Pak, anu Bapak tadi saya dapet keterangan dari anu Swantek katanya anu ada kasi tambaan untuk perdamaien ya? kalok ada dia ada merasa ada tambahan? nyang dia punya apa
sudah ada suara mau mintak berapa tambahannya? O bukan, iya iya he he ha ha naanti cuma peker yang sepuluh ndak mau kasih dua puluh katanya. Apa sudah ada gambaran? Oh dulu punya yang katanya orang yang wakil siapa ndak ada? bukan bukan Darman (0.3) Ndak gitu yang Bapak yang atur mana yang kekuat yang dia mau bantu sama kita, kita kasih dia. Iya iya iya saya, ya he he he he ha he ha iya he ha he ha hea-hea ya ya hea, ya hea ya (. ) gini iho Pak Joko, ancer-ancer ni ya kita cuma belon tahu ya sebab dia ndak tanya itu sama Darman, dia kalok ada bujak harga jadi kita boleh kurang lebih Pak Joko boleh putusan, saya, saya ha, tapi bukan Darman minta, koq ada wakilnya sapa?, iya, bukan Pak Darman sendiri mintak, Pak Darman dulu mintak seratus juta, itu bukan Darman, bukan Darman. Maka dari ini Bapak sekarang jadi disahakan carik satu jalan tanyak rencana punya bisa bantu kira-kira kasih berapa sama Darman, pertama itu kasih berapa itu ada ...bukan-bbukan, iya, iya , iya iya haha a, ha iya haha....ya ya Waktu itu yang tinggal insinyur orang Amrika, insinyur pabrik gula iya ya (0.5) iya terima kasih Pak.15

[Sir, well Sir just now I got information from well Swantek that well there should be an increase (in the amount of money) for peace, is that right? If that’s so, he thinks there should be an increase. Is there any opinion how much (they) will ask for an increase? Oh no, yes, yeah, he he ha ha later (I) just thought (they) don’t want ten and ask for twenty, it is said. Have (you) had any idea yet? Formerly it is said there was no representative? No, not Darman (0.3) It’s not that, you arrange for those who want to help us with power and we’ll give them. Yes, yes, yep I, yes, he he he he he ha hea hea hea hea hea yes, yes, yes hea hea (. ) It is like this Mr. Joko, this is just an approximation and we don’t know for sure yet because he didn’t ask Darman, if he mentions the price, so we more or less your decision, I, I ha, but it’s not that Darman asked, there’s his deputy, who? Yes it is not Mr Darman himself who asked, Mr. Darman formerly asked for one hundred million, that’s not Darman, not Darman. So that’s why Sir now you try to find a way to plan approximately how much to give to Darman, the first time how much (we) gave, we had ...no, not, yes, yes, yes, ha ha a, ha yes ha ha yes, yes at that time an American engineer lived there, an engineer from the sugar factory yes, yes (0.5) yes thank you Sir]

27. 2FCT-Pa: **CE ME YANG Pa?**16
   [how is it Dad?]
28. 1MCT-P: **NA PYÉN ITU tonggo itu jendral**
   [overthere has a general as their neighbour]
29. 2FCT-Pa: **komandan?**
   [a commander?]
30. 1MCT-P: **komandan (,) anu yang pigi Blitar, besok pulang dia janji ke sini omong, soal dia pangkat tinggi.**
   [a commander (,) well, who went to Blitar, tomorrow he’ll be back and promises to come here to discuss, it’s because he’s a high rank officer]
31. 2FCT-Pa: **heço**
   [yeah]
32. 1MCT-P: **pangkat tinggi, tapi nanti tukar pikiran sama dia, kira-kira**
   [high rank, but then having discussion with him, approximately---]
33. 2FCT-Pa: **YAO DAO TWO SAO JYÉN?**
   [how much money will he ask?]
34. 1MCT-P: **yha?**
   [yes?]
35. 2FCT-Pa: **déqé MING TYÉN YAO CYÉN DA MEN DE REN yha?**
   [tomorrow he’ll meet his people, is that right?]
36. 1MCT-P: **DA MING TYÉN**
   [tomorrow he--]
37. 2FCT-Pa: **yha TAO MESJID CIU CYÉN**
   [yeah to meet at the mosque]
38. 1MCT-P: **mesjid yha, sering ketemu sama ini orang**
   [at mosque, (he) often meets this person]

15 Kong uses broken Indonesian to speak to a ‘mediator’ who is an indigenous Javanese speaker.
16 Mimi asks Kong in Mandarin and the conversation is then held in Mandarin and CMI while Kong uses Malay/Indonesian everytime he refers to the matter discussed on the phone with that ‘mediator’.
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39. 2FCT-Pa: oh CAO SANG CYÊN ketemu CE KO jendral
   [in the morning will meet this general]
40. 1MCT-P: ndak SIA U, SIA U DA TA TAO CE PIÊN
   [no, in late afternoon, afternoon he'll come here]
41. 2FCT-Pa: yha uda
   [well, Ok then]
42. 1MCT-P: Itu orangnya baq sekali
   [that person is very kind]
43. 2FCT-Pa: YAO BU YAO KAU SU Swantek?
   [would you like to tell Swantek?]
44. 1MCT-P: ya bôlé
   [yeah that's fine]
   on the phone: 333-342
45. 2FCT-Pa: Swantek, Tek Papa wès telpon Darman, katané déqé, déqé ada tonggoné itu jendral,
   atasané ato komandané kyak apa gitu, bekas komandan, lang orang ini paginé itu isiq keluar kota,
   ya Bangil, sore baru datang, lang sore déqé Darman mau ngejak orang ini gi sini, ngomong ambëq
   Papa. Papa wès ngomong wès aturen yaq apa ketokané ini, ketokané ini ménangé ndeq kertas toq
   kan, ya Pa? (to her father) cumaq TWO SAO FEN SU-E déqé HAI MEI YHU CHYANG, déqé
   ya nggaq gaq isa omong léqé Tik, hargané piro. Darman, dua pulu (.).hee ndaq tahu, makané itu
   Papa suða setuju ngomong ambëq Darman, comaq déqé mau dateng lagi ambëq jendralé itu,
   komandané itu mbesoq, yha wès yha gitu sèq a yha? S yha KAMSIA $17$
   [Swantik, Tik, Dad has called Darman already, he said his neighbour is a general, whether
   his boss or his commander how’s it, ex-commander, and this person was still out of town
   that morning, yes Bangil, in late afternoon, Darman is going to ask that person to come here,
   to speak to Daddy. Dad has talked to him, well how it should be you take care of it, it seems
   this one, it seems this one wins on the paper only, is that right Dad? (addressing her
   father),only HOW MANY THE FIGURES ARE HE HASN'T MENTIIONED IT
   YET. I think probably he can’t tell Tik how much the price is. Darman, twenty (?) hee I
   don’t know, that’s why Daddy has agreed to speak to Darman, only that he’d like to come
   again with the general, his commander, tomorrow, Ok then, Ok that’s all for today ....OK
   THANK YOU $]

Conversation Three (Family A): Accommodating a guest
The following conversation shows how Kong (1MCT-P) and Mimi (2FCT-Pa) choose
their code to accommodate another participant in the dialogue. In the previous
conversation, more Mandarin was used in order to exclude an unwanted audience from
the conversation. In the following dialogue, Kong and Mimi employ more Malay (CMI)
than they would normally do in order to accommodate their guest. In the following
dialogue Kong and Mimi are showing a house they want to sell to Suni, a real estate
who is a friend of the family. Suni doesn’t speak Mandarin, so the conversation
which involves Suni is held in CMI. The languages in this dialogue are CMI, and a
mixture of Mandarin and CMI.

$17$ Mimi uses CMI to speak to her brother-in-law.
1. 2FCT-Pa: heh sapa sèng jaga?
   [well, who guard (the house)?]
2. 1MCT-P: heh? Belon dateng
   [what? (he) hasn’t come yet]
3. 2FCT-Pa: heh? belon dateng orange, lhó trus? heh? Dikonci (. ) panggil tukang konci lhó, békén konci baru lhó
   [what? The person hasn’t come yet, so then? What? It is locked (.), call a locksmith then, make a new key then]
4. 1MCT-P: iya
   [yes]
5. Suni: lampu-lampu wès diganti Om?
   [Have you changed the lightbulbs, Uncle ?]
4. 1MCT-P: cumaq belon kábè
   [(I) haven’t changed all]
5. 2FCT-Pa: laq lampu mestì ganti kabel yha Pa?
   [do you have to change the light cables too, Dad ?]
6. 1MCT-P: dak
   [No]
7. Suni: kabel ndaq ganti lampu ganti?
   [the cables are not changed, the lightbulbs are changed ?]
8. 1MCT-P: lampu?
   [lightbulbs ?]
9. 2FCT-Pa: bukan kabelé itu suja dua duapulu a?
   [No, are the cables two hundred twenty already ?]
10. 1MCT-P: dua duapulu
    [two hundred twenty]
11. 2FCT-Pa: koq tau Papa? 18
    [how do you know Dad ?]
14. 1MCT-P: wah tadi ujan bocor semua (.) MEI YHU REN MEY Yu SIU LI
    [well it just rained and it leaks everywhere (.), NOBODY’S (LIVES HERE), NO ONE FIXES (things)]
15. 2FCT-Pa: niq dicét titik-titik tros dijual ya Pa? keja apa NIE SIU LI yha abis uang banyaq..
    [later (the house) will be painted here and there then it is to be sold, is that right Dad? what’s the use of YOU FIXING IT (you) spend lots of money]
16. 1MCT-P: dak titik koq (.) cuma dalem MEI YHU SE-MOQ (.) pinggir-pinggir semua (.) sèng-sèng punya ancör semua
    [No, just a little bit( . ) only the inside part, IT’S OK ( . ) all the sides ( . ) the roof and the gutter are all run down]
17. 2FCT-Pa: yha mungkin orang beli ya beli tana toq
    [well maybe people just buy the land]
18. 1MCT-P: iya
    [yes]
19. Suni: ndaq beli ruma, aër ada?
    [not buying the house, is there water?] 19
20. 1MCT-P: aër dak ada, anu ( . ) semór
    [there’s no water, well ( . ) (there’s a well)]
21. 2FCT-Pa: ya babaqno lhó suruh anu ( . ) aër sômór

---

18 From this line up to line 18 the conversation is between Mimi and her father. When Mimi asks in line 11 how her father knows, Kong answers in a mixture of Mandarin and CMI. This kind of interaction happens every time they discuss things between themselves (doesn’t involve Suni).

19 It means whether the house has water installation.
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22. 1MCT-P: WO MEN MAI MAI Sanyo bekas (.) LI MYEN TU MEI YHU SWE bersih bersih pakèq semôr

[WE BUY BUY second hand Sanyo (water-pump) (.) THERE IS NO clean WATER INSIDE]

23. 2FCT-Pa: lhô sômôr? pakèq tangan gini?

[well, the well? using hand like this?]

24. 1MCT-P: dak pakèk—

[No using—]

25. Suni: ada Sanyo? ²⁰

[is there a Sanyo?]

26. 1MCT-P: pakèk Sanyo

[using Sanyo]

27. 2FCT-Pa: ndaq pèkèrè babaqño aë, suru orang sëng mo beli itu suru dèqë óròs lhô

[no, (I) think just let the person who wants to buy the house take care of it, y’know]

28. 1MCT-P: CE GO (.) kotor duà kendaraan CIAO REN CIAU BUANG (.) kotoran (.)

[THIS (.) dirty (we need) two (garbage) trucks TO ASK PEOPLE TO THROW AWAY (.) the garbage]

29. 2FCT-Pa: barang sëng ndaq pakèq-pakèq gitu?

[all these useless things, right?]

30. 1MCT-P: dak pakèk(.).ya rokok(.) kotak rokok aya semacem macem tarô kaya larakan, arêk PAI PAI IK REN CIAU buang , kemarên sama ini ari.

[waste..yes cigarettes (.) cigarette boxes, well all kinds of things (were) thrown here like garbage, ON MONDAY ASK SOMEBODY to throw them away, yesterday and today]

31. Suni: Ada apa CIAQPAI IQ?

[SIS, what’s happening ON MONDAY?]

32. 2FCT-Pa: ngôngkösno orang keja mbuang nó sampa-sampa itu

[paying people to throw away all this garbage]

33. Suni: cecece

[well]

34. 1MCT-P: HEN TO, AN CANG (.) tapi ini kamar bekas Mama dulu

[LOTS OF THEM, SO DIRTY (.) but this used to be Mama’s bedroom]

35. Suni: ada berapa kamar Om?

[how many bedrooms are there Uncle?]}

36. 1MCT-P: LIOK KO, JI KO kamar

[SIX, SEVEN bedrooms]

37. Suni: gedhë ya

[it’s big, isn’t it?]

38. 2FCT-Pa: ndaq tahu pírò BING FANG Pa?

[(I) don’t know how many SQUARE METERS is it Dad?]

39. 1MCT-P: LIOK PAI JI amper pôdô CE KO ruma JA PUTO I YANG tapi DA bangonnan penu

[SIX HUNDRED SEVENTY almost the same as THIS house, MORE OR LESS THE SAME but IT (has) more building]

2FCT-Pa: iyha palêng kalôq jual, jual tana lhô, bangunan orang ya mesti ganti

[yeah, even if it’s sold, it’s only the land, people must rebuild the house]

39. 1MCT-P: Iya, tentu selena kalôq ada orang perusahan mau kerja apa gitu bôlé

[yes, of course except there is a person (or) a company wants to use it for something, it’s OK]

40. 2FCT-Pa: masi kerja apa, apa ndaq dibékén betôl?

²⁰Sanyo is the trademark of a Japanese water pump which then is used to refer to any water pump.
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[even though working (people) isn’t it going to be refurnished?]

41. 1MCT-P: békén betól gampang
   [it’s easy to refurnish]

42. 2FCT-Pa: gampang itu duwéq, memang gampang kabèhé itu gampang nèq punya duwéq
   [easy means money, actually everything is easy if (you) have money]

43. Suni: lyha têpi mungkin ndaq usa diróbónó kabe hêqê yha?
   [yes but probably it’s not necessary to level everything, is it?]

44. 1MCT-P: cumaq itu lhó?
   [only that, y’know?]

47.Suni: bocor-bocor?
   [leaking?]

48. 1MCT-P: kongsléteng (.) KANG JA. (.) KANG JAI (.) bólé NEN-KO bólé BU NEN-KO ING WEI—
   [short circuit (.) JUST NOW (.) JUST NOW (.) it’s Ok IF YOU CAN (.) it’s also OK
   IF YOU CAN’T BECAUSE]

49. 2FCT-Pa: khan berarti kabel léstréké wès ndaq karuan (.) NEN-KO konsltè?
   [it means the electricity cables are already unsafe it CAN CAUSE short-circuit]

50. 1MCT-P: WO YAO CAO tukang lampu préksa
   [I WANT TO CALL an electrician to check]

51. 2FCT-Pa: naq tukang lampu itu lhó (.) dulu Bali ada sitoq (.) JA PUTO PA (.) WAII suru déqé
   ini lho atór ini lhó (.) ini sengkrénqé kan ndaq karuan (.) Bali, suru déqé ngatór (.) 02 JIEN PU
   CE-ME-YANG KWI, kabel semua suru déqé éck waku itu. Ali tahu alamaté (.)
   [if the electrician, y’know (.) formerly there is one in Bali (.) (HE’S) OK PA (.) I ask him this
   y’know, arrange this, y’know (.) the fuse is out of order (.) Bali, ask him to take care (.) HOW
   MUCH ALL OF THEM COST, ask him to check all the wires then. Ali knows his address (.)]

52. 1MCT-P: orangé (.) CE-KO kabel HEN YAO JING (.)
   [the person (.) THESE wires ARE VERY SERIOUS]

53. 2FCT-Pa: kabel HEN YAO JING, NIE kebakaran kabel WAN LEQ lhó (.) naq kabelé dilliaq
   lhó perlu ganti apa—
   [the wires are VERY SERIOUS, YOU burn the wire, all GONE, y’know (.) so you’d
   better check the cable to see whether it needs replacement-]

54. 1MCT-P:--Comaq sekaran makanya CIAO, CIAO anu tukang listrik konsltè YHU MEI
   YHU? (.) ING WEI—CANG JEN
   [only now that’s why CALL, CALL eh an electrician, short-circuit, IS THERE
   ONE? (.) BECAUSE (.) IF YOU AGREE--]

55. 2FCT-Pa:--ini keni mesti liaq kabel keseluruan nèq naq NIE comaq liaq konsltè tòq ya séng
   konsltè tòq didandani, mungkin ngèq sana kabelé keneq tékós (.)
   [this y’know, should inspect the whole wire, if YOU only check the short-circuited one,
   well only that one will be repaired, maybe up there the wire is gnawed by rats]

56.1MCT-P: apa NIE mau jual? ya NIE comaq itu tòq, bikin betól tòq, kaloq mau semua cek ya
   ganti ya mahal
   [do YOU want to sell (the house)? Well, YOU just (repair) that, just repair, if (you) want to
   have all checked, (you have) to replace, (it’s) expensive

57.Suni: iya (.)
   [yes]

58. 1MCT-P: lebih mahal dak tahu ya yang pem-pembeli dak begitu gampang, ya disana banyak
   rumah mau dijual—
   [(when) it’s more expensive I don’t know, it’s not easy to find buyer, yes there are lots of
   houses for sale overthere]
59. 2FCT-Pa: mau dijual—jual itu Meri sudah tanyaq harga, kira-kira LIANG DIAO, itu ada LIANG DIAO seprapat pokojan huk itu masiq bolé ditawar, sebelahé lagi mintaq SAN DIAO
   (for sale—for selling Meri has found out the price, it’s about two million, over there it is 2 and a quarter million, in that corner, still bargainable though, next to it is three millions)
60. Suni: per meter?
   [per meter?]
61. 2FCT-Pa: kira-kira ya sekitar LIANG DIAO lah, ada orang LIANG DIAO mau yha suda HAO CIA JYÈN PA
   [it’s more or less about TWO MILLIONS, if someone agrees to buy TWO MILLIONS that’s A GOOD PRICE already Dad]
62. 1MCT-P: iya
   [yes]
63. 2FCT-Pa: soalé wèké Papa kan pocok, ppocok apa?
   [because yours Dad, is the end, what end?]
64. Suni: saté, tósoq saté ambèq jalan mana?
   [kebab, ‘kebab skewer’21 with which street?]
65. 2FCT-Pa: Flores apa? atau apa? Kalimantan gini tósoq saté gi sana
   [What Flores (street)? or what? This Kalimantan street is like a kebab skewer to that direction]
66. 1MCT-P: sekarang ujan nqa ada banjir, dulu ada, sekarang nqa banjir
   [now (when it) rains, (it’s) not flooded, formerly yes, now no longer flooded]
67. 2FCT-Pa: ya ujanè nqaq keras łeqé, tèq anu ujan terós satu jam suqa nqaq banjir.
   [yes probably it’s no heavy rain, if well (it) rains continuously for one hour, it’s no longer flooded]
68. 1MCT-P: konci semua bagus punya SIU LI HAO LIAO, SIU LI LIANG KO CAI HWAI MIEN, LI MIEN MEI YU SIU LI
   [all the keys are good ones, AFTER FIXING IT’S GOOD, REPAIR TWO (BEDROOMS) OUTSIDE, (YOU DON’T NEED) TO REPAIR (THE ONES) INSIDE]
69. 2FCT-Pa: yha tinggal nantiq dipasarno aé, suru Suni pasarno, TEN PAO-CE LIANG DIAO ntiq liaq orang tawar brapa lhó
   [yes, then ask Suni to market it IN THE NEWSPAPER FOR TWO MILLIONS and we just see how much people will bargain for it]
70. 1MCT-P: iya
   [yes]
71. 2FCT-Pa: nggaq perlu dicèt disèq?
   [isn’t it necessary to have it painted first?]
72. 1MCT-P: dak
   [No]
73. Suni: gaq usa wés
   [it’s not necessary]
74. 1MCT-P: cumaq bersih penteng, mesti tenaga kamar mandi, kamar mesti bersih penteng, keterangan kan bisa liaq ya penteng
   [but (it’s) important to be clean, (we) should clean the bathroom thoroughly, (it’s) important that the bedrooms are clean, the light to see is also important]

(0.10)
75. 2FCT-Pa: Papa catet aërè brapa listriké brapa, ntiq naq ada penagihan apa

---

21 “Kebab skewer” is an expression used to describe the location of a house which is facing a street in such a way that it can be likened to a piece of meat on a skewer end ready to be stuck through. The locals believe that this kind of house brings no luck to the house dwellers.
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[Dad, take notes how much the electricity how much the water, should there be bills coming]

76. 1MCT-P: yha gampang () TYÈN HWA yha DAO IKO, TYÈN HWA YU, DA NA, NA JI [yes, (that’s) easy () TELEPHONE OK (we’ll) ASK FOR ONE, THERE IS A TELEPHONE, HE TOOK IT, TOOK IT AWAY]

77. 2FCT-Pa: mesti-è BU GO I NA lhó [actually, (HE’S) NOT ALLOWED TO TAKE (IT), y’know]

78. 1MCT-P: DA NA JI () isa () CE-ME-YANG? [HE TAKES IT AWAY (he) can () HOW’S IT?]

79. 2FCT-Pa: tapi TYÈN HWA itu punyaqé Telkom lhó [but the TELEPHONE belongs to Telkom22, y’know]

80. 1MCT-P: YU () CE-KO, TAI GAI SE DA NA [THERE’S ONE () THIS, PROBABLY HE TOOK IT AWAY]

81. 2FCT-Pa: TYÈN HWA semua naq pasang kan dikasiqi satu, dari Telkom [TELEPHONE all who install telephone will be supplied with one, from Telkom]

(10)

82. 1MCT-P: TYÈN HWA MEI YU BU YAO pasang I KO, BU HWEI CE KO pembayaran CE ME YANG BU CE TAU? [I DON’T WANT TO install a TELEPHONE, (I) DON’T HAVE THIS payment slip, HOW’S IT (I) DON’T KNOW]

83. 2FCT-Pa: TYÈN HWA? [TELEPHONE?]

84. 1MCT-P: he’eh

85. 2FCT-Pa: masoq BCA aé, ntiq BCA langsóng mbayar [just register with BCA bank, later BCA will pay direct (to them)]

86. 1MCT-P: bukan, ada interlokal ngaq, ngaq tahu [No, whether there’s a long distance call, (we) don’t know]

87. 2FCT-Pa: oh sekarang? oh mina itu, penagihané, ntiq di-PRINT OUT-no [oh now? Oh just ask for that, the bills, later (they) will print them out (for you)]

88. Suni: lhó ñeq orangé belóm bayar piro-piro bulan kayaq apa Om? [well, it the previous tenant hasn’t paid for months what then Uncle?]

89. 1MCT-P: jadi sedikit ya kita baayar, sudah pakéq dia punya nama, kalok dak ak dak mau, pasang baru [so if it’s not much we’ll pay, it’s on his name, if not (you) will not, just install a new one]

90. 2FCT-Pa: lhó Papa perjanjiané kyak apa lhó sama dia? [well Dad how is your agreement with him?]

91. 1MCT-P: daq ada perjanjian [there’s no agreement]

92. 2FCT-Pa: wès díkèq’I PEQ DIAO itu ngaq ada perjanjian?!! [(he) was given A HUNDRED MILLION but still no agreement?!]

93. 1MCT-P: ngaq ada [there’s none]

94. 2FCT-Pa: tunggaqan ini ini harós— [the unpaid bills shoul be—]

95. 1MCT-P: --daq ada, ya serah terima itu tjóq [--None, yeah only the contract for the transfer of occupancy, just that]

96. 2FCT-Pa: ci...u.....

---

22 Telkom is the telecommunication company owned by the Indonesian government.
97. 1MCT-P: CE KO SİEN CAI CE I SE, CE KO NGO MEN YU NA CEKO, panglima U PÂI DIAO CÎEK, DA kuar paleng LIÂNG DIAO, DA deseq sama Darman, peraturan peraturan sudah diputuskan Makamah Agung, YU dulu sudah terima lima juta, ini beli sepuluh juta, berarti ini separuh sudah ambil uangnya, teken dia SİEN CAY CAI NA I PEK DIAO KEI NI, ini sudah luar biasa, iya?

[now this one is like this, we take this one, the commander, take five million, he spent at the most two million, he urged Darman, all the verdicts have been issued by the Supreme Court, there's one, he) has received five million, (he) bought this ten million, it means he has taken half the money, put pressure on him, now he's going going to take another one hundred million from you, this is too much, is that right?

98. Suni: lhó misalé lêq anu-anu listrik apa belôm bayar, kyak apa lêq nómpôq berbulan-bulan?

[well, supposed mm mm the electricity bills aren't paid yet, how is it then if it piles up for months?]

99. 1MCT-P: lêsêtêq sumaq I PAI OL SE

[electricity is only one hundred twenty]

100. 2FCT-Pa: lêsêtêq mungkin ndaq banyak, deqê cuma buat penerangan toq

[electricity might not be too much, he just uses it for light]

101. 1MCT-P: cumaq sidkit

[only a little]

102. Suni: lhó ndaq lêq orangé belôm bayar

[well, no supposed he hasn't paid (the bill)]

103. 1MCT-P: yhå Papa mbayar wong ndaq ada perjanjian, kabêh Papa, wong Papa ya ndaq mau buat perjanjian, ndaq apa-apa katané

[well, Daddy will pay y'know there's no agreement, all is Daddy, y'know Daddy also doesn't want to make agreement, it's alright he said]

104. 1MCT-P: ini uang keci, CE KO () hak pengadilan HAI YU mina uang sedikit () anu ke () ke () anu nya jugaq mintaq YAO mintaq tambahan I DIAO, pengadilan kira-kira () YAO kuar SAN DIAO

[this is small money, this () the right of the court, (they) still ask for some money () well to () to his () well also ask, will ask one million more, the court approximately () (we) will spend three million]

105. 2FCT-Pa: heh? kabêh wès NIE DE JAI JAN NA JUK LAI FEN KER DA MÉN aja!!

[what? Then all wants your money, (why don't you) just take all and distribute it to them all!!]

106. 1MCT-P: iya MÉI YU WAN DA, DA TU SE YU YU bantu orang ya SYEN CAI NGO MEN TU HWAI LIAU CE YANG TO, I TIÊN TIÊN SAO, WO CE KO HAI ME YU JYÈN, NGO SWOK I TIÊN TIÊN MÉI YU JYÈN ya ndaq apa ndaq apa, cumaq saya kasiq osol(...)?

[iyeah, (I) haven't paid him, all of them have helped people Ok now we all have spent all this much, a little less for us (it's ok), we haven't got the money, I say having less money is ok, it's ok I only suggest(?)]

107. 1MCT-P: CE I CE, CE KO, CIU SE anu jendral () Pramono dia pansiun, dari puluhan juta, DA tôrôn tangan banyak.

[this time, this, that is well ...general ...Pramono he is retired, from tens of millions, he directly handled the matter,]

108. 2FCT-Pa: ya NIE kasiq piro?

[yes, how much (do) you give (him)]
Conversation Four (Family B): Giving money to Grandma to buy air ticket

This dialogue, like the others from family B found in this appendix, occurred during a family gathering to celebrate Christmas and New Year. In the following dialogue, there is a main sequence and some side sequences. In the side sequences, there are sub-topics in which the speakers divert from the main topic in the main interaction in order to converse directly with a subset of the participants from the main sequence, before continuing with the main topic again. In all the side sequences, the participants use the unmarked code(s) they share with their interlocutors. The side interaction shows situational code-switching which occurs in the middle of the main interaction. There is usually a change of topic, situation with the coming another speaker but there are no exchanges of marked codes taking place. There are four side sequences within the main interaction, i.e., lines (40a-40f), (52a-52d), (59a-b) and (60a-b). In the dialogue there are instances of sequential unmarked code-switching, code-switching itself as an unmarked code, unmarked and marked code-switching.

The dialogue below took place one afternoon when the speakers were sitting together at the dining table. The main topic is about giving Bobo some money to buy her airplane ticket to Jakarta and each speaker is telling Bobo that they will give Bobo some money for her ticket. Members of three different generations from family B, the first, second and third generations were present. They are Bobo (1FCT), her daughter, Lisa (2FCTa), Lisa’s daughters, Tania (3FCTa) and Jenny (3FCTb) as well as Jon, Bobo’s son-in-law (2MATb). The codes found in the dialogue are CMI, Javanese,
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Javanese mixed with Hakka, EJL, with the Mandarin words for ‘airplane’ and ‘airplane ticket’.

In the main sequence there is a sequence of unmarked code choices performed by Bobo who uses different codes to answer different interlocutors. Her interlocutors address her as discussed in §8.3.1.2 on sequential unmarked code-switching. See the turns with asterisks (lines 36, 50, 54, 62).

12. 3FCTa: Bobo naeq FEICI mari yha?
    [Bobo, you’d better go by plane, OK?]
13. 2FCTa: IKI DI KEQI DUWEQ U’UN, NUMPAQ FEICI tα?
    [this is money given by U’un, how about going by aeroplane?]
14. 3FCTa: naeq FEICI yha? di keqi duweq U’un ini lhő
    [just go by aeroplane, will you? (you) were given money by U’un, you know]
15. 1FCT: naeq FEICI sendili, sendili daq bisa (.) mesti ada yang anu—
    [going by aeroplane alone, alone (I) can’t (.) there should be (one) to—]
16. 2FCTa:—IYO SAK JANGĖ (.) Mama YHO, KWO NYAN KAN HOK HO, OJO LUNGO-
    LUNGO AKU AĖ, HEQ SANG NYIN AKE (.)
    [that’s it actually (.) Mama you know, (.) don’t go travelling (.) even myself (.) I,]
17. 1FCT: leq gitu pegi Surabayata dulu, TAQON MAPAQ AKU AĖ
    [if that’s so, (I’ll) go to Surabaya first, I’ll ask (somebody) to pick me up]
18. 3FCTa: heq
    [OK]
19. 2FCTa: A Giu MOSOQ GELEM MAPAQ, repooqut
    [Uncle doesn’t want to pick (you) up, (he’s) very busy]
20. 3FCTa: ndaq, gini aē lha (.) kan Ayi mo ke Jakarta, A Yi mo ke Jakarta toh?
    iyha le Jong, Ayi mau ke Jakarta yha?
    [No, it’s better this way, I think (.) Auntie is going to Jakarta, isn’t she? Auntie is going to
    Jakarta, right? Is that right Uncle, Auntie is going to Jakarta?]
21. 2MATb: Mana, bentar, Bobo mo ke Jakarta?
    [Mama, later, Bobo wants to go to Jakarta?]
22. 3FCTa:—$$hiya$$ (laughing)
23. 2MATb: iyha terbang
    [yeah, (she’ll go) by plane?]
24. 1FCT: yha pigi aē sana
    [yes, let’s just go there]
25. 2MATb: lhő “pigí aē sana”
    [Oh no! ‘let’s just go there’]
26. 2FCTa: LUNGO TA? LUNGO?
    [will (you) go? Going?]
27. 2MATb: huh hah ha ha. teriket teros aē yha, teriket NGGONÊ
    [laughing> (she) is always bound, you know, bound to her place]
28. 2FCTa: MBOH, TAQON NGETERNÉ ARÊQ-AREQ TA? KON NGETERNÉ GUGUN TOH?
    KON NGETERNÉ GUGUN TA?
    [I don’t know, shall I ask the children to take (you)? I’ll ask Gugun to take you, how about
    that shall (I) ask Gugun to take you?]
29. 3FCTa: Jakarta?, naeq FEICI aē la, iya jangan naeq, jangan naeq kendaraan, jangan naeq
    mobil, naeq FEICI aē, cepet, yha?

---

23 In line 49, there is slip of the tongue in which the speaker says ‘numpakno feici piao’ (go with
aeroplane ticket) when she actually means ‘tuku feici piao’ (buy aeroplane ticket).
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[Jakarta? It’s better to take an aeroplane, yeah don’t take, don’t take vehicles, don’t go by car, just go by aeroplane, (it’s) quick, OK?]

30. 1FCT: heqe
[yeah]

31. 2FCTa: IKI LIHO DIKÈQI DUWÈQ U’UN SITIQ YHO, PAS KANGGO NUMPÀQ FÈICI…
[This you know some money given by U’un, enough for going by AIRPLANE …]

32. 1FCT: heqe
[yeah]

33. 2FCTa: LHÔ GAQ, DI KÈQI U’UN PAS KANGGO KOWÈ TUKU FÈICI BIAO
[Well, no, (it) is given by U’un enough to buy AIRPLANE TICKET]

34. 1FCT: NUMPÀQ FÈICI?
[going by plane?]

35. 2FCTa: HEQE, ENGKÒQ TEKO KONO TAQKÈQNO YHO, TAQGOWO SÈQ TÀ?
[yes, later, when (we) arrive there, (I) give it to (you), OK, shall (I) bring it first?]

36. 1FCT: IYHO GOWOEN DISÈQ **
[yes, take it (with you) first]

37. 2FCTa: OPO KON NGETERNO GUGUN TÀ?
[Should (I ask) Gogo take you?]

38. 1FCT: IYHO, KON NGETERNO GUGUN
[yes, ask Gugun to take (me there]

39. 3FCTb: IKI FÈICI BIAO-È
[This is the AIRPLANE TICKET]

40. 2FCTa: IKI TEPÀQAN DIKÈQI DUWÈQ U’UN, DIKÈQI DUWÈQ U’UN
[well, it so happens that (you) were given money by U’Un, (you) were given money by U’Un]

24. 2MATb: Cik, cik, cik KOWÈ DOYAN DURÈN NGGAQ?
[Elder sister, elder sister, elder sister, do you like durian?]  

40b. 3FCTa: ha ha ha ha

40c. 3FCTb: YHO KEPENGÈN SAQDONGÈ, NGGONÈ Singaraja IKU TUKU GAQ DIGOWO MULIH...
[yeah, actually (I) want to, in Singaraja (we) bought (some) but (we) didn’t take them home…]

40d 2MATb: nantiq siang siang taqpecahnö durèn, tiga suga dimakan mateng itu
[later this afternoon (I) will break the durian (for you), three have been eaten, (they) are ripe]

40e. 3FCTa: iyha giwu he he he
[yes, that’s it he he he]

40f. 2FCTa: WES MATENG TÀ?
[are they ripe already?]

41 2FCTa: TAQKON NGETERNO GUGUN TÀ?, TAQKON NGETERNO GUGUN NGINEP NGGONMU YHO?

24 The first sequence (lines 40a to 40f) involves Lisa, Tania and Jon. Jon comes to the scene and addresses Lisa using Javanese. Lisa answers him using the same code and Tania laughs to acknowledge Jon, so Jon speaks to Tania in CMI, the shared unmarked code between them (line 40d) to acknowledge and include her. In this case Jon switches from using Javanese (line 40a) to using CMI (line 40d) in order to specify or accommodate his addresses/interlocutors. Tania answers Jon in CMI and Lisa in Javanese. This side interaction shows situational code-switching which is happening in the middle of the main interaction. In this side interaction there is a change of topic and situation with the coming of Jon. Although Jon switches from Javanese to CMI to address different interlocutors, there are no exchanges of marked codes taking place here.
[Should (I) ask Gugun to take (you)?, (I)'ll ask Gugun to take you (and) sleep at your place, what y'think?]

42. 1FCT: yho yho yho
   [yes, yes, yes]

43. 2FCTa: KOWE MÉLOQ JENNY YHO MULIH SUROBOYO YHO?
   [will you go with Yenny to Surabaya, will you?]

44. 3FCTb: SAQINI TANGGAL PIRO? MULIH SUROBOYO? YHA?
   [what is the date today? Going back to Surabaya? Yes]

45. 1FCT: yha, yha

46. 2FCTa: MELOQ SUROBOYO YHO OLE TAPI GAQ ONOQ FANBO MA....SAQ IKI FAN BÓ MULIH, MBÖH KAPAN TEKO GAQ ERO AKU...
   [going (with us) to Surabaya is OK too but now no servant Ma, now the servant has gone home, (I) don't know when (she) is coming back I (.)]

47. 2FCTa: NGKÖQ TEKO KONO TAQKON NGETERNO GUGUN TÀ? NUMPAQ FÉICÉ, LEQ MINGGU, MINGGU OPO SETU-SETU NGÖNÖ YHO?
   [later, when we arrive there, should I ask Gugun to take you? To go by air plane, either one Sunday or one Saturday, is that OK?]

48. 3FCTb: YEN-É (.) NGOMONGO DİKÉQI U’UN
   [the money (.) just tell (her) it was given by U’un]

49. 2FCTMoB: heqe YEN-É IKI DİKÉQI U’UN, TAQTUQNO FÉICÉ BİÀO YHO?
   [yeah, this money was given by U’un, shall I by an airplane ticket (with it)?]

50. 1FCT: iyha bawaqen, iyha bawaqen**
   [yes, just take it (with you), yes, just take it (with you)]

51. 2FCTa: TAQTUQNO FÉICÉ BİÀO YHO? YHO PAS KANGGÖ TUKU FÉICÉ BİÀO
   [I’ll buy the airplane ticket (with it), OK? Yes, (it’s) just enough to buy the airplane ticket]

52. 3FCTa: ntıq aku ya ngasiqi Bobo, ndéq Surabaya aé yha?
   [3FCTa: later I also give you (some money) Bobo, better in Surabaya Ok?] (while Tania and Bobo are conversing, in the background Lisa (2FCTa) and Jenny (3FCTb) are talking about something else)

25 52a.2FCTa: NGÉNÉ AÉ GUGUN TAQ HANDPHONE, GAQ OPO-PO TAQGMOMONG KON NGETERNO GÖGÖ OPO LIN
   [HOW ABOUT THIS, (I) WILL CALL GUGUN THROUGH HANDPHONE, I WILL SPEAK, (I) WILL ASK GÖGÖ OR LIN TO TAKE (HER)]

52b 3FCTb: ENGKÖQ AÉ, WES MULIH HE HALAH DI HANDPHONE LA
   [LATER, AFTER (WE) GO HOME, WELL, CALL (HIM) THROUGH HANDPHONE THEN]

52c 2FCTa: IYO YHO TAQTÇELPON SAQIKI
   [yes, yeah, (I) will call (him) now]

52d. 3FCTb: HANDPHONE IKI PULSAÉ LARANG, PULSAÉ LARANG... SÈNG MAMA IKU RUNDINGAN—
   [THIS HANDPHONE, the credit is expensive, the credit is expensive (.) once when Mama was discussing—]

53. 2FCTa:—YHO WES (?), WES KOWE BUDALO KARÖ YENNY YHO?
   [OK(), ALRIGHT YOU JUST GO WITH JENNY, OK?]

54. 1FCT: iyha, iyha bawaq aja,**
   [1FCT: yes, yes, take it (with you) first]

55. 3FCTa: iyha, Tania kasiq Bobo nantiq ndeq Surabaya aé, yha?
   [3FCTa: yes, Tania (will) give Bobo later, (when we’re) in Surabaya, Ok?]

25 The second side sequence (52a-52d) is another example of situational code-switching with a different topic and different participants from those involved in the main interaction. Lisa is talking to Jenny in Javanese (their shared unmarked code). They are talking about Lisa’s wish to call her son using Jenny’s mobile phone to which Jenny declines. This second side interaction is taking place while in the main interaction Tania is telling Bobo that she is going to give Bobo some money too.
56. 1FCT: iyha, yha
    [Yes, yeah]

57 2FCTa: SAQIKI AKU GAQ DUWÉ FAN BÔ Ma!
    [now I don’t have servant Ma!]

58. 1FCT: IYO FANÉ CANG TO SÉSŌQ? MÔ FANBÔ?
    [1FCT: yes, tomorrow is Moslem New Year, isn’t it? no servant?]

59. 2FCTa: FANÉ CANG FAN BÔ-È MÔLÉ
    [2FCTa: moslem new year the servant has gone home]

In the background:

26 59a. 2MATb: WAYAÉ MANGAN
    [it’s time for dinner]

59.b 2FCTa: SAQIKI?, LIOQ TYÈN PAN, MANGAN ÀE SEMBARANG
    [RIGHT NOW?, SIX THIRTY, JUST EAT ANYTHING]

27 60a. 1FCT: OPO KOWÉ YHO PULANG?
    [1FCT: do you also go home?]

60b. 3FCTa: iyha, Tom sama Rina
    [3FCTa: yes, Tom and Rina]

61. 2FCTa: DADI DUWÉQÉ IKI TAQGOWO MÔLÉ SUROBOYO YHO, NGGO TUKU FÈIÇI BIAO,
    NUMPAQO FÈIÇI BIAO, NGKOQ TAQKHON NGETERNÔ GÔGÔ OPO LÍN YHO?
    [so I will bring this money going home to Surabaya for buying airplane ticket, go by
    airplane ticket, later (I) will ask Gogo or Lin to take you Ok?]

62. 1FCT: iyha yha bawaq ajaq! (in a stressed tone)
    [yes, yeah just take it (with you)!]

(silence)

Conversation Five (Family B): Discouraging Grandma from traveling to Jakarta

In this conversation, most of the speakers are trying to discourage Bobo from travelling to Jakarta. At the time of the conversation, Bobo was 90 years old and needed somebody to constantly look after her. The time of her proposed travel was Moslem

26 The third side sequence (lines 59a-b) involves Filip who comes to the scene and reminds Lisa, his wife, that's it's time for dinner. They both converse in Javanese with Lisa using Mandarin for time reference. Lisa uses a different pair of codes to speak to Bobo and Filip. In line (59) she uses Hakka and Javanese to speak to Bobo, then in line (59b) she uses a mixture of Javanese and Mandarin to answer Filip. Although Lisa code-switches between different pairs of codes from one interlocutor to another there are no marked switches taking place here.

27 The fourth side interaction (60a-b) is between Tania and Bobo. In line (59) Lisa tells Bobo that she has no maidservant because they have gone home. Lisa speaks in Hakka but uses the Javanese word ‘muleh’ for ‘going home’. When Bobo asks Tania (line 60a) whether she is going home, Bobo speaks in Javanese, the marked code, in the first part of the question but uses the Malay word ‘pulang’ ‘going home’ in the last part of her question. Tania answers in CMI, the unmarked code they share. It seems that the first part of Bobo’s question is influenced by Lisa’s Javanese word ‘MÔLÉ ‘going home’. Thus, Bobo uses Javanese in her question to Tania before she quickly switches to the Malay word ‘pulang’ ‘going home’ to finish off her sentence and refrain from using the Javanese ‘MÔLÉ’ used previously by Lisa. It’s worthy to note how Bobo is very conscious of the code she shares with her interlocutor and once again indicates that she accommodates her interlocutors with her code choices. It also proves the point that a speaker exercises mental awareness in her code choice practices.
New Year (*Idul Fitri*), and this being the case all the servants would have gone home and there would be noone to provide her with the care she needed. Thus, people are trying to make Bobo realize her predicament if she is to stay home alone in Jakarta. Amongst the speakers, only Tania supports Bobo’s wishes to go to Jakarta. She argues vehemently against the audience by gliding along the continuum of Malay codes shared between all the participants.

In this dialogue, there are ten participants from three different generations, i.e., Bobo (1FCT), Lisa (2FCTa), Ani (2FCTb), Filip (2MATa), Jon (2MATb), Tania (3FCTa), Jenny (3FCTb), Tom (3MATa), Gugun (3MCTc) and one other relative (R). The codes involved in the dialogue are Standard Indonesian, CMI, EJI, Javanese, Hakka and a few Mandarin words.

The following dialogue starts with Lisa and Ani talking to Bobo while Tania (3FCTa) just listens to them and laughs. In the lines that follow each participant either tries to address Bobo, or argues with another participant, and each generally uses the unmarked code choice they share with their intended addressee. An exception to this generalisation might be Tania’s use of CMI or EJI with participants like Lisa, her mother, with whom Tania usually converses in Javanese.

45. 3FCTb: *naeq bis dlapan jam*
   [going by bus takes eight hours]
46. 2FCTa: *IHA IYHO COBO MAMAH ND=i KUWAT, IKI MASI NGÉNÉ SÉNG MBALÉQ NGONO AKÉH LHO MA, MBALÉQ JAKARTA*
   [that’s right, c’mon (I think) Mamah can’t stand that long, y’know Mam there are lots of people going back, going back to Jakarta]
47. 3FCTb: *IYHO MANGKANE*
   [yes, that’s why]
48. 2FCTa: *SÉNG MARI, MARI KUPAT LAGÈQ ISA MBALÉQ TOH, GAQ KIRO KUWAT DÉQÉ*
   [those who are able to go back (to Jakarta) only after ‘kupat’ 28, (I don’t think she’s strong enough)]
49. 2FCTb: *WONG BOBO PENGEN NJOPOQ BARANGÉ, APÉ NJOPOQ BARANGÉ*
   [of course Bobo wants to collect (her) things, (she) wants to collect (her) things]
50. 2FCTa: *BARANG OPO SÉ MA, MAH? BARANG OPO!? KOQ KOYOQ BARANG OPO!*
   [what kind of things Ma, Mother? What things!? As if what (important) things!]
51. 3FCTa: <$$...$$> (laughing)
52. 1FCT: *pelu prëksa mataa! matai ini!*
   [(I) need to have my eyes checked! These eyes!]
53. 2FCTa: Bobo *déwëg kepëngén pulang, KI OPO Æ ONOQ…*
   [Bobo, herself wants to go home, *THAT’S WHY THERE’S ALWAYS SOMETHING…*]
54. 1FCT: *pëngén ambëq kaca mataa!*
   [(I) just want to take my eye-glasses]
55. 2FCTa: *NEI WES MBALÉQ JAKARTA, MBALÉQ MALANG NÈH GAQ?*

---

28 ‘Kupat’ is a dish eaten on the seventh day after the Moslem New Year (Idul Fitri). It especially marks the end of the recommended six-day *Syawal* fasting after having celebrated *Idul-Fitr*. 

440
Appendices

56. 1FCt: Lhô liaq dulu toh, gapang dëah!
    [Well, (I’ll) see first y’know, no problem, Ok?!]

57. 2FCtB: "Ilhô liaq dulu", MBALEQ OPA ORA TOH MA KOWÈ? KOWÈ EMOH TO NÈQ MALANG? EMOH TO? GAQ COCOQ?
    [What, (I’ll) see first, ARE YOU COMING BACK OR NOT MOTHER, DON’T YOU LIKE IT IN MALANG? (YOU) DON’T LIKE IT? NOT TO YOUR LIKING?]

58. 1FCt: ndaq yha, ndaqé gitu!
    (it) isn’t that, not like that]

59. 2FCtA: LHA IYHO, KOWÈ LËQ NGOMONG NGGAQ YHO NGGAQ, NGOMONG IYHO YHO IYHO
    [that’s why, if you say No means No, say Yes means yes]

60. 3FCtB: gi sana ya? nggaq kan?
    [are you going there? (that’s not true), is it?]

61. 1FCt: ndaq ya, ndaq apa-apा
    [if (I’m) not (going), (that also) doesn’t matter]

62. 2FCtA: LËQ NGÔNÒ SOPO ÑÈNG FUK SE?
    [If that’s so (you’re going), who will look after (you)?]

63. 1FCt: mau bisa, gampang, mau bisa!
    [(if I want to (I) can, not a problem, (if I) want to (I) can]

64. 2FCtA: ANQ NYIN FUK CONG MA, ANQ NYIN FUK CONG, ÑÈNG FUK SE KOWÈ SOPO?
    [NO ONE TO LOOK AFTER YOU MOM, NO ONE TO LOOK AFTER YOU, who will LOOK AFTER YOU?]

65. 2FCtB: KABÈ NGOMONGAMBÈQ KOWÈ “MESTI MBALIQ MBALIQ”, SAQIKI NGOMONG GAQ, AKU ÑÈNG >SÌU SÌÈ MA (.).MO (.).M (.)< (in a loud and angry voice)
    [all speak with you (that you) will go back surely will go back, now (you say) no, I am (who is) >ASHAMED MOM (.).No (.).N (.).k.]

66. 1FCt: >ndaq apa-pa!! <
    >[it’s OK!!!<]

67. 3FCtA: Iq. Iq. WONG TWEQIq. yhāa, yhāa
    [Auntie, Auntie, AN ELDERLY PERSON, Auntie, (please y’remember)]

68. 3FCtA: Bobò, Bôbò ini soqalé kan dëqè MERASAŞ (.).MERASAŞ JAKARTA ITU RUMAHNYA, ndaq boèlè, ndaq boèlè dipeksa ++29
    [Bobo, Bobo, this is because she FEELS (.). FEELS JAKARTA IS HER HOME, please don’t, please don’t force (her)]

69. 2FCtA: Wah, WONG TWEQAE, LHA DËQÈ NÈQ AMÈ NANG JAKARTA OPO AÈ ONOQ, SÈNG BARANGÈ NING NDI. AKU GAQ PATIO SEQ. IYHO, YHO, YHO BARANG OPO TAQ TAKOQI, OBAT MOTO ha ha aha ha
    [Wow, just an elderly person, you know if she wants to go to Jakarta, there is always anything, be it her things somewhere, I am not too sure, yes, yeah, yes what kind of things I asked (her), eye drop he he he

70. 1FCt: ndaq ini mata (.). sering sakét mata ini
    [No, these eyes (.). these eyes are often sore]

71. 3MATA: ndèq sini aè Bô, yha? (.)
    [just stay here Bo, OK? (.)]

72. 2FCtA: CIU SEQ SWÉ AMÈ TEKO, SEN MING-È KARÈQ PIRO SÈ?
    [Almost Ninety years old, how much longer more is left at her time (age) ?]

++29 Lines with asterisks (68, 79, 84, 92 and 126) show how Tania uses a variety of different codes in trying to get her message across to different members of the multigenerational audience. Basically Tania repeats more or less the same thing in different codes: “don’t force Bobo as she is old already”.
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73. 3FCTa: *nțiq pulang Jakarta ndaq mbaléq ya?* (to her Auntie) *lq. (.)Jakarta, ndaq bole (.)* [later when (you) go back to Jakarta, (you) are not coming back, right? (to her Auntie) Auntie, (.)Jakarta, please don’t (.)]

74. 1FCT: *ndaq nantiq anu tapi Yenny taqkasiq ini, ndaq apa-pa, sering lhó taqkérémí—* [no, later uh but I gave Jenny this, it’s OK, I often send (something to her)]

75. 3FCTb: *-arák (.),laq gitu* [-Chinese wine.]

75b. 2FCTb: *CHONG TAU KI SE? CHONG TAU KI SIEN CHON KI SE? NYI CHONG TO KI SIEN CHON, CHONG TAO KI SIEN CHON WA?* [until when (will you) look after (him)? will you look after him until he’s gone first? You look after him until he’s gone first, (will you) look after him until he’s gone first?]

75c. 1FCT: *CHONG TO NGAI KON M TO, YU DA CHONG TO NGAI SIEN CHON, kaloq aku CHONG TO NGAI KON M TO ya suda, kaloq saya masiq liat, denger kasan* [(I) look after him until I don’t see, see him until I die, if I look after him until I can’t see so that’s it, if I still can see, hear, (I) pity him]

76. 2FCTb: *NDÉQ OMAH KEJU* [*she’s bored at home *]

77. 1FCT: *gampang dah nțiq bisa baliq* [it’s easy, you know, then (I) can go back]

78 2FCTb: *Lina (.), NGAI OZanter (.), kulaqan ndeq YÉQ JEN* [Lina (.) I will take (.) buy things (.) at Jakarta]

79. 2FCTb: *- sóqale Bobo tu MERASA YÉQ JEN itu rumae, ojoq dipaksa wès** [3FCTa- (it is) because Bobo FEELS JAKARTA is her home, please don’t force (her), OK?]

80. 3FCTa: *NGOMONG AMBÈQ MAK YEM D=ÉQÈ KEPÉNGÉN NDELOQ MALANG, KEPÉNGÉN NDELOQ SUROBOYO, KEPÉNGÉN MBALIQ JAKARTA, WÈS BAKALAN gaq isa MBALIQ MENEH, jadi ojoq dipaksa* [she told Mak Yem that she wanted to see Malang, wanted to see Surabaya, wanted to go back to Jakarta, (she) is not going to be able to go back again, so don’t force (her)]

81. 2FCTb: *NGOMONG NGONO?* [did (she) say that?]

82. 3FCTa: *heqè* [yeah]

83. 2FCTb: *LHA GAÈ OPO?* ((un intelligible))

84.3FCTa: *yha ndaq lah namané ORANG YA SUDAH TUA kepéngén liaq SEBELUM, SEBELUM mbaliq KERUMAH BAPAK *** [well, it’s not that, let’s say a very old person wants to see before before going back to the Father’s home]

85. 2MATb: *tap ndeq Jakarta itu ada rumah dèwèqan itu* [but in Jakarta she’s home alone]

86. 3MATa: *Iha iyla* [well, that’s it]

87. 3FCTa: *tapi, kita ndaq isa maksa Tom* [but, we can’t force (her) Tom]

88. 3MCTc: *nèq ada apa-apa tu, ndaq ada orang tau, ndaq ada orang ndaq, apa-pa dèwèq, apa-pa dèwèq, ndaq ada orang lho, apalagi?* [if something happens, nobody knows, for sure no one is there, (she does) everything herself, (she does) everything herself, no one is there, you know, so what?]

89. 2FCTa: *memangé aku YHO tau keadaané Gun*
[That’s true, I also know the situation (there) Gun]
90. 2FCtb: NÉNG KÉNÉ MANGAN YHO MANGAN ONOQ SEMBARANGÉ
[overhere, (she) can eat, everything is provided]
91. 2FCta: YHO MANGKAQNO
[yeah, that’s the reason]
92. 3FCTa: iyha TAPITKATAN BATINNYA ITU, JAKARTA ITU RUMAHNYA, gitu lho, kita ndaq bisa maksap**
[yeah, but his heart attachment, Jakarta is her home, like that y’know, we can’t force (her)]
93. 3MATa: Tania, kamu ni mbéla sapa sé Tan?
[Tania, on whose side are you Tan?]
94. 3FCTa: lhó AKU INI NETRAL, TENGAH, TENGAH
[well, I am neutral, in the middle, in the middle]
95. 2FCtb: LHO TRÓS LEQ NÉNG JAKARTA SOPO SÉNG NGÒRÓS?
[So, then, if in Jakarta who will look after (her)?]
96. 3FCTa: yha, kita pasrahno ambéq AGiu sama Giu Mé
[yes, we put her in the charge of Uncle and Auntie]
97. 2MATa: lhó (...saqari-ari? AKU MYANG KONO... DÉWÉQAN LAWANGÉ TÔTOP
[what (.) in the daily basis? I went there (.) (she was) alone, the door is closed]
98. 3FCTa: lhá tapi—
[well, but—]
99. (( ))
100. 2FCtb: AKU NGÉNÉ DÉWÉQAN ( )
[as for me, I am alone ( )]
101. 2MATa: mo kontrolé
[(she) wants to check out]
102. 2FCTa: kontrol apa? WONG WÉS TUWÉQ YHO TRIMO AÉ
[what to control? Of course (she’s) old already, (she should just) accept that]
103. 3FCTa: déqé (.) maksudé Giu Mé itu—
[She (.) what she wants is that Auntie—
(( )) for a few moments everybody was talking with their own code (unidentifiable)
104. 2MATb: pendirianné déqé ndaq tēga tinggal Kebon Kacang
[her principle is that she doesn’t have the heart to leave Kebon Kacang]
105. 2FCtb: PAPÆ DINA YHO GAQ TAU SAYANG DÉQÉ NGÓNó LHO, ndaq perna sayang
déqé koq, díñqoq terós
[DINA’S FATHER NEVER CARES FOR HER, Y’KNOW, never cares for her, y’know, (she) is
always scolded]
106. 2FCtb: ndeq sini diopéni baq-baq, makan, tidór, [istirahat, diajaq omong-omong ,
[overhere (she) is well taken care of for, eating, sleeping, [resting, being kept company]
107. 2FCTa: 
[díñqoq terós]
[(she) is always scolded ]
108. 2FCtb: SÉQ GAQ GELEM DÉQÉ
[still she doesn’t want (it)]
109. 2FCta: lhá ia
[well, that’s it]
110. 3MATa: SPULANG JAKARTA BANYAK UNJUK RASA BÔS
[Going home to Jakarta there are a lot of demonstration, Grandma ha ha ha ha]
111. 2FCta: MANGKAQNO
[that’s why]
112. 3FCtb: TAPIT KELILING, JALAN-JALAN ITU séng MEMBUAT SEMANGAT HIDUP
DIA,
[BUT, TRAVELING AROUND, SIGHTSEEING, that’s what GIVES HER THE SPIRIT
OF LIFE]
113. Relative: lhá DISINI MAU KELÉLÉNG MANA?
[well, OVERHERE, WHERE CAN (she) GO?]
114. 3MATa: keléléngi kompleks ini
In short, the dialogue shows how the participants make use of their code choice for various purposes. These include participating actively in the conversation as well as representing themselves and their views in appropriate terms to different audience members.
Conversation Six (Family B): Finding a carer to look after Grandma

The following dialogue displays an intergenerational interaction involving Bobo (1FCT), Ani (2FCTb), Lisa (2FCTa), Jenny (3FCTb) and Tania (3FCTa). Thus, it is a three-generational interaction. The codes used are Javanese, Hakka, EJI and CMI. All the participants are talking about finding a servant to look after Bobo. However, Bobo insists that she is the one who will look after her grown up son, which makes others concerned.

148. 2FCTa: LHA IYHO, NÉNG KÉNÉ YHO MO, YHO APÉ DIAPAGNo?
[Well, y’know, in here (she) also doesn’t want to, what can (we) do?]

149. 3FCTa: MAKANÝA (.) DARIPADA (.) DARIPADA nyesel yha, laq aku ndaq MAU MEMBUAT ORANG nyesel oq
[that’s why (.) better (.) better than regretting well, if me (I) don’t want to make one regretful, y’know]

150. 2FCTa: CUMAQE PIYÉ TAN? LÉQ NÉNG OMAH RAQ ONO SÉNG NGÓRÓS
[BUT HOW IS IT TAN, IF AT HOME THERE IS NO ONE TAKING CARE (OF HER)]

151. 3FCTb: ada FAN BÓ-né lhó
[3FCTb: there is (HER) MAID SERVANT, y’know]

152. 1FCT: PIYÉ? bisa cariq FAN BÓ KON TEN.. YU.*30
[1FCT: HOW’s IT, (we) can look for A SERVANT TO LOOK AFTER (ME). THERE IS ONE]

153. 2FCTb: FAN BÓ SAQIKI COMAQ ANYI ANYI YO MA? IK HA JUI CHON, IK HA JUI CHON MA

154. 2FCTa: [LHÓ GAQ, AMBÉQAN GAQ KÉNÉQ GAQ KENDO DI-drol KADANG-KADANG YU MOLOI,
[Well no, and also (they) can’t, (they) can’t be-counted on, sometimes (they) don’t come,]

155. 1FCT: tapi skarang MO LEK KWO NYAN YU YAK YUGAMPANG
[but now it’s not New Year, (you) want (them), (you) get them, easy]

156. 2FCTb:= OJQOQ MUNI gampang MA, KOWÉ BOLAOQ-BALÉQ MO FAN BÓ, koq gampang-gampang , NYI MÉ İSE MO FAN BÓ NGÓNÓ LHO, FAN BÓ SE SONG ÕI CHON JUI CHON, SE SONG ÔI CHON JUI CHON= 
[=Don’t say ‘easy’ Ma, you evry now and then have no servant, how could you say ‘easy easy’, everytime (you have) no servants, you know that, a servant if (she) wants to go home, (she) just goes home, every time (she) wants they want to go home, (she) just goes home=]

157. 2FCTa: WONG PAPAÉ EVI, WONG ONOQ BOJONÉ LHÔ, ONOQ-ONOQ--
[well, of course, Evi’s Dad, of course he has his wife y’know, he has, he has--]

158. 2FCTb:=MAMA MÉKÉRÉ, GAQ TÉGO, NGRAWAT SAKUN
[=Mother is worried, (she) doesn’t have the heart, taking care of Sakun]

159. 2FCTa: SAKUN ONOQ BOJONÉ NĐEQ KONÓ LHÔ MA
[Sakun has his wife over there, y’know Mom]

160. 1FCT: bòjóné gila, wong gaq nggena gitu

30 Bobo is trying to answer all her interlocutors by combining the key words of all the different codes used by her various interlocutors (Javanese, Malay/Indonesian, Hakka, Mandarin/Hakka).
Conversation Seven (Family B): Advising Grandma not to worry too much

Bobo (1FCT) is worrying about her son too much and wants to look after him. The other participants in the conversation are trying to make her see that she should not feel like this, since Sakun is grown up and has his own family, wife and children. The participants are Bobo, Lisa (2FCTa), Ani (2FCTb), Jenny (3FCTb) and Tania (3FCTa) and the conversation takes place at Ani’s house. The codes employed in the dialogue are CMI, EJI, Javanese, Hakka and a mixture of Javanese and Hakka.
[HOW COULD YOU LOOK AFTER SAKUN, YOU YOURSELF ASK TO BE LOOKED AFTER]

176. 1FCT: *bukan NGOPÉNI dia ya (.) cumaq ya (.) jaga dia NGÓNÓ LHÓ*
   [it’s not LOOKING AFTER him yeah (.) only yeah (.) watch over him, JUST THAT Y’KNOW]

177. 2FCTa:-*LEQ MBIYÈN AKA PERCOYO, ISO NYUCIQNO BAJUNÉ DÈQÈ, ISO NGGOSEQNO BAJUNÉ DÈQÈ, LHA SAQIKI NQI ISQ?*
   [*IF IN THE PAST, I BELIEVE (IT), (YOU) COULD WASH HIS CLOTHES, (YOU) COULD IRON HIS CLOTHES, WHAT ABOUT NOW HOW COULD (YOU)?*]

178. 3FCTa: Bo, orang suda besar ndaq usa DIOJPÉNI, Bo, bisa NGOPÉNI awaqè déwèq suda
   [Bo, grown-ups need not TO BE LOOKED AFTER, Bo, (they) can LOOK AFTER themselves already]

179. 1FCT: huh huh huh dia isa sendiri, bisa, liaq ndaq apa-pa
   [huh huh huh he can do (it) himself, (he) can, just see that’s OK]

180. 3FCTa: iyha wès ojqo diopèni
   [yes, c’mon don’t look after him]

181. 2FCTb: *KENÈ PALÈNG RONG ULAN MESTI NJALOQ MULIH, MESTI LANG MULIH*
   [in here (she will stay) at the most two months (she) always asks to go home, always directly goes home]

181.3FCTb: ndaq, tapi janjinè tiga bulan, wong di Karang Asem palêng saqmìnggu mintaq mbaléq Kebun Kacang koq
   [no, her promise is three months, y’know in Karang Asem (she stays) at the most one week (and she) asks to go back to Kebun Kacang]

182.?  

183.2FCTb: ngomong Mama—
   [say Mother—]  

184.1FCT:—*A YI yha mau tahu? ini yha Amin, dia bilang kaloq Sakun itu nèq sđa tua bagèmana masanya tua, rumanya nyang mau békèn betol lotèng dibangön, bawa diganti lès tègel, kan suda békèn betol dikotak kotak kamar, kost, panggíl anak anak*
   [Auntie, yes (you) want to know? This Amin y’know, he said if Sakun is old how’s his old age, his house is to be renovated, multi-storeyed house is built, the floor is refurbished with tiled floor, being divided into rooms, boarding room, for boarders]

185.2FCTb: *LHA SAQIKI békèn betol rôma, NÝI NA NÉSAT JU A? LEQ OMÀH DIBONGKAR KOWÉ NÝI NA NÉSAT JUP?*
   [well NOW the house (is being) renovated, WHERE WILL YOU STAY? IF THE HOUSE IS BEING RENOVATED WHERE WILL YOU STAY?]

1FCT: *PITY gampang bò, Bobo JU (.) gampang, Mama tinggal gampang lha, M SE YU LÍ LA, cariq (.) kaloq ini suda jadi rôma suda anu ada yang ato, Mama pinda, jangan sampèq mbèsoq (.) leq Tuhan taq (.) kaloq suda ada kos rôma ini, isa buat pengasilan (.)*
   [how’s it? easy, you know, Bobo live (.) easy, it’s easy where I live, DON’T WORRY, looking for (.) if this house is ready, already eh there’s somebody taking care of, Mother will move, don’t wait until later (.) if God I (.) if this house has boarders, it can earn money (.)]

186.3FCTb: kan ada anaqè Bò, ada Esty*
   [Isn’t there his kid Grandma, there’s Esty]

187.2FCTa: *HEQE SAKUN ANAQÈ AKÈH LHÔ, ANAQÈ TEL- PAPAT LHÔ*
   [yeah Sakun has many children, y’know, he has thr-four, y’know]

188.3FCTa: TIGA
   [three]

189.1FCT: *yaqapa, tangan satu mana bisa ikót orang lagi?*
   [how’s it, one hand how can he work for other people again?]

190.2FCTb: *ANAQÈ GAQ GELEM NGOPÉNI TA ANAQÈ?*
   [Isn’t his kid willing to look after him, his kid?]

191.1FCT: ha?
2.2FCTb: *ANAQÉ! M MOI KI A?*
[his kid! doesn’t his kid want him?]

1.1FCT: *anaké? jangan diharep dah*
[his kid? Don’t ever hope for that]

1.4. 2FCTb: *LHA KOWÉ, KOWÉ GELEM KON TEN TAU KI SE WA A?, NYI CHONG TAU KI SE?*
[AND YOU, UNTIL WHEN ARE YOU WILLING TO TAKE CARE OF HIM? UNTIL WHEN WILL YOU LOOK AFTER HIM?]

186: All: ha ha ha ha ha huh

[until when (will you) look after (him)? will you look after him until he’s gone first? You look after him until he’s gone first, (will you) look after him until he’s gone first?]

188.1FCT: CHONG TO NGAI KON M TO, YU DA CHONG TO NGAI SIEN CHON, kaloo aku CHONG TO NGAI KON M TO ya suda, kaloo saya masi liat, denger kasian
[(I) look after him until I don’t see, see him until I die, IF I look after him until I can’t see so that’s it, if I still can see, hear, (I) pity him]

for him]

196.2FCTa: *repot Mamah, repot*

[2FCTa: (it’s) difficult, Mama, (it’s) difficult]

197.3FCTa: BO, A GIU ITU PUNYA ANAK, ITU NANTIQ(.) [PUNYA ISTRI ITU TANGGUNG JAWABNYA ISTRI SAMA—
[Grandma, Uncle has kids, that will be(.)[he has a wife it is the responsibility of (his) wife and--

201. 3FCTb: [punya BÔJO]

[(he) has a spouse

202. 3FCTa:—ANAK-ANAKNYA, gitu lhó Bó, Bóbó wès bóq mikiri
[--his children, like that y’know Grandma c’mon don’t worry (about it)]

203.1FCT: *anak tiga, anak tiga tu ndaq ada harapan dah*
[three children, those three children can’t be accounted for]

204. 3FCTa: *iya Bóbó bóq mikiri, suda biar, heqe*
[yes Grandma don’t worry (about it), let it be, OK]

205. 2FCTa: *leq ndaq ada harapan, yha amé diapaqno, wès nasibé dêqê*
[if (they) can’t be accounted for, well what can be done, it’s his fate already]

206. 1FCT: JADI, BIARPUN SAYA SUDA ndaq liaq, SAYA SUDA TRIMA SAMA TUHAN,
SUDA PULANG SURGA, BEBAS, SUDA ndaq meker
[So, even though I don’t see (him) anymore, I’ve accepted that from the Lord, I have gone home to heaven, free, (I) haven’t been worried (about it)]

207. 3FCTa: *kan ada A Giu, A Mè, kan A Giu Sakun selama ini kan ya kerjasama sama A Giu, A Mè*

[isn’t there Uncle? Auntie, Hasn’t Uncle Sakun so far been working together with Uncle, Auntie?]

208. 1FCT: A Giu, A Mè?

[Uncle, Auntie?]?

209. 3FCTa: *yha itu TANGGUNG JAWABNYA A Giu A Mè jugaq*
[yes, that’s Uncle and Auntie’s responsibility too]

210. 1FCT:—kaloo saya bilang gini gini A Giu lantas marah “MAMA IKI OJOQ MIKIRI, kan mosoq tau nêq Sakun gini gini, ndaq dianu anterno pulang, jangan to, ndaq (.).Bobo disuru tinggal di anu ...Karang Baru, Bóbó ndaq mau, bukan sana ndaq terima, Bobo ndaq mau, saya bilang, “sunda totop ruma sini aé, gitu “, Bobo sendiri ndaq mau, sampêq
ini Kuku marah, “Mama KI gitu, NGKOQ saya dimarahi Didi31”, gaq mau, ndaq mau ditunggoni, bukan marahi, Didi ndaq apa-pa, Didi ndaq marah. (~) Mama (~) perluné disini apa mau SE NYÈN gitu, kalóq Sakun ndaq pulang (~) taqmarahi dia, ndaq berani lagi (~)."

[if I say something like this Uncle then gets upset “MOTHER DON’T YOU WORRY”, you don’t know if Sakun is like that, not eh taken home, please don’t be like that”, no...Bobo was asked to stay at eh (~) Karang Baru, Bobo didn’t want to, not because they didn’t accept (me), Bobo didn’t want to, I said, “OK, close this house” like that, Bobo herself didn’t want to, until Auntie got angry, “Mama, YOU”, like that “THEN I’ll be scolded by Teddy”, “(I) didn’t want to, didn’t want to be waited on, it’s not scolding, Teddy is OK, Teddy isn’t angry” (~) why Mama (~) wants to be here? It’s to be sure if Sakun doesn’t go home (~) I will scold him, (he) dares not do that again (~).”]

211. 2FCTa: Sakun OPO WEĐI MBÈQ KOWÉ TO MA?, MOSOQ SAKUN WEĐI MBÈQ KOWÉ TA?

[Is Sakun afraid of you Mom? Is Sakun really afraid of you?]

212. All: he he he ha ha

213. 1FCT: YHO?

[yes?]

214. 2FCTa: Sakun WI NGAİ A?

[Is Sakun afraid of you?] 

215. ALL: he he he

216. 2FCTa: Sakun E WI NGAİ? M DYÈN DO TO E TIEN MA BO, Sakun koq WI NGAİ A?

[Sakun, is he afraid of you? If he is, he didn’t marry that crazy woman, Sakun isn’t afraid of you, y’know]

217. All: he he he

218. 1FCT: BETÔL, DYÈN M WI NGAİ, tapi sêq hati saya ni ndaq tega, biarpun ya ya ya SUDA NASIBNYA DIA deh, MEMANG ANAK se-TUJU SEMUA genah, DIA SENDIRI daq genah, ya MEMANG NASIBNYA TERUTAMA kaloq kawin orang genah ndaq sampeq gitu. Papa sunda dibilangi “Lha, Sakun sekarang Papa sakêt gini, laên kali ndaq bisa liäqno, SEKARANG SAVA BILANG ya, BOJO mu tinggal, Esty ngopêni, kasiq ongkos buat makan apa, lu jadi yang betôle yang baeq, jadi Papa anu SUDAH TENANG, ndaq mikiri. “Ya, ya Pa, ya ya”. Maq ya ya toq koq, ndaq usah apa-pa dah, SAKIT KERAS itu, seneng suru pigi kasiq tau satu-satu (~) kasiq tahu satu satu.

[That’s right, he’s not afraid of me, but I don’t have the heart, although that’s yes, yeah, IT’S ALREADY HIS FATE, that’s right, ALL THE-SEVEN children are good and proper, ONLY HE isn’t good and proper yes, that’s HIS FATE especially if he married a good person he wouldn’t be like that. Dad has been told “well, of course Sakun, now Papa is sick like this, next time I can watch over you, NOW I SAY OK? Leave your SPOUSE, (let) Esty look after you, give her money for daily needs, you should be a good person, so Dad uh is IN PEACE, not worrying about you. “yes, yes Dad, yes”, Only yes yes y’know, no need for anything OK, gravely ill then, (he) liked to go telling one by one (~) telling one by one]

219. 2FCTa: wès gaq isa ngikutí aku modélé

[well, I can’t really follow (her) way of thinking]

220. 1FCT: ya, tunggu ya, itu saudara (~) JADI SEMUA YA—

[yes, wait please, all brothers and sisters...all become established OK—]

221. 2FCTa:—ndaq MOK AN HAO LAO, LAO, SIN GÜ, [KIÖK MOLIK CIO TAO NGAİ, NGAİ ya ndak seneng CIO TO...NGAİ ya ndaq seneng

[~no, DON’T OFTEN GO SIGHT-SEEING, IT’S DIFFICULT (YOUR) FEET ARE NOT STRONG, I GO, I also don’t like, I also don’t like going out]

31 Grandma cannot pronounce the English word ‘Daddy’. It seems that her granddaughter addresses her father (Grandma’s son who lives in Jakarta) as ‘Daddy’. I suspect this family kinship term has been influenced by English kinship terms.
222. 1FCT: [sukaq-sukaq CIO TAO NGAI ke greja nêq bisa ya pigi, nđaq bisa [[ya diruma

[as (I) like, I GO to church if (I) can, well (I) go, if (I)
can’t, [[then just stay at home

223. 2FCTa: [[ha iyho
[[so that’s it

224. 1FCT: [greja itu ada yang jempot ada yang anter
[at church there are (people) who pick up who drop off]

225. 2FCTa: [kakiq, lêq nđaq kuat...
[the legs, if (they) are not strong (.)

226. 3MATb: Bo, noleò, lha
[Grandma, please turn around, pec ke boo]

227. 3FCTa: le Djong, ORANG TUA(.).
[Uncle, old person]

228. 2MATb: hmmm...

Once again in this dialogue, all participants are exploiting their multilinguality to take part in the conversation and contribute to the ongoing interaction.

Conversation Eight (Family B): Jon’s giving advice to Grandma

In the following dialogue Jon (2MATb) is giving advise to Bobo (1FCT) who is worrying about her sons. He suggests that Bobo prays for her sons so that God will look after them. The participants in the dialogue are Bobo, Jon, Tania (3FCT), Lisa (2FCTa), Ani (2FCTb) and Gugun (3MCTc). The codes found in this dialogue are CMI, EJI, Javanese, and Hakka. Hakka and Mandarin are employed only when Jon directly addresses Bobo. All the participants use at least some CMI, but for some it is a marked code choice (as between Jon and Bobo) while for others it is an unmarked code choice. Although Hakka is used between Bobo and Jon, it is seen in the dialogue that Tania participates actively by supporting Jon which indicates that she understands perfectly what Jon says to Bobo. (Hakka is one of the codes in Tania’s passive repertoire).

229. 2MATb: iyha suru PAN NYÊN ndèq sana
[yeah, let (her stay) half a year over there]

230. 3FCTa: iyha nđaq apa-apa
[yes, that’s OK]

231. 2FCTa: ha, BÊN NGERTI UWONG-UWONG
[well, so others will understand]

232. 1FCT: iyha Mama pulang dulu,
[OK Mama is going home first,]

233. 2MATb: iyha MING NYÊN pulang
[yes, tomorrow (you) go home]

234. 1FCT:=Mama pulang dulu, Mama ada ada ini barang keci, keci gini, gini la mesiq banyak,
taqliaq-liaq sampêq satu bulan, dua bulan nđaq apa-pa, nantiq mau sini gampang dah,
musi baliq sini lagi, kan ndaq lama, yha musi kan baliq sini lagi, sebab Mama IKI ya () sudah ómórnya suja cokop, ntiq kapan-kapan panggil Tuhan ndaq tahu. Tapi, tapi satu kali saya mikir, ya memang ada sini panggil Tuhan ya baqy ya, cumaq ya kasian itu tuh seng ndeq Jakarta, yha?=(she is saying the last sentence with a lump in her throat)

=[Mama will go home first, Mama has these small things, these small (things), these(things) are still plenty, I will consider up to one month, two months it’s OK, later if I want to come back here, it’s easy, surely (I) will come back here, not long, surely (I) will come back here again, because Mama yeah…I am old already, when I will die (I) don’t know. But, but, once I think, well it’s OK if I die here, but I pity those who are in Jakarta, y’know?= (she is saying the last sentence with a lump in her throat)]

235. 2MATb: SONG TI DOI TE LIONG CAK I TING, Tuhan yang peliara mereka

[God will look after them both, God will look after them]

236. 3FCTa: Iya betul Bó

[that’s right Grandma]

237. 2MATb: orang tua itu ya, cintanya ndaq ilang terós, itu suđa ómóm, yha, tapi keadaané Mama ini laén, Mama tinggal ndeq Kebón Kacang, A Gù Kebón Kacang ITU MEMANG SUĐA LAMA MAU KELUAR, MAU MENGHINDARI ndaq mau kómpol mbq Mama, ITU SUĐA LAMA, aku wés krungun () kebetulan, éntqó berkari titíq, éntqó pinjeman dari Taiwan, beli rumah Karang Asem terós mencolot, ini ditengan, disuru Pantu seng ngguru, kan saqno gini ni () lha Mama gaq ngerti taqkeqi ngerti sekarang ()

[y’know parents’ love never fades, that’s natural, OK, but Mama’s situation is different, Mama lives in Kebon Kacang, that Uncle (from) Kebon Kacang HAS BEEN LONGING TO LEAVE HOME, (HE) WANTS TO AVOID living with Mama, IT HAS BEEN FOR A LONG TIME, I have heard that () it so happens they are blessed with some money borrowed from Taiwan, bought the house in Karang Asem then went out, (that’s) left behind under a servant’s care, well that’s pitiful () well Mama doesn’t understand so I Make her understand ()]

238 2FCTa: heqé, BÈN NGERTI SÀQIKI

[yeah, so (she’ll) understand now]

239. 2MATb: $ ihya tohS?

[$ isn’t that right $?]

240. 2FCTa: IYHO, BËNER, DIKEQI NGERTI AMBÈQAN GAQ DIUROS UROS UWONG, ENKQOQ LAQ ONOQ OPO OPO, ANAQ SÈNG DICELA

[yes, that’s right, (she’s) made understood moreover (we) won’t be rebuked by people, if something happens, the children are going to be rebuked]

241. 2MATb: iyho

[yes]

242. 2FCTa: PÉKÈRÈ MOSOQ WONG TUWÈQ KYOK NGÒÑÒ DITINGGAL KABÈH, LHA ITHA ANAQ PITU

[(people) will think “how could someone leave such an old lady all alone (at home)”, c’mon (she has) seven children]32

243. 2MATb: MESAQNO ANAQ LHO, NING KEBUN KACANG IKU, KAPAN IKU AKU NGGOLÈQI KUNCINÈ () ditaruq ndeq sini, tok tok,

[IT’S PITUFL FOR THE CHILDREN, LAST TIME AT KEBUN KACANG I WAS LOOKING FOR THE HOUSE KEY () it is placed here, knock, knock,]

244. 2FCTa: lha iya, lha iya anak tuju

[c’mon, c’mon seven children]

245. 3FCTa: yha Bo yha, wés tinggal ndeq [Surabaya, apa tinggal ndeq Malang, gitu aè yha?

[OK grandma, OK, just live in Surabaya, or in Malang, what y’think, Ok?]

32 Among the Chinese and Javanese, it is customary for elderly persons to live at their children’s home and for children to look after their old parents. If children did not behave in this fashion, people would gossip and brand the children as having no piety towards the parents. In Chinese culture, it is primarily the eldest son’s obligation to look after his old parents.
246. 1FCT:  

[iuya  
yeah]

247. 2MATb: kangen Jakarta ya pulang saqbulan  
(if you) miss Jakarta, just go home (there) for a month]

248. 3FCTa: iya pulang sebenar (. . .) niq baliq Malang lagi, baliq Surabaya  
[yeah, just go home for a while (. . .) then go back to Malang, to Surabaya]

249. 2FCTa: tapi pulang pulangKO yêu a tahu lhó ORANG ORANG ITU SEMUA KERJA,  
pokok ada ketika gitu lho, mereka bukan--  
[however, even (you) go home (there) YOU should know, ALL OF THEM WORK, what’s  
important (they) have time y’know, they are not--]

250. 2MATb:--merekas uisq wés keluar rumah séng lakiq, putu-putu wés géghé (. . .) terbang  
kaqèh  
[--early in the morning they leave home already, the gentlemens, the grandchildren have all  
grown-up (. . .) they all left already]

251. 2FCTa: SOKÈLE KABÉH YO KERJO—  
[because everybody works--]

252. 3MCTc:--masalahé pulang pergi Jakarta-Surabaya, Jakarta Malang—  
[--the problem is commuting Jakarta-Surabaya, Jakarta-Malang--]

253. 2FCTa: --wong déqé kuat tá?  
[--do y’think she’s that strong?]

254. 3MCTc: kondisi fisiqé?  
[her physical condition?]

255. 2MATb: ya cumaq semasa séq kuat gaq POPO lah mbéuq lèq gaq kepengen ya laén kata  
yà, sekarang séq isa ya biar terbang àe suèq, yha?  
[well, when she’s still strong, that’s ALRIGHT, in the future if she has no more wishes (to  
go), that’s another matter, at present while (she) can still (go), let her fly, what y’think?]

256. 1FCT: yha  
[yes]

257. 3FCTa: niq laq ndaq kuat ya ndaq mintaq, wésan  
[Later when she has no more strength, she won’t ask]

258. 2MATb: he he he  

259. 2FCTa: BOBO IKA NJALUQ NANG Taiwan  
[y’know Grandma wants to go to Taiwan]

260. 3FCTa: Itu berarti misiq kuat  
[it means (she’s) still strong]

261. 2FCTa and 2MATb: ha ha ha  

262. 3FCTa: yha Bo?  
[isn’t that right Grandma?]  

263. 1FCT: yha Puji Tuhan semua, kuat lah seperti Mama dah, karna omor tinggi tiaggi besar dah  
[well, praise the Lord all (you) will be as strong as Mama, because of high and big age]

264. 3FCTa: iyha Bo yha?  
[OK Grandma, is that right?]  

265. 2MATb: makané yha, Mama MI AMBU, DOI KI TING KI TAU KAU, SONG TI, SAKUN  
AMIN TE LIONG CAK M KOI, SIN SAK SING SANG-SONG TI FI KOI, M TE LIONG  
CAK M FI KOI, SONG TI M CUK FUK. HE KI LIONG CAK FI KOI SONG TIE CUK FUK,  
MAMA NGE M SEI, SONG TI WOI ON BAI KIT IING IN CAK YA!  
[= that’s why Mama, EVERY NIGHT, HELP THEM BY PRAYING, GOD, SAKUN,  
AMIN IF BOTH OF THEM CHANGE, BELIEVE IT, GOD WILL BLESS THEM,  
IF THEY DON’T CHANGE, GOD DOESN’T BLESS THEM. IF BOTH OF THEM  
CHANGE, GOD BLESSES THEM, MAMA, YOU DON’T WORRY, GOD WILL  
TAKE CARE OF THEM, OK!]=

33 Bobo means to say “ having long life and healthy”.
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266.3FCTa: iyha betól, Bó
[that’s right, Grandma]
267.1FCT: iyha memang
[that’s really so]
268. 2MATb: Kaloq dua orang itu ndaq FI KOI, SONG TI ndaq CUK FUK.
[If both of them don’t CHANGE, GOD won’t BLESS THEM]
269. 3FCTa: iya betól Bó (.).
[that’s right, Grandma]
270.2MATb: saya bilang doakan anaq-anaq dua itu, biar bertobat, kalóq ndaq, hidup mereka ndaq karuan, kalóq suda bertobat, sudalah Tuhan yang peliara mereka, M SE-SEI, JANGAN KUATIR (.)
[2MATb: I say, pray for both of them so they will realize their mistake, if not, their life isn’t in order, if they have, don’t worry, God will take care of them (.). DON’T WORRY, DON’T WORRY (.)]
271.3FCTa: iyha-
[yes]
272.1FCT:- suda ngeriti
[(I) understand (that) already]
273.2FCTa: Mamaé, Papá Dewi, Iha wong Papá Dewi anaké, yah dia nèq isiq omor-omor lima puluh lebi, enem puluh lebi isiq isa ngeliaoqné, omor semblan puluh Mama
[Dewi’s Mom, Dewi’s Dad, well of course Dewi’s Dad is her son, well if he’s still fifty or more, sixty or more, (she) can still take care of (him), mother is ninety years of age]
274. 3FCTa: Bobo, ya orang tua jugaq ngeliaoq anak tapi terbatas Bo, paling cumaq berapa (.)
[jam toq,
[Grandma, y’know parents are also concerned about children but it’s limited Grandma, the most is (.). for several hours,]
275.1FCT: iyha
[yes]
276.3FCTa: Bobo scrahno sama Tuhan, Tuhan jaga dua puluh empat jam, setiap hari dijaga—
[Grandma just surrender (them) to God, God will take care of (them) for twenty four hours, (they) will be watched over everyday--
277. 2MATb: --ehm--
278.3FCTa:--iya? jadi Bobo ndaq usah kuatir
[--OK? So Grandma doesn’t need to worry]
279.2MATb: YANG PENTING Bobo doakan, TUAI KAU RUAT ANAK-ANAKNYA YHA?
[-the most important thing is Grandma pray (for them), pray for the children, OK?]
280.1FCT: yha
281.3FCTa: yha Bo?
[is that right Grandma?]
282. 2FCTa: IYHO NĐEQ OMAH SANTAI NGÔNÔ, LÈQ MISALÉ NING BINTARO GAO ONOQ FAN BO, DÈWÈQAN INTIL-INTIL, SAKUN LUNGO, KABÈH LUNGO, LÈQ ÒNO OPÔ-OPÔ?
[yes, at home relaxed like that, if let’s say in Bintaro no SERVANT, all alone, Sakui goes out, all go out, if something happened?]
283.2MATb: NÈQ, NÈQ, SOÇAL ANU LUNGO GAO POPO, takóté dèwèqan trós,
[ (. ) tibò pan swie
[If, if because (everyone) is gone, it’s OK, the problem is (she is) alone, then
[ (. ) fall down half paralyzed
284.2FCTa: [Iha iyha dèwèqan laq ada apa-apa trós kyak apa?
[that’s why all alone, if something happens how’s it then?]
285. 2FCTb: AKU NYAMBANGI MAMA YHO, NÈQ Njerô DÈWÈQAN IKU NÐEQ BINTARO, TÈK O TÈK O TÈK TV-NE MÔRÔP
[y’know I visited Mother, she was all alone inside (the house) at Bintaro, knock, knock, the television was on]
The dialogue above shows how the subjects can use a variety of code choices to directly specify their addressee or just to ‘insinuate’ their messages by ignoring the addressee and attending to the audience instead. It also shows how one’s choice might be triggered by the other participants’ code choices.

**Conversation Nine (family B): Discussing and advising Grandma**

In this dialogue there are six participants, only five of whom are actively engaged in the conversation: Lisa (2FCTa), Ani (2FCTb), Tania (3FCTa), Jenny (3FCTb) and Gugun (3MCTc). Bobo (1FCT) remains silent. As Gugun is the main interactant, the code he uses is CMI. The other participants are switching between codes and use the code to indicate who their intended addressee is. The codes found in this dialogue are CMI, EJI, Javanese, English and some Mandarin words.

**Sequential account of what’s happening:**

The conversation starts with Tania and Gugun talking to each other about Bobo and then Gugun addresses Bobo to confirm that what he says is true, but there is no answer from Bobo. Then in line (4) Lisa comments on what Tania said in the previous line using CMI for the first half of the sentence and finishing it off in Javanese. When Gugun is about to tell Bobo about the advantages for the elderly of travelling by airplane, Lisa cuts in by saying in Javanese that it is forbidden (line 6). To this Ani responds in line (7) by recounting her experience of being ‘warned’ by an airline crew to take the responsibility of travelling for an elderly person. Lisa and Ani then go on to discuss the ‘danger’ of travelling in both Javanese and CMI (line 8-11). In line (12), Gugun advises Bobo just to stay put at home or just to travel to places close by in order to live long. When Ani mentions that Bobo’s thought is with her son Sakun, once again Gugun advises Bobo not to worry about Sakun (line 14, 15, 17) using CMI. Then Lisa, Gugun and Jenny go on discussing Bobo (18-29) using CMI. Yet, in line (23) Jenny uses English which then is answered by Tania who shares with them all the reason why Bobo wishes to travel to Jakarta in English and CMI (line 30). Tania used English because she didn’t want Bobo to know that she knew her reason for wanting to go to Jakarta. Gugun and Jenny acknowledge Tania’s information in CMI and Javanese respectively, the codes each of them share with Tania.

1.3FCTa: laén, orang tua itu laén

[(it’s) different, elderly people are different]
2. MCTc: secara psikologis tu orang itu ngoyot ndeq tempat seng dia seneng, lebih seneng ndeq tempat dia, buat apa jalan-jalan (.) ya Bo, iyha to?!
[psychologically, a person is rooted at the place he likes, (he) prefers (it) at his own place, why traveling around (.) right Grandma, is that right?]
3. FCTa: lhó ndaq, Bobo itu kan punya tradisi, CONGKWOK tradisi
[well no, Bobo still has tradition, the CHINESE tradition]
4. FCTa: leq kuat badan YHO GAQ PO PO
[jif the body is still strong, THAT'S OK]
5. MCTc: Bobo naeq FEICí yha kena tekanan itu gaq baéq, omor kurang –
[Bobo goes BY AIRPLANE, well, being exposed to the pressure is not good, (her) age is not enough--]
6. FCTa:—GAQ ÉNTUQ LHÓ, LÉQ WÉS OMOR PAQ SEQ SWÉ, IKU WÉS DILARANG SAQDONGÉ NUMPAQ FEICí
[—it’s not allowed, y’know when (one) is 80 YEARS OLD already, it’s actually forbidden to go BY AIRPLANE]
7. FCTb: IYHO AKU DIONOMGI “tangung sendiri lhó Buk” “iyha sava yang nanggung”
[THAT’S RIGHT, I WAS TOLD” your own responsibility, Ma’am” “yes, that’s my responsibility”]
8. FCTa: FÉICí IKU UDPARANÉ HAMPA AMPÉQ KAN MEĐUN IKU SEEET NGONO, IKU LÉQ JANTONG GAQ KUAT IKU ISO POTOS
[the air on the AIRPLANE is a vacuum and also if it (the pressure) is going down like that, if (one’s) heart is not strong, (it) might stop]
9. FCTb: MAKANÉ PÉKÉREN AHÓ
[that’s why, please give it a consideration]
10. FCTa: masi orang muda leq jantongé gaq sehat numpaq FEICí gaq gampang lhó
[even young people, if their hearts are not healthy, going by PLANE is not easy, y’know]
11. FCTb: aku dionomgi “tangung jawab sendiri lhó Buq sama Mam, Mamanya” “lhó iyha wong mama savá”
[I was told “you are responsible for your mo, your mother, Ma’am” “yes of course, she’s my mother”, isn’t she]
12. MCTc: he Bo, Bo, Bobo seneng-seneng ndeq sini aé, jalan-jalan ndeq deket-deket sini, omor lebi panjang, ya Bo?
[he, Bo, Bo, Bobo please be happy here, traveling around here, (you’ll) live longer, OK Bo?]
13. FCTb: pékerané ndeq Sakun
[her thought is with Sakun]
14. MCTc: ah, ndaq usah dipékér Bo
[c’mon, don’t (you) worry, too much Bo]
(0.4)
15. MCTc: Bo, Bo, Bo, A Giu Sakun itu gaq usah dipékér Bo, dèqé itu ya gaq mikiri Bobo, mikiri Bobo? Mikiri Dian anaqé yha ndaq Bo.
[Bo, Bo, Bo, that Uncle Sakun, don’t worry about him Bo, he also doesn’t care about you, (you think) he worries about Bobo? (he) doesn’t even worry about his own kid, Bo]
16. FCTa: IYHO GAQ TAU MIKIRI
[yes, (he) never worries (about them)]
17. MCTc: mikiri laén aé Bo
[please just worry about other things Bo]
18. FCTa: prasaku koq Bobo mèkiri Sakun itu gaq terlalu
[In my opinion, Bobo is not worrying too much over Sakun]
19. MCTc: Gaq cocoq
[that’s not right]
20. FCTa: gaq terlalu ya an, gaq terlalu
[not really, y’know, not really]
21. 3FCTb: wong deket aja gaq diórós dulú séq mudané
   [even when they were near to each other she didn’t care about him when she was young]
22. 2FCTa: lagi sekarang wés tuwéq
   [let alone now, she is old already]
23. 3FCTb: IT’S ONLY THE REASON, THAT’S HER REASON
   [that’s only her excuse, that’s her excuse]
24. 2FCTa: dulú séq enomé bebas, sekarang wés tuwéq
   [when she was young, she was free, now (she’s) old already]
25. 3MCTc: secara psikologis itu déqé terikat ndéq sana
   [psychologically she is bound there]
26. 3FCTb: bukan, aku bilang ini déqé sukaq jalan-jalan
   [no, I say she likes traveling]
27. 2FCTa: heqe íya seneng jalan-jalan
   [that’s right, yes (she) likes traveling]
28. 3FCTb: semangat idopé itu tinggi
   [she has a strong spirit for life]
29. 2FCTa: heqe semangat idopé itu misiq tinggi, isiq kepengen kayak orang muda itu lhó, séq
   pengen pìqi-pìqi, pengen gi mana, tapi ya gaq apa-apa leq memang fisiké kuat ya gaq apa-apa.
   Leq isiq kuat gaq apa-apa
   [that’s right, her spirit for life is still strong, she still wants to be like young people, y’know,
    still likes traveling, wishes to go somewhere, but it’s Ok if she is still physically fit. If
    (she’s) still fit, that’s OK]
30. 3FCTa: DON’T SAY THAT, wong I HEARD FROM Mak Yah Y’KNOW SHE SAID
    SOMETHING ABOUT YAH VISITING HERE AND VISITING SURABAYA AND THEN
    RETURNING TO JAKARTA. THEN SHE WON’T COME BACK TO (.), SHE WON’T BE
    ABLE TO COME BACK. Ini (.) aku ndaq mau membuat orang menyesel itu ya gitu. Taqékér wés biarno
    laq—

   [Don’t say that, of course I heard from Mak Yah you know she said something about visiting
    here and visiting Surabaya and then returning to Jakarta. Then she won’t come back, she won’t be able
    to come back. This (. ) I don’t want to make people regret, that’s why. (I) think, well let it be if—]
31. 2FCTb: [hmm
32. 3MCTc: [gitu?
   [is that so?]
33. 3FCTb: [NGÔNÔ TÀ?
   [is that so?]

Other short conversations within both families

Most of the following short extracts are taken from longer conversations. Each one is
discussed in turn below.

Family A

Extract 1: Discussing banking
The following interaction takes place in CMI between Mimi (2FCT-Pa) and her sister
Titi (2FCT-Pb). Notice how they use Malay/Indonesian personal pronouns kamu and
aku 'you' and 'I' as well as the Hokkien word Lu meaning 'you'. As they are talking about banking, some borrowed English words are used.

1. 2FCT-Pa: LU diparani Guntur yha
   [Guntur came to you, didn’t he]
2. 2FCT-Pb: iya
   [yes]
3. 2FCT-Pa: dikèqi formulir yha
   [(you) were given a form, weren’t you]
4. 2FCT-Pb: lha LU kan wès taqbilangi
   [I told you already]
5. 2FCT-Pa: wès taqbilangi (.) lho arèqé ke Co-saqbelómé gi AKU wès gi LU
   [(I) told you (.) you know they boy went to Co-before coming to ME he already went to you]
6. 2FCT-Pb: oh gitu
   [oh, that’s the case]
7. 2FCT-Pa: dadı—
   [so—]
8. 2FCT-Pb:—AKU sèq baru gi KAMU
   [—ME first then went to YOU]
9. 2FCT-Pa: eh gi KAMU—“laq KAMU boq gi Jalan Slamet”, “saya tadi sudah pergi, tadi Ibnu Titik nya semah” “Kapek” naqqitugnu
   [eh, (he) went to YOU—‘YOU don’t go to Jalan Slamet’,”I went there already, and Bu Titik was going to the gym” “Serve (you ) right”, (I) told him.]
10. 2FCT-Pb: he he he
11. 2FCT-Pa: “KAMU ndaq usah gi sana, nantiq Ibnu Titik yang (.) ” nggaq PERSONAL itu lhó,
    opo BANKING gaq boleh ndèq situ soqalé aku ndaq perna nomboq-nomboq, jadi
    AKU mesti ngantir skarang ndaq dikèqi aër minóm
    [“YOU don’t need to go there, later Bu Titik who (.) ” no PERSONAL, you know, what is it
    BANKING, can’t be there anymore because I never deposit more money, so I should queue up
    now, no more drinking water supplied]
12. 2FCT-Pb: oh ndaq PRIORITY itu tâ sèng masoq kamar
    [oh, not anymore is PRIORITY the one that is in a private cubicle]
13. 2FCT-Pa: iya masoq kamar itu PERSONAL BANKING
    [Yes, coming inside a cubicle is PERSONAL BANKING]

Extract 2: Chatting while preparing dinner
The following example is from a conversation between Indah (2FAT-Pd) and her
daughter, Amanda (3FCT-Pd), held in CMI, but with a loaned English word ‘chatting’
and Javanese word ‘la opo’ ‘what for’ or ‘why’ borrowed and inserted in the sentence.
The only Chinese element in this dialogue is the use of the Foochow kinship term Ku
‘auntie’ in line (4) to refer to Mimi.

1. 2FAT-Pd: angelëni Alda (.) CHATTING mbèq Alda (.) sèq, sèq taq tanyaqnu
   [waiting for Alda (.) CHATTING with Alda ()wait, wait (I) will ask]
2. 3FCT-Pd: wès lhó Ma (.) Ma ini lhó Ma, gosong lhó
   [ already Ma (.) Ma look Ma, it is burnt, you see]
3. 2FAT-Pd: Laila ndaq ngomong ambèq Alda lèq mbésōq aè ta? mbésōq lusa, he?
   [Laila, you are not talking to Alda if it is better tomorrow? The day after tomorrow, hi?
4. 3FCT-Pd: LA OPO ngomong? ndaq meloq aku pigi Trawas Ma, males aku, aku mo
   diajaq makan mbèq Ku_Mimi
Appendices

[WHY, should (l) ask? I am not coming to Trawas, I don’t feel like going, I am going to dinner with Auntie Mi]

Extract 3: Making a plan to go to Malang

Similar patterns of code choice also exist in the interaction between aunt and niece. The next example is from an interaction between Mimi (2FCT-Pa) and Amanda (3FCT-Pd). The conversation is conducted in CMI. Mimi is the one who starts the conversation. In line (9) Mimi uses the originally-Fukkien second personal pronoun lu 'you' to address Amanda, while in the previous turns, there were no personal pronouns used.

1. 2FCT-Pa: Jadi pigi Malang tå?
   [Are (we) going?]
2. 3FCT-Pd: Ndaq tahu ntvq leq misalé Mita sido nginep sini yha
   [I don’t know later if for example Mita definitely decides to stay overnight here]
3. 2FCT-Pa: Iha opoqo koq sido ndak sido, tergantung apa?
   [why is it definite and not definite, what does it depend on?]
4. 3FCT-Pd: Kq onoq seng ngenburo, nginep sini, padahal baju wè sèq sini
   [if there is (someone) to take her here, stay overnight here, actually her clothes are here]
5. 2FCT-Pa: Iho seng ngenburo, jempôtèn sian Iho
   [why (someone) to take her here, (you) can pick her up, you know]
6. 3FCT-Pd: Iho sekarang déqé ndaq onoq ndéq ruma
   [you know, now she is not at home]
7. 2FCT-Pa: lagì mana?
   [so how is it?]
8. 3FCT-Pd: ndaq tau ambèq koncoè dèwèq
   [(l) don’t know (she) is with her own friend]
9. 2FCT-Pa: Iho gq saq kelas ambèq LU?
   [oh, (she) is not in one class with YOU?]
10. 3FCT-Pd: ndaq
    [no]

Extract 4: Winter clothing

The following conversation is held in CMI with some German words when Mimi (2FCT-Pa) tries to explain about clothing worn in winter time. The conversation took place before Mimi and Indah (2FAT-Pd) went shopping together and were waiting for Amanda, Indah’s daughter to join them.

1. 2FCT-Pa: iki ngentènl Amanda
   [This is waiting for Amanda]
2. 2FAT-Pd: oh Amanda-é gq méloq, Amanda itu pakéq Pakde lès (0.2) Ivana, mungkin léq déqé dateng Pakde taqsuru gi Ogan, léqé, trus Amanda méloq kita? ndaq?
   [oh Amanda is not coming, Amanda is with Pakdé (the driver) taking course at Ivana., maybe if she comes, (l) will ask Pakdé to go to Ogan, then is Amanda coming with us? No?]
3. 2FCT-Pa: Ndaq tahu
   [(l) don’t know]
4. 2FAT-Pd: CIE, Amanda beli jinsitu CIE, hêm jinsitu sala Iho CIE, kurang gedé, dalemé ndaq isa Dillon.
   [Sis, you, Amanda bought those jeans Sis, that denim shirt is wrong, you know Sis, not big enough, (you) can’t wear anything inside]
5. 2FCT-Pa: Iho ndaq semuanya didalem mesti Dillon. Nèq anu keja jins-é toq yha isa kan? isa, keja—
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[you know, (you) should not always wear something inside. If not, for the jeans only, it’s possible, isn’t it? it can be for--

6. 2FAT-Pd: tipiè CÎÊ
   [it is so thin, Sis]

7. 2FCT-Pa: kejá ÜBERGANG itu APA NAMANYA? MASA PERALIHAN itu isa dipakêq,
tapi dalam mesti pakêq héêm, néq aku--
   [for TRANSITION, WHAT-YOU-CALL-IT?, THE TRANSITIONAL PERIOD, you can wear it, but inside (you) should wear (a) shirt, if I--]

8. 2FAT-Pd:-- ukurané jins ini mesti gééan titik
   [the size of the jeans should be a bit bigger]

Extract 5: Borrowing a car

Another example of an interaction between Mimi (2FCT-Pa) and Indah (2FAT-Pd) is presented in example (6). They are talking about borrowing a car to go out to eat. The conversation is in CMI

2FCT-Pa: Indah, ntiq læq ngaq cókóp, pinjem montoré kijang yha?
   [Indah, later if it is not enough, may (I) borrow (your) car?
2FAT-Pd: yha
   [yes]
2FCT-Pa: aku mo maken itu ambéq arèq-arèq
   [I am going to eat out with the kids]
2FAT-Pd: maken mana?
   [where do you want to eat?]
2FCT-Pa: depot tuju-tuju
   [Café seven-seven]
2FCT-Pd: eh séng èmpèré biru itu yha
   [oh, whose outside ....is blue]

Extract 6: Talking about Grandpa’s wounds

The following extract occurs in an interaction between Grandpa (1MCT-P) and Mimi (2FCT-Pa) who starts the conversation and asks about Grandpa’s wound. They are conversing in Mandarin with some Malay/Indonesian words inserted here and there. In most of his lines, Grandpa employs Mandarin with one or two Malay words. However, in line (20) he switches to Malay and back within his turn.

1. 2FCT-Pa: ini wès MÈI-YHU JUK SUI
   [this is already NO WATER COMING OUT]
2. 1MCT-P: MÈI-YU, MÈI-YU
   [NO, NOTHING]
3. 2FCT-Pa: MÈI-YHU, tapi SANG-GEU HAI-MÈI-YHU KUAN-CU
   [NO (WATER), but THE WOUNDS ARE NOT YET HEALED]
4. 1MCT-P: HAI-MÈI-YU KUAN-CU
   [(IT’S) NOT YET HEALED]
5. 2FCT-Pa: itu HAI-YHU SUI NA I PYÈN
   [over there, THERE IS WATER OVER THERE]
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6. 1MCT-P: CE PYÈN HAI-YU I TYÈN-TYÈN
   [THERE IS A LITTLE HERE]
7. 2FCT-Pa: JUQ SUI
   [WATER OOZES OUT]
8. 1MCT-P: CE KÔ PING-CENG HAU-SIANG BI-CIAU YANG, gatei
   [THIS SICK AREA IS A BIT TICKLISH, ticklish]
9. 2FCT-Pa: itu bekasé SANG-GEU
   [that’s the scar of THE WOUND]
10. 1MCT-P: SANG-GEU YA SIÈN-CAY BI-FU PYÈN-JENG HEN HEU, gatei,
    [THE SKIN OF THE WOUND HAS BECOME THICK, ticklish]
11. 2FCT-Pa: Kasiqi itu krem lhô ‘arméd’
    [give that cream, you know, ‘arméd’]
12. 1MCT-P: ( )
13. 2FCT-Pa: nggag I DYÈN LIANG SAN JE nggag gitu BI-FU HEN KAN-JAU
    yha?
    [no, ONE DAY TWO THREE TIMES, if not so, THE SKIN GETS DRY, right?]
14. 1MCT-P: cumaq (.) musti HUO-TUNG
    [only (.) (one) has TO MOVE ABOUT]
15. 2FCT-Pa: iyha
    [that’s right]
16. 1MCT-P: HUO-TUNG BI-CIAU cepet
    [MOVING HERE AND THERE A BIT quick]
17. 2FCT-Pa: CIAU, YER MÈI-YHU SE-MEQ CUNG LEK yha
    [THE LEG IS NOT SWOLLEN ANYMORE, is it?]
18. 1MCT-P: CAO-SANG JI-LAI BI-CIAU HAU
    [IN THE MORNING WHEN (I) GET UP (it is) A BIT BETTER]
19. 2FCT-Pa: iyha nêq...
    [yes, if...]
20. 1MCT-P: CAO-SANG JI-LAI MÈI-YU SE-MOQ ya biasa koq ndaq ada apa
    apa koq, JI-LAI YA CEU-CEU pagi ada I TYÈN-TYÈN
    [IN THE MORNING (I) GET UP NOTHING THE MATTER, well it is normal,
      nothing happens, you know, (I) GET UP THEN WALK AROUND A LITTLE BIT in
      the morning]
21. 2FCT-Pa: WAN-SANG tamba CUNG JI-LAI
    [AT NIGHT (it) gets SWOLLEN]
    (telephone rings)
22. 1MCT-P: WAN-SANG SWÉ I SIA-CE suda kempès (.) kempès
    [AT NIGHT (I) SLEEP A MOMENT THEN (the swelling) gets flat (.) flat]

Extract 7: Interaction between two sisters of the same age cohort

The following is an interaction between the siblings Mimi (2FCT-Pa) and Titi (2FCT-Pb). They are talking about another friend who had been looking for a Singaporean surgeon. In this interaction, their father was present. The main code used is CMI with some Mandarin, Fuzhou and English words inserted or borrowed. However, the Mandarin used is only a formulaic expression and the Foochow word employed is one of the words belonging to their family repertoire. The English word used is also one that is widely accepted among modern Peranakan Chinese people. The Mandarin expression in line 5 is uttered by Grandpa/Kong (1MCT-P), while Foochow words are only found
in line (4) uttered by the second daughter, Titi (2FCT-Pb). She says that she used to be able to communicate better in Foochow when she was younger.

1. 2FCT-Pa: he. suda taqkèqi  
   [he, (I) have given (them)]
2. 2FCT-Pb: oh ya, gitu tu LUndaq narèq?—  
   [oh ya, like that did YOU ask (them) to pay?—]
3. 2FCT-Pa: --gaq, mèk, mèk JING WEN tqg koq  
   [--no, only, only MAY I ASK PLEASE, just that]
4. 2FCT-Pb: oh... NGONG NYANG!  
   [oh... STUPID!]
5. 1MCT-P: nèq NA-KÓ, SIN-CIA-PÓ NA-KÓ BI-CIAU pintner  
   [if that, THAT, THAT SINGAPOREAN IS RATHER clever]
6. 2FCT-Pa: iya—  
   [yes—]
7. 2FCT-Pb: --ya dokter Singgapor—  
   [yes, that Singaporean doctor—]
8. 2FCT-Pa: --itu wèś taq têtépno sóster, anu-è, NAME CARD-è  
   [--that, (I) have given the NAME CARD to the nurse]
9. (4.0)

Extract 8: Plan of hiring a driver for Grandpa

The following extract is from an interaction between Mimi (2FCT-Pa) and Kong (1MCT-P) which is held mainly in Mandarin but in which some CMI words are also used.

   [yes, (it's) a habit (.) sleeping in the morning (.) we are looking for one who can guard the house (.), agree? (if) we don't use him, he watches over the house, (if we) don't use him, (.) in the afternoon we use him (.) until evening, whether there's a person or no person at home, he's watching over the house, you tell him how high is his salary? He'll busy with other things, so (he's) not specially for ME (.) what do you think?]
2. Mimi: YHA DA MEN YHA CE TAO TING (.) I SO YHÉQ ITU NEN KO NA TAO CIA LI TÓ SOW JYÉN  
   [well, they want to know later (.) that in one month how much money (they) can bring home?]
3. Kong: ya kira-kira ya SAN PEQ TÓ JYÉN  
   [well, approximately three hundred thousand]
4. 1MCT-P: ya kira-kira ya SAN PEQ TÓ JYÉN  
   [well, approximately three hundred thousand rupees]
4. 2FCT-Pa: WO DEQ NA U PEK JYÉN lhó Pa, soalé déqé khan anu nglembur (.) WO DEQ aè NA U PEK JYÉN lhó (.). ya lèq Pap comaq (.) IN TUNG tqg--
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[my (driver) gets five hundred thousand, y’know Dad, because he y’know works overtime
(.) mine gets five hundred thousand y’know (.). Ok if you Dad only (.). to take you out for
sport—]

5. 1MCT-P:—NI KEK DA TÓ SOW? SEK SAN JYÈN U I DYÈN?
[how much do you give him? Thirteen thousand five hundred a day?]

6. 2FCT-Pa: .IN TUNG TOQ, SEK SAN JYÈN U
[only for sport, thirteen thousand five hundred rupiah]

7. 1MCT-P: SE SAN JYÈN U, YA NGO MEN SE CIANG CE, SE SAN JYÈN U
[thirteen thousand five hundred rupiah, well mine will be the same, thirteen thousand five
hundred]

8. 2FCT-Pa: SE SAN JYÈN U itu I DYÈN, naq ni mesti KE DA, ya déqé KONG COK, cumaq
LIOK, JI KO CONG DO, khan ndaq isa sampeq SIA U, SE U TIEU...
[thirteen thousand five hundred is for a day, if you have to give him, well he will work only
for six, seven hours, (you) can’t (work him out) until late afternoon, five pm]

9. 1MCT-P: NA KO nglembur TING SIA...
[oh, that’s overtime work, later on]

10. 2FCT-Pa: nglembur NI I KO YEK KEK DA TO SAO?, I KO CONG DO TO SAO?
[to work overtime, how much will you give him?, how much is it for an hour?]

11. 1MCT-P: I KO CONG DO LIANG JYÈN, LIANG JYÈN U
[an hour will be two thousand, two thousand five hundred]

12. 2FCT-Pa: he?
[what?]

13. 1MCT-P: LIANG JYÈN atawa LIANG JYÈN U
[two thousand or two thousand five hundred]

14. 2FCT-Pa: I KO CONG DO WO DEK cumq I JYÈN, ch I JYÈN U
[mine only earns one thousand, oh, one thousand five hundred an hour]

15. 1MCT-P: I JYÈN U? LIANG JYÈN!! NA KO HEN SIAO lhó, nglembur, WO SIANG
HEN SIAO
[one thousand five hundred? Two thousand!! That’s too little, y’know, overtime work, I
think (it’s) too little]

16. 2FCT-Pa: na nèq NI CIAO DA I CEK SE TIEN, ya I CEK SWAN lembur lhó, REN CIA
KUNG COK itu kan cumaq JI KO CONG DO, PAK KO CONG DO, laq naq NI SE TIEN
CIAO DA KUNG COK se ya (.). sampëq SEQ TIEN CAO SANG wès buyar .SE U LIOK
JI PAI CIU SEK, SEK I SE OL, SE OL TIEN DA MEI YU SIA KUNG lhó, mana
ada,
[well, if everytime you call him to work at 4 am, well, everytime you calculate it as
overtime work, people work for only seven hours, eight hours, well if you at 4 am you call
him to work already, well (. the working hours finish at ten am, four, five, six, seven, eight,
ine, ten, eleven, twelve, twelve pm he’s still working, y’now, there’s no such thing.]

Extract 9: Family Reunion

The conversation below takes place between two family members who are not members
of the core subject group for this study and two members of the main subject group.
They live apart from each other and are having family reunion. They converse in CMI
and Javanese. In addition to Mimi (2FCT-Pa) and Jade (2FCT-Pe), there are two more siblings, A who studied in Germany and S, who studied in an English speaking country and got married there. Their educational background accounts for the English and German words used.

A: aku ya beli sayor koq! Aku ini tadi mau CAMPING! eh taqpekér anu séq blonjo séq gaq tauné anu gaq nemu anu.
   [I also bought vegetables, you know! I actually plan to go CAMPING! eh (I) thought what is it, shopping first, not knowing what it is (we) can’t find what it is]

2FCT-Pa: gado-gado ah?
   [(would you like) gado-gado?]

A: San lio, san jose SÉNG RUMA ANU IKU NDÉQ ENDI?
   [San lio, san jose THAT HOUSE WHERE IS IT?]

S: rumah Winchester?
   [the Winchester House?]

A: JARÉNÉ KÉTOQ TEKO 'autoway', KOQ NDAK KÉTOQ?
   [IT IS SAID YOU CAN SEE FROM 'autoway', WHY (DIDN'T WE) SEE IT?]

S: MBOH, GAQ ERO AKU. (turning and talking to her husband) Daddy, Winchester——
   [DON'T KNOW, I DON'T KNOW (turning and talking to her husband) Daddy, Winchester——

A:—WHERE IS/IST DAS? You can see VON freeway?
   [where is it? you can see FROM freeway?]

2FCT-Pe: lho KOYOK OPO SÉ koq 'WHERE IST DAS?'
   [HOW IS IT THEN, (why do you say) 'WHERE IST DAS?']

All: ha ha ha huh huh huh (laughing)

Extract 10: Mimi and Titi’s discussion on various topics

Mimi (2FCT-Pa) and Titi (2FCT-Pb) are talking about various topics from the haemodialysis machine in the hospital to, the soaring prices of all things, and the exchange rate for the United States dollar. They use CMI and Mandarin.

1. 2FCT-Pa: naq ini memang dari pabriqé sumbang, tapi YOK-É WO MEN mesti beli ambeq déqé dimonopoly ambeq déqé
   [if this one, it is the donation from the factory, but THE MEDICINE WE HAVE to buy from them, (it) is monopolized by them]

2. 2FCT-Pb: oh
   [oh]

3. 2FCT-Pa: tapi alaté di kéqq giwu lhó, lhó séng dulu ya giwu, sekaranj séng dulu ya giwu, séng—
   [but the machine is donated, you know, you know the former one is the same, now the former one is the same, the—]

4. 1MCT-P: katanya CE KO, CE KO YOK YAO JI CIA I PAI JIEN
   [it is said THAT THIS, (the price of) THIS MEDICINE IS GOING TO GO UP ONE HUNDRED THOUSAND]

5. 2FCT-Pa: heq= [sula JI CIA CING DYEN
   [that's right] [it has GONE UP TODAY]

6. 2FCT-Pb: = [sula JI CIA
   [has GONE UP ]

7. 1MCT-P: sda JI CIA
   [has GONE UP]
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8. 2FCT-Pb: kabêh JI CIA, aku tadi mau beli alatê GROHE Ciè, kran
   [everything WENT UP, just now I would buy GROHE, Sis, the faucet]
9. 2FCT-Pa: he
   [he]
10. 2FCT-Pb: gila ndaq CING DYEN GAE SE JI CIA, aduh aku di telp-Tin ngomong."
   KOWE IKU LHO DIDOLEKI ANU ITU lhó Cik Lani-Cik Lani itu lhó, GROHE ATE MUNDAQ"
   aku khan kurang sitoq kranê, taqparani JI CIA sungguan dari SA TIAU skarang SA TIAU

   POA
   [isn’t that crazy, TODAY (IT) HAS STARTED TO GO UP, oh I was call-Tin said "YOU ARE
   WANTED BY WHO THAT Sis Lani-that Sis Lani, GROHE IS GOING UP" I still need one
   more faucet, I went there really WENT UP from THREE MILLION now THREE AND A
   HALF MILLION]

11. 2FCT-Pa: JI CIA kabêh
    [everything GOES UP]
12. 2FCT-Pb: ini hari mulai
    [today it starts]
13. 1MCT-P: tapi ME CING LOK CIA
    [but AMERICAN DOLLAR GOES DOWN]
14. 2FCT-Pb: lyha [MEI CING LOK CIA tapi
    [yes AMERICAN DOLLAR GOES DOWN but
15. 2FCT-Pa: .... [biarpun LOK CIA tapi MEI YU PAN FAK, DA MEN khan sudah import
    sudah lama masi MEI CING LOK CIA ini khan JANG JE SING A. Gus Dur CANG CE
    AN TING LOK CIA, MING DYEN YU CAI JJ, YU CAI JAO, YU CAI JJ
    [......although (it) GOES DOWN but NO WAY OUT, THEY imported (the goods)
    long time ago so even though THE AMERICAN DOLLAR GOES DOWN, this is common,
    Gus Dur IS NOMINATED THE SITUATION IS PEACEFUL, (dollar) GOES DOWN.
    TOMORROW (it) GOES UP, THE SITUATION BECOMES UNSTABLE, (dollar) GOES
    UP AGAIN]
    (03)

Family B

Extract 11: Conversation between Rina (4 FCTa) and Lisa (2FCTa), her grandmother (G2)

The observations revealed that the conversation between the members of G2 and G4
were usually conducted in a mixture of CMI and EJI, while G4 member always
answered G2 in either EJI or in a more refined version, SI. The recorded conversation
available between these two generations is only a short dialogue between the G2
members, 2FCTa and 2MATa who are talking to 4FCTa, their granddaughter who at the
time of the recording was 7 years old, in CMI. 4FCTa, on the other hand, answered and
addressed her grandparents in EJI or rather a code that looks like EJI in structure but has
more lexical items taken from SI. Although Rina is basically speaking Indonesian, she
uses a Mandarin kinship term to refer to her grandfather.
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2FCTa: Rina, ayo sini dôôq makan nyang baèq.
      [Rina, come here and sit and eat properly]

4FCTa: Aku mau duduk dekat Kungkung!
      [I want to sit next to Grandpa]

2MATa: iyha, sini.
      [yes, come here]

Extract 12: The conversation between Rina and Tania, Rina’s mother

This is an example of a conversation between Rina (4FCTa) and her mother, Tania (3FCTa). The line in upper case is in SI while the underlined lines are in EJI and the ones in lower case are in CMI.

3FCTa: RINA, AYO BELAJAR DULU, BARU BERMAIN!
      [Rina, come study first then play!]

4FCTa: aku capêq
      [I am tired]

3MATa: dari tadi bermain, sekarang waktunva belajar capêq
      [you have been playing all the time, when it’s time to study, (you feel) tired]

4FCTa: sebentar saja ya?
      [just for a while Ok?]

3FCTa: yah nantiq dilihah
      [well, (we) will see later]

Extract 13: Tania and Grandma (Bobo)

The following example is from an interaction between Tania (3FCTa) and Bobo (1FCT) which is held in CMI.

Tania: Rina itu sering panas dalem\textsuperscript{34} Bô
      [Rina often has sprue.Grandma]

Bobo: bibiré mèra?
      [are the lips red?]

Tania: pokoké kaloq suqâ mèra bahaya
      [basically if (the lips) are red (it means) danger]

Bobo: itu masaq apa tu?
      [well, (you) boil, what is it?]

Tania: masaq temulawak yha?
      [Boil temulawak\textsuperscript{35}, is that right?]

Bobo: masaq dikasiq gula batu...kaloq dia ndaq suqaq makan ya temulawak sama kunyet sedikit
direbôs dikasiq gula Jawa. Minom oh bisa nafsu makan. LU sendiri ya bolê menôm

\textsuperscript{34} Sprue and uncomfortable feeling which is believed to have been caused by the heat inside the body

\textsuperscript{35} Temulawak is a kind of root plant which has a soothing effect especially when one has a high fever.
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[boil it and add some Chinese sugar... if she doesn’t have an appetite, well give her temulawak with a pinch of coriander, boil and give Javanese sugar. Drink it oh you will have good a appetite. You yourself may also drink it]

Extract 14: The intergenerational family interactions

The conversation below involved speakers from three generations and the codes involved are CMI, Javanese and Hakka (with possibly a Mandarin phrase too). Those involved are Tania (3FCTa), Lisa (2FCTa), Ani (2FCTb), and Bobo (1FCT). They are talking about Bobo’s birthday according to both the lunar and solar year.

3FCTa: —ndaq, ulang taoné Bobo itu laq tangalan Indonesi—[eh tanggalan internationalé piro—
[—no, isn’t Grandma’s birthday Indonesian calendar—[eh international calendar what date—]
2FCTb: [LAGÈK IKI khan bulan sebelas tanggal duabelas TAK ULANG TAHONI NDÉQ KÉNÉ—
[JUST NOW that’s month eleven and day 12 (i) CELEBRATED HER BIRTHDAY HERE—]
3FCTa: oh
2FCTb: SEP I NYAQ SEP I HAO MA?

[MIDDLE ELEVEN DAY ELEVEN, ISN’T IT?]
1FCT: ya SEP I NYAK ndak YIM LAK SEP NYAK SEP KIU, YONG LAK-é... anu lain gitu
[yes, MONTH ELEVEN no ROMAN CALENDAR MONTH TEN NINETEEN, THE LUNAR CALENDAR... eh different, you know]
2FCTa: YONG LAK PIRO? GAK ERO?

[LUNAR CALENDER WHAT DATE? DON’T KNOW?]
3FCTa: YONG LAK ganti-ganti
[THE LUNAR CALENDER always changes]
1FCT: YIM LAK-nya hari apa jadi... YONG LAK jadi bisa jadi...
[so the ROMAN CALENDAR what day... so THE LUNAR CALENDER can be...]
2FCTa: iya tanggalan—
[yes calender—]
3FCTa: tanggalan CONG KWOQ
[CHINA calender]

Extract 15: Bobo’s travel by road transportation

In the following dialogue Bobo (1FCT) and Lisa (2FCTa) use a mixture of Javanese and CMI. Lisa is wondering whether Bobo is strong enough to travel by road transportation like a bus or car especially when it comes time for Bobo to go to the toilet.

5. 2FCTa: NUMPAK BIS, NUMPAK MOBIL IKU kuat ta?
[GOING BY BUS, GOING BY CAR, (ARE YOU) strong enough?]
6. 1FCT: kuat gitu ada tempat tidur
[I (‘m) strong enough you know (if) there’s a bed]
7. 2FCTa: tempat tidur sé tempat tidur, NGKOK LÉQ APÉ NGOYO?
Extract 16: Discussing Grandma

The excerpt presented below is an example of an interaction between two siblings, Lisa (2FCTa) and Ani (2FCTb), who are discussing their mother, Bobo, and the fact that she needs a special carer to look after her personal needs. They converse mostly in Javanese, except in line 379 and 380, in which there are stretches of CMI.

376. 2FCTb: LHA IYO, MAMAH TAQGOLÈ ʔQNO KORSI IKO YO, AKU TURU BARENG MAMAH, SÊQ KAPANE DURUNG GAWÈ KORSI SÈ, RENGKIRIÈN KELU TERO NYANG JEQING, AKU GAQ ISO TURU, LHA MAMAH SLONJOR. NGOROQ ĐÈQÈ (.) TURU
   [That’s true, I found a chair for Mama, I slept with her, last time we didn’t use a chair, three
times (I) took her to the bathroom, I couldn’t sleep, but Mama stretched out, she slept and
snored (.) asleep]
377. 2FCTa: ĐÈQÈ TURU?
   [was she asleep?]  
378. 2FCTb: AKU SÆNG STENGA MATI, CÈQ ISO DÈWÈ TAQKÈQÈ EMBERÈ, ISUQ TANGI TAQBUAQNO OYOÈ
   [It’s hard for me, in order that she could help herself I prepared a pail (for her urine). In the
morning I threw the urine out]
379. 2FCTa: Seharusè kusus pembantu SLI (.) TAPEQNO LÈQ ISIQ SÈQ, YHO AWAKÈ, YHO OJOQ terlalu NGANTONGNO. LÈQ AWAKÈ DÈWÈ ISIQ KUAT YHO MA YHO, GOLÈQ [AKAL PIYÈ CARANÈ,  
   [Actually there should be one helper especially (for her) (.) but if still, yes you, yes don’t
depend on (others), if you still strong, yes Ma, [find ways how to
380. 2FCTb: îhò memangè Mama
   [Isiq kuat—
[that true, Mama is
382. 2FCTa: 
   NGGANTUNGAQNO UWONG  
   [[DADI OJOQ
   [still strong
   [[so don’t
   depend on others
383. 2FCTb: DÈWÈ KABÈH]\]
   [[[MAMA ADOS IKU ISIQ
   [[[Mama still takes a shower by herself

Extract 17: Examples of a repetitive message in different codes

The following extract contains two codes, CMI and Javanese. In line (100) Lisa (2FCTa) repeats what she said in her first Javanese sentence using CMI for emphasis in the next sentence. In the first sentence, the Javanese discourse marker ngônó lhó is used, while in the second sentence another discourse marker from CMI toh is used for emphasis. Both sentences have the same meaning.
100 2FCTa: PAPAÈ DINA YHO GAQ TAU SAYANG DÈQÈ NGÔNÔ LHÔ, ndaq perna sayang dêqê toh, diamôqi terôs
[DINA'S FATHER NEVER CARES FOR HER, Y'KNOW, never cares for her, isn't that right,
(she) is always scolded]

101. 2FCTb: ndêq sini diôpêni baêq-baêq, makan, tidôr, [istirahat, dîjaq omong-omong,
[over here (she) is well taken care of, eating, sleeping, [resting, being kept
company,]