This paper focuses on the role of institutions and everyday talk in the building of associations between language, region, ethnicity and class in Indonesia. In particular, I am interested in exploring how institutions have contributed to the reproduction of language ideologies that link ethnicity and class with language variety. While I argue that institutional activities have helped – often unintentionally – to associate region with language to the extent that both are equated with ethnicity or ethnic identity, these associations do not fully account for the patterns of language use at the local level. I support this argument using data from inter-ethnic conversations in two urban neighbourhoods of Java where talk is in fact carried out in a variety of Javanese rather than in Indonesian. In itself, this raises doubts about the link between language and ethnicity in this Indonesian context. The question remains how to account for such usage.

In attempting to answer this question I argue that any explanation of this pattern of language use needs to see the association process as one which makes certain identities available for Indonesians to use in conversation. Secondly, I argue that this process of appropriation in situated interaction needs to take into account how such associations might relate to the conditions of production of this talk, which in this context point to the relevance of a class-based interpretation of language use. In this particular case, I account for the pattern of language use encountered in these two neighbourhoods by looking at:

1. the Indonesian state’s influence on community formation,
2. income levels and their relationship to both community formation and daily social life in these communities, and
3. the daily lives of the individuals.
Exploring structure and action

In this section I argue for a fluid approach to language, society and culture that allows us to tease out some of the complex inter-relationships that exist between them. In sociological terms this is a question of the relationship between action and social structure. While such a relationship has long been the concern of social theorists, the focus of sociologists (Goffman 1983; Giddens 1984; Bourdieu 1984) and sociolinguists (Heller 1988; Milroy and Milroy 1992; Carter and Sealy 2000; Coupland, Sarangi and Candlin 2001) has increasingly come to be on the inter-related nature of action and social structure.

For example, Goffman (1983:11) has argued that social structures don’t determine ways of speaking but merely provide a repertoire of information which may be drawn on in interaction. Where Giddens (1984) differs from Goffman (1983) is in his fleshing out of how the routinization of social practices over space and time can relate to the formation of social systems (which Goffman might refer to as ‘structures’). Bourdieu (1984) has provided insights into how such routine social practices relate to language use and to the general development of patterns of taste or *habitus* that can be used by others to identify a speaker of a certain variety as a member of a particular group.

Some sociolinguists have synthesized these theories, as can be seen in the work on language and social networks (Milroy 2002; Milroy and Gordon 2003; Milroy and Milroy 1992) and language socialization (Ochs 1988; Schieffelin and Ochs 1986). For example, Milroy and Milroy (1992) suggest that documenting a person’s social networks, gathering data on their use of phonological variables, the correlation of these two data sets, and subsequent comparisons with other data (gathered and analysed using these processes) allows insights into how classes are formed and reproduced and how this relates to language use. In non-urban settings, language socialization accounts of relationships between action and social structure have demonstrated the links between situated language use, learning and cultural reproduction in small communities. For example, Ochs (1996:408) argues that:

语言实践是社会性组织的，作为新手经常参与这些实践与社会中更有经验的成员一起，他们发展对社会行为、事件、情绪、美学、知识性、地位、关系和其他社会文化现象的理解。

From this perspective we can see the inter-related nature of interaction, social structure, and social reproduction, especially as it relates to how novices develop an ‘understanding’ of the rules of interaction. The way in which ‘understanding’ has been conceptualized in this type of research is in terms of indexicalization.
A basic tenet of language socialization research is that socialization is in part a process of assigning situational, i.e. indexical, meanings (for example temporal, spatial, social identity, social act, social activity, affective or epistemic meanings) to particular forms (interrogative forms, diminutive affixes, raised pitch and the like) […]. To index is to point to the presence of some entity in the immediate situation-at-hand. In language, an index is considered to be a linguistic form that performs this function. […] A linguistic index is usually a structure (for example sentential voice, emphatic stress, diminutive affix) that is used variably from one situation to another and becomes conventionally associated with particular situational dimensions such that when that structure is used, the form invokes those situational dimensions. (Ochs 1996:410-1.)

The perspective that people learn and reproduce identities and social groups through social practice has also been developed by a number of ethnographers of education (Lave and Wenger 1991; Wenger 1998). More recently the role of social practice and language in the production and reproduction of communities has been explored by sociolinguists (Eckert and McConnell-Ginet 1992; Eckert 2000; Barton and Tusting 2005). In both educational and sociolinguistic perspectives participants’ ongoing social interaction and its outcomes are described as communities of practice. In such communities of practice the meanings of particular linguistic forms and other meaning-making resources are negotiated in situated interaction. In cases where there are recurring interactions involving similar groups of participants, linguistic forms can be reified to the extent that they become part of recognizable patterns of language use or styles (Eckert 2000). In other words, such styles are indexed to particular persons or groups.

For scholars of language ideology such local-level processes enable language users to make and interpret distinctions between groups of people based upon their language use (Irvine and Gal 2000; Irvine 2001; Bucholtz and Hall 2004). In cases where groups of speakers of one variety come from a privileged, elite or powerful position, their variety can become standardized (Agha 2003). This process, referred to by Agha as ‘enregisterment’, relies on the existence of metadiscourses about language use that might initially be found in dictionaries and prescriptive grammars, and then later in more widely accessible books on etiquette, novels, newspapers, magazines, radio, and television. Such metadiscourses often concern or develop into discourses about the type of people who habitually speak a certain variety of a language (Agha 2003:242).

This process of attaching cultural value to linguistic forms is dependent on individuals’ access to or participation in speech chains and the demographic makeup of those involved in these speech chains. Essentially these speech chains consist of a speech event containing the type of metadiscourses noted above along with senders and receivers (which can be individuals or groups in various participatory roles, for example observer, ratified observer, partici-
pant, ratified participant). Typically speech chains do not involve whole populations: thus while many people may understand a certain variety of language as well as be aware of its relationship with certain types of social structures and social characteristics, far fewer people will be competent in speaking such a variety (Agha 2003:260). The extent to which a population share and pass on ideas about the cultural value of a particular language variety depends not only on their exposure to such a variety, but also on their willingness to identify with and to use such a culturally valued language variety in their own interactions (Agha 2003:243-4). Such a process is assisted when the cultural value of a certain language variety is given authority or legitimized through public schools, as has been the case in Britain (Agha 2003:260-5).

More generally the involvement of institutions can be seen as acts – intentional or unintentional – of ‘authorization’ in relation to particular language varieties (Bucholtz and Hall 2004:386-7). That is to say, institutional involvement at any level often not only assists in the creation of language ideologies but also in their legitimization. Such processes also produce competing ideologies (Schieffelin and Charlier Doucet 1998). Indeed, the ability to differentiate either style or a register relies upon their coexistence with other styles and registers within a system (Bucholtz and Hall 2004; Irvine 2001; Agha 2003). As such, processes of style reproduction or ‘enstylement’ and enregisterment play a role in the reproduction of other competing language ideologies that may also help ‘denaturalize’ or deconstruct dominant language ideologies (Bucholtz and Hall 2004:385-6). Such cases seem to be common in multilingual settings where contact between persons from different linguistic backgrounds results in new mixed varieties or new codes being associated with new identities, both situated and more enduring (Alvarez-Cáccamo 1998; Franceschini 1998; Le Page and Tabouret-Keller 1985; Meeuwis and Blommaert 1998; Oesch-Serra 1998; Wortham 2005).

In addition to representing new varieties associated with a particular community of practice, these new varieties along with other enstyled and enregistered varieties represent resources or ‘constituting possibilities’ (Mäkitalo and Säljö 2002:63). In this respect I am also aligning my discussion with other dimensions of action-structure relationships whereby participants can use their knowledge of such relationships to appropriate and recontextualize language varieties in situated interaction (Bakhtin 1981; Bauman and Briggs 1990). The act of doing this often ‘reframes’ (Goffman 1981; Tannen 1993) an interaction in such a way that situationally changes participant identities (Irvine 2001).

This practice is often talked of in terms of ‘styling the other’ and ‘adequation’. ‘Styling the other’ is roughly a situation where:

---

I see the major difference between the two terms being related to the local in the case of style and the more widespread in the case of register.
People use language to index social group affiliations in situations where the acceptability and legitimacy of their doing so is open to question, incontrovertibly guaranteed neither by ties of inheritance, ingroup socialization, nor by any other language ideology (Rampton 1999:422).

While styling the other and adequation both relate to the pursuit of sameness (Bucholtz and Hall 2004), adequation is more appropriate for categorizing those who by way of in-group socialization learn and habitually use a language that mainstream language ideologies about race and ethnicity would not normally associate with that person (Skapoulli 2004; Bucholtz and Hall 2004; Sweetland 2002). Those who engage in adequation are seen as authentic, legitimate and authorized users of the language from the viewpoint of those whose language is being ‘borrowed’. Often this is because they also share social spaces, economic circumstances, and interactional histories (Sweetland 2002). In this sense, we can question essentialist claims relating to the existence of fixed or enduring one-to-one relationships between language variety and identity to argue that identity is often situated (Antaki and Widdicombe 1998; Auer 1995; Li Wei 2002; Sebba and Wootton 1998).

Having moved a number of times between an agentive and structural position, I should note that we also need to understand the role of states and institutions in the routinization and ‘naturalization’ of social practices (Bourdieu 1994). In other words, we need to understand whether and to what extent the state plays a role in creating social structures and the conditions of production which put people in certain situations to begin with (Bourdieu 1994:13; Carter and Sealy 2000). What the discussion thus far points to is theoretical and methodological difficulties in treating social action and social structures as separate or causative because often they are ‘mutually constitutive’ (Gubrium and Holstein 1997:119).

According to Gubrium and Holstein (1997:119), teasing out the complex relationships between social action and social structure requires the use of multiple approaches in a way that doesn’t privilege or present one approach as providing the reality. Rather, it is seen as just one of many possible realities. For example, ethnographically recoverable information about social structures at national, regional and local levels provides participants and researchers alike with resources for interpretation (Gubrium and Holstein 1997:205). The use of approaches to situated discourse, such as conversation analysis or interactional sociolinguistics to look at (interaction), allows both participants and analysts to see how these structures are used in face-to-face interaction. Moreover, examining the conditions bearing on the production of talk and interaction also helps analysts to account for different forms of talk in situated interaction (Gubrium and Holstein 1997:198; Stroud 1998).

I used such an approach during fieldwork conducted in two rukun tetangga...
Zane Goebel

(RT) ‘neighbourhoods’ in Semarang, Central Java over a period of two-and-half years from April 1996 to July 1998. With my spouse we rented a house in one of these neighbourhoods that I will call RT08. With the help of my spouse and a number of Indonesian research assistants, we observed and audio-recorded the conversations of around half of the members of RT08 and adjoining RT05 in numerous naturally occurring group settings. This resulted in some sixty hours of recordings. These were subsequently transcribed with the help of Indonesian research assistants and participants of the interactions, and by using Javanese and Indonesian dictionaries (Prawiroatmodjo 1989, 1993; Echols and Shadily 1992; Robson and Wibisono 2002). Analysis and interpretation of the talk in these recordings was initially carried out using conversation analysis. I then continued this process by: 1. comparing these conversations with others made in both of these neighbourhoods, 2. observing and recording social interaction in these two neighbourhoods, 3. formal and informal interviews with participants and their neighbours, 4. post-recording interviews with participants using transcripts of the talk as stimulus for discussions about language use, and 5. the distribution of surveys in the last few months of fieldwork.3

Ethnicity, class and language in Indonesia

Much scholarly attention has focused on the origins of ethnicity and its relationship with region in Indonesia (Steedly 1996; Smith-Hefner 1989; Errington 2001), subsequent inter-ethnic relations (Bertrand 2004; Bruner 1974; Chua 2004; Hoey 2003; Lenhart 1997; Hoshour 1997), and pluralism more generally (Hefner 2001; Hoon 2006; Schefold 1998). What seems clear from these discussions is that many political initiatives tended to focus on language as related to region and ultimately to ethnic identity in some form or another. In doing so, ethnicity was essentialized and authorized as a resource for use in public discourse and private talk. Moreover, there were many cases where ethnic categories were by-products or unintended consequences of complex historical, political, and social forces related to processes of imagining allies and enemies. What is less clear is how such categories and their ideological associations with language varieties have been maintained. In this section I draw upon the concept of enregisterment to suggest that the link between language and ethnicity has been reproduced in Indonesia through the education system and the media.

I should start this exploration by pointing out that the most obvious case of enregisterment is the propagation of Indonesian as the national language. A number of scholars have pointed out the ideological dimensions of language planning in Indonesia which, they argue, was based upon western models of development, nationalism, and national identity where relation-

3 For a more detailed explanation of my research methodology, see Goebel 2000.
ships between territory and language were assumed (Errington 1998a, 1998b, 2000; Heryanto 2007). Such accounts highlight the fact that there were no native speakers of Indonesian, and therefore the types of social personas enregistered with Indonesian were less related to ethnic categories of people than to those who were educated, development minded, authoritative, and privileged (Errington 1998b; Hooker 1993).

What is missing from these accounts is the observation that the act of institutionalizing Indonesian as a language of wider communication, education, and social mobility also helped reproduce us–them distinctions. That is to say, this process helped imagine another category, namely the ‘ethnic other’, as someone who requires or is spoken to in Indonesian. This process was also helped through constitutionally sanctioned language policies relating to the need to preserve regional languages (Anwar 1980:137). While ideological links between language, region and ethnicity are obvious from this standpoint, they will be much less obvious to Indonesian children going to school for the first time. Indeed, although these children will already have various experiences with languages other than Indonesian (LOTI) and varieties of Indonesian, the labelling processes that go with teaching, textbooks, and timetabled subjects will contribute to their understanding of language as a named object and as a marker of ethnic identity.4

For example, where Indonesian is portrayed as the language of unity and communication among geographically dispersed ethnic groups with their own languages (Abas 1987; Dardjowidjojo 1998), differences are highlighted between ‘us’ as a LOTI-speaking group and ‘them’ as a stranger or ‘ethnic other’ requiring Indonesian. To summarize, we can say that children’s exposure to such discourses enregisters LOTI and Indonesian with ethnic identity as part of a constitutionally sanctioned language-maintenance programme.

Mass media also contribute to the reproduction of links between language variety, class and ethnicity. For example, serials, dramas about old kingdoms, and ‘traditional’ performances (such as wayang) broadcast at provincial and national level that show regional languages and symbols tying the speakers of these languages to particular regions also contribute to the process of reproducing associations between language, region and ethnicity. Consider Extract 1, drawn from an episode titled Cipao ‘Con artist’ of a series called None ‘Missy’, broadcast nationally in 1995 by the state-owned television station TPI.

In this setting a young woman (YW) has travelled by taxi to a house she wishes to rent. After pressing the door buzzer she is met by another young woman (Dewi) at the door, who turns out to be the owner of the house. After the exchange (lines 1-15) Dewi sees the older male taxi driver in the street and they realize that they know each other. Dewi then runs down the steps while smiling and calling out to greet him. At this stage I should also point out that

4 For a related discussion, see Lowenberg 1990; Nababan 1991.
I use the following transcription conventions: Indonesian is in normal font, LOTI in bold, and bold italics indicates forms that can be classified as either a LOTI or Indonesian.

Extract 1.

1 YW Ada orangnya nggak sih di situ? Is anyone there or not?
2 Dewi Ya Yeah.
3 YW Ada orangnya nggak di situ? Is anyone there or not?
4 Dewi Ada. Yes there is.
5 YW>Panggil, eh ada uang kecil nggak? Call [the house owner] eh, haven't got any change [have you]?  
6 Dewi Ha? ada kamar kecil, ada tu di dalam, masuk aja What? Is there a bathroom, yeah, there is one inside, just come inside.
7 YW>Dewi Waduh oh my god this house is great, yeah. But [we] need to change some of the things (furnishings) with more trendy ones.  
8 Dewi Ya If it's [me] I don't like colours like this, they are not active enough.  
9 Ucup>Dewi Neng Dewi Miss Dewi?  
10 Dewi>Neng Ya Mang Yes Uncle.  
12 Dewi>Neng Neng Dewi . Neng Miss Dewi. Miss!  
13 Dewi>Ucup Mang Mang Mang Uncle Uncle Uncle  
14 Dewi>Ini teh Neng Dewi téa You're Miss Dewi aren't you?  
15 Dewi>Ucup Ya Mang Yes Uncle.  
16 Ucup>Euluh euluh euluh mani sudah Gee gee gee wow you're already grown up; do [you] still remember  
17 besar begini ah . masih inget ka Uncle, try [and remember].  
18 Mang coba . he.  
19 Dewi>Ya masih atuh ini teh Mang Mang Yeah of course you [are] Uncle,  
20 kéheula kéheula kéheula kéheula kéheula kéheula Uncle, hang on, hang on, hang  
21 . Mang … Mang Ucup on, hang on, Uncle, Uncle Ucup  
22 Dewi>Wah betul . damang Neng? Wow, right. How are [you] Miss?  
23 Dewi>Ucup SAÉ Mang GOOD, Uncle.

See the Appendix for an overview of the transcription conventions.
At the national level most Indonesian television viewers will not understand much of the language used in lines 18 to 31. Even so, they may pick up on symbols associated with regions within Indonesia, such as number plates on cars (in this case Mang Ucup’s taxi has a number prefixed with a ‘D’, indicating it is registered in Bandung, the provincial capital of West Java). Given that the majority of viewers at the national level would be speakers of a LOTI as a first language – with such experience including language use in intimate contexts – they may also interpret the use of a LOTI language as displaying some sort of intimacy or solidarity. Thus, for some viewers certain language varieties may be enregistered with region and intimacy, while for other viewers – especially those who actually speak the language being used – this may also contribute to the reproduction of such associations. Moreover, when the use of such language is contrasted with the use of Indonesian in other contexts with strangers – as in this case the exchange between Dewi and YW (lines 1-17) – then this will strengthen the enregisterment. That is to say, it will offer clear distinctions between social characters and language use, which in this case is the Indonesian-using ‘stranger’ or ‘ethnic other’ and the Sundanese-using ethnic brethren or familiar.

Thus far I have suggested that institutional processes, often unintentionally, help reproduce associations between language variety and identity (Table 1 summarizes these language ideologies). I have also argued that the existence of a style or an enregistered variety implies the existence of other styles and registers. While exposure to schooling and mass media may help Indonesians recognize ‘we’ and ‘they’ distinctions based on style and register, it needs to be reiterated that these represent resources to be appropriated or not in situated interaction. In the following section I look at whether and to what extent such knowledge is actually used in talk.

Before doing so, however, I should first make two methodological points relating to language categorization. Firstly, and as maintained through this paper, categorizing languages as Javanese, Sundanese and so on is an ideological act. My classifications need to be seen as such. My classifications of language variety in transcripts were based on the extent to which they approximated or deviated from standard forms found in dictionaries (Prawiroatmodjo 1989, 1993; Echols and Shadily 1992) and other descriptions (Wolff and Poedjosoedarmo 1982) or were categorized by participants as either a variety of Javanese or Indonesian. Secondly, the communities-of-practice framework I adopt here also prevents me from making claims as to the extent to which the varieties used in situated interaction represent varieties that are common in Semarang. Accordingly, my claims about language and identity relate only to the two neighbourhoods where I worked.
Table 1. Language ideologies created through processes of enregisterment in Indonesia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Languages other than Indonesian (LOTI)</th>
<th>Indonesian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inter-ethnic interaction</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfamiliarity</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-group relations</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic identity</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-group relations</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimacy</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiarity</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conversations among neighbours in Semarang

Here I examine language choice in some female and male conversations that occurred during monthly RT ‘neighbourhood’ meetings in RT08 and in a card game in RT05. In these settings I show that patterns of language exchange are different to what we might expect, given earlier explanations about use of Indonesian and Javanese. In particular, I show that, often, ngoko Javanese forms, rather than Indonesian, are used inter-ethnically.

As to the transcription conventions used, in the following transcripts normal font indicates the local colloquial variety of Indonesian (CI), bold italics indicate forms that can be classified as either Javanese or Indonesian, bold represents ngoko Javanese (NJ). Instead of just using commas to indicate pauses in speech, I have used a number of conventions for indicating the use of pause, intonation, and tempo. Familiarity with these conventions will enhance the reading/understanding of the transcribed texts. The letters ‘J’ and ‘NJ’ after a person’s name indicate Javanese and non-Javanese ethnicity respectively.

Extract 2 represents a conversation between people I will call Pak Feizel and Pak Saryono. Pak Feizel reported being a Banjarese from the island of Kalimantan, while Pak Yono reported being a Javanese from Klaten in Central Java.

---

5 The meaning-making potential of pause and silence has been demonstrated in the studies of Gumperz (1982) and Tannen (1984). The study reported here used these techniques to establish some of the meaning-making potential of pause as used in conversations among the residents of these two neighbourhoods.

6 These categories are based on how speakers identified themselves in terms of ethnicity, and how their neighbours identified them. I have changed the names and other identifying information of the participants in all of the extracts presented in this paper.
Java. This conversation took place during one of the monthly male neighbourhood meetings, which were forums for the male heads of household within this neighbourhood to discuss matters relating to the maintenance and upkeep of RT infrastructure, social services, and social events (for further details see Goebel 2000:115-49). This conversation is preceded by a group discussion about the problems of getting in contact with some of the owners of residences in this RT08 (in order to obtain financial contributions toward the building of the new pos kamling ‘guard post’).

Extract 2. Inter-ethnic male talk in an RT08 monthly meeting

Pak Taufik (J)
1 na semua mbuat berapa lembar Right [for] all those make up some
2 nanti akan di (Pak ??? ???) dapat pages and later [they] can be
3 (??? ???) #tanda tangan#= (Pak ??? ???) can (??? ???) be signed.

Pak Feizel (NJ)
4 = >ha itu difoto copy aja> ndak Ha, just photocopy, no problem,
5 papa lah (.2) | (???) (???).

Pak Saryono (J)
6 → kemarin saya dikasih The other day I [was] given the
7 nomeré Pak punyanya Pak #(??)’# number [of] Pak, the one owned by
8 (.2) yang ngisi: (.4) Pak (???), the one who fills (that is
9 lives in).

Pak Feizel (NJ)
9 → >Situmorang> Pak Situmorang (.5) Situmorang, Pak Situmorang?
10 → iya | #Situmorang# Yeah Situmorang.

Pak Feizel (NJ)
11 → | >kalau tahu alamatnya dikirim If [we] knew his address [we could]
12 Pak Situmorang mbayar itu> dulu send [it], Pak Situmorang [would]
13 orangnya bagus +dulu+ = pay, he used to be good.

Pak Saryono (J)
14 → = kasih telpnya hubungi telpon [I was] given his phone number,
15 nggak nganu #nggak ini nyampai# [but] couldn’t um, couldn’t get
16 = through.

Pak Feizel (NJ)
17 → = nggak nyambung = Wasn’t connected.

Pak Saryono (J)
18 → = nggak angkat angkat dia’ (1.0) He didn’t pick up [the phone].

Extract 2 is characterized by a heavy use of Indonesian (normal font). Of course such usage isn’t surprising given that Indonesian is the ideologically prescribed
medium of communication in such ‘inter-ethnic’ conversations. In interpreting this talk from a situated discourse perspective, we can see that Pak Feizel’s use of Indonesian from line 9 onwards shows that he does not orientate to Pak Saryono’s use of ngoko Javanese on line 7 (that is the è suffixed to nomor ‘number’). That is to say, he makes no comment about the appropriateness of the use of Javanese. This interpretation of non-orientation is further supported by looking at the larger conversation of which this extract is a part, where we see that inter-ethnic talk among these speakers consists mostly of Indonesian, which suggests that this use of Javanese wasn’t anything out of the ordinary.

We thus have to ask whether this alternation between Indonesian and ngoko Javanese is relevant to the participants. It may be that this is interpreted by participants as one medium, that is, language alternation is the medium (Gardner-Chloros 1995; Álvarez-Cáccamo 1998; Gafaranga and Torras 2002). This is in contrast to categorizing this conversational usage as ‘code-switching’, where speakers alternate between two separate languages with social meaning often attached to each switch. Such a position is also supported by what we know about the phonological, morphological and grammatical similarities of Indonesian and Javanese. For example, Javanese words and affixes can and are easily borrowed into Indonesian and vice versa (Poedjosoedarmo 1982; Errington 1998b:107, 115).

Examination of recordings and observations of these people’s talk in other settings (see Goebel 2000:150-60, 225-66) shows similar ways of speaking. We can say, then, that their speech was habitual and authentic. Moreover, looking at inter-ethnic interactions among other male heads of household of this RT also revealed usage of this medium and no negative comments by other neighbours about such usage (Goebel 2000:150-60, 225-66). In other words, this style appeared to be associated not only with the speakers described above but also with other inter-ethnic interactions in this neighbourhood.

The use of this style contrasts somewhat with the style used in RT05, as can be seen in Extract 3. Extract 3 is from an interaction that I recorded in the guestroom of Pak Abdul’s house during one of the card games that regularly occurred at around four or four-thirty in the afternoon in RT05 (Goebel 2000: 115-49, 207-24, 267-93). The conversation is between Pak Abdul and Pak Madi. Pak Abdul reported that he was a Buginese from the island of Sulawesi and Pak Madi reported being a Javanese born and raised in Semarang. Pak Madi was an original inhabitant of this RT, while Pak Abdul had moved into this RT from Sulawesi about twenty months before this recording was made. Pak Abdul, considered a good card-player by other members of the RT, is goading Pak Madi to pick a card from the down-turned deck knowing full well that he has the card Pak Madi is looking for.

---

Extract 3. Inter-ethnic talk in a card game in RT05

Pak Abdul (NJ)
1. \texttt{>keduk Pak> keduk'} = \textit{Pick up, Pak, pick up.}

Pak Madi (J)
2. \texttt{\rightarrow = nanti ndhisik waé:: =} \textit{Later, just wait a moment first.}

Pak Abdul (NJ)
3. \texttt{= keduk keduk Pak Madi +keduk} \textit{Pick up, pick up, Pak Madi, pick up, pick up, pick up, gee why why [did you throw that card away for]!}
4. \texttt{keduk keduk kok lo::h+ lo::h'} (.5)

Pak Madi (J)
5. \texttt{wis ben lah'} = \textit{[It's] already happened eh [it is too late].}

Pak Abdul (NJ)
6. \texttt{= maksudé piyé | (???) keduk} \textit{What do you mean [by] (???) picking up [that?] (laughs)}
7. \texttt{(laughs)}

Pak Madi (J)
8. \texttt{\{ lah iya' e::h=} \textit{Yeah. Eh.}

Pak Abdul (NJ)
9. \texttt{= asem aman sik ok asé ok asem} \textit{What a bummer [for you], [I was] playing it safe first [by holding the] ace, heh [that you needed], what a bummer.}
10. \texttt{(said while laughing) (3.0)}

Pak Madi (J)
11. \texttt{nunggu siji thok iki'} (2.3) \textit{I [was] waiting for just one [more card].}

Pak Abdul (NJ)
12. \texttt{#anu#} \texttt{\{ tak nggolèk iki ok'} \textit{Eh, I [was] looking for this, heh.}

Pak Madi (J)
13. \texttt{\{ iki nggolèk siji menéh kih'} \textit{I [was] looking for one more. I [was]}
14. \texttt{(9) #nggolèk as siji néh ki#} \textit{looking for one more ace.}
15. \texttt{(3.7)}

Talk in lines 2, 5-6, 9, and 11-14 of Extract 3 is characterized by the heavy use of \textit{ngoko} Javanese forms (bold) and ambiguous forms that can be classified as either Indonesian or \textit{ngoko} Javanese (bold italics). This usage is surprising given that it is Indonesian that is ideologically associated with such ‘inter-ethnic’ conversations. From a situated discourse perspective, we can see that neither participant found the use of \textit{ngoko} Javanese or ambiguous forms strange. That is to say, none of them commented on it as strange, nor is the use of pause indicative of the existence of any conversational problems.

This assumed ‘normality’ is further supported if we change our focus of attention to ethnographic information gathered outside of this conversation. For example, during my frequent conversations with these participants after this card game, none commented on the language used, nor did I hear of any
gossip to that effect, or of any avoidance of future interactions. Indeed, I and my research assistants regularly observed these patterns of language use in subsequent interactions involving these participants in a number of other settings (Goebel 2000:207-24, 267-93). In other words, such speech was habitual and authentic in the eyes of the other members of this neighbourhood.

Thus, as with Extract 2, we could classify the alternation between Indonesian, ngoko Javanese, and ambiguous forms as ‘alternation as the medium’ rather than as code switching. Put in terms of style, alternation as the medium was a new style that emerged out of interactions among these speakers. Also of interest here is that other inter-ethnic and intra-ethnic interactions (that is interactions among the Javanese themselves) in this neighbourhood were in this style, despite many speakers of Javanese ethnicity having the ability to use krama varieties of Javanese and Indonesian had they wished (Goebel 2000:150-60, 207-24, 267-93).

While the make-up of this style in RT05 is different from the style being used inter-ethnically among male heads of household in RT08, I did find some examples of such a style in inter-ethnic interactions involving the female heads of household in RT08. Extract 4 presents an example of such talk which occurred in an RT meeting of female heads of household recorded by my Indonesian spouse (who identified herself as a Sundanese). Part of the purpose of the meeting was to gather funds from members (Rp 10,000 from each RT household) for the preparation of food for the festivities that accompany the Independence Day celebrations, which were to be held the following month.

This particular interaction occurs about 25 minutes into the meeting. It is preceded by a number of the members (including those in the extract below) talking about one non-Javanese member of the RT who neither attends meetings nor wants to contribute money or participate in RT social life. Shortly afterwards the conversation turns back to the question of who hasn’t paid up the Rp 10,000, and starts with Bu Joko’s question to Bu Saryono and Bu Pujianto. In connection with this interaction I will be focusing only upon the talk between Bu Tri, a non-Javanese, and her Javanese neighbours (Bu Nur, Bu Joko, Bu Saryono, Bu Pujianto, and Bu Toro). Bu Tri reported being born and raised in Medan, Sumatra. After marrying a Javanese nearly twenty years earlier, Bu Tri had moved to Semarang and then into RT08 when it was first built (eight years prior to the fieldwork reported here).
Extract 4. Inter-ethnic talk in a female neighbourhood meeting in RT08

Bu Nur (J)
1 Bu Robi karo Pak Robi iki yo
2 dijaluki yad: angèl wis ra usah
3 waé opo? (.4) Pak Indro: sampai
4 Pak Jati Pak Tobing Pak Yuli
5 podo angèl waé? (1.2) #orangé
6 nggak bayar ≠ tenan =

Bu Robi and Pak Robi, yeah, [if] asked
for [money] yeah [are] difficult, what if
[we] don’t bother [with them], Pak
Indro down to Pak Jati, Pak Tobing, Pak
Yuli [all of them] are just as difficult,
those people don’t pay ever.

Bu Joko (J)
7 = wolulas Bu mung dadi (Dani?)
8 (sebagian??) (???) (pergi??)

Only eighteen Bu happened [that is,
have paid up] (Dani?) (only some?) (???)
(went?).

Bu Nur (J)
9 [ kok aku ujané males +dadi
10 males kon nariki ora dikei
11 sebelahku yo ngono ora dikei?+
12 =

Actually I couldn’t be bothered, [I]
become disinterested [if] told to go and
collect money, [they] don’t give [me
any]. Beside me like that [that is that’s
the story], [they] don’t give [me any]

Bu Joko (J)
13 = oh iya =

Oh yeah.

Bu Nur (J)
14 = [ Sebelahku’

[the ones living] beside me.

Bu Tri (NJ)
15 → [ Sing nggoné dhéwéké akèh
16 sing ora bayar =

[Actually] those who own and live in
their houses [make up] many who
don’t pay.

Bu Nur (J)
17 = >akèh kok sing podo ora gelem
18 bayar ok’> (2) #aku bari Bu Yon
19 wis kuwi ra bayar wis
20 [ ngono≠

Plenty, heh, who don’t like paying,
heh. Me and Bu Yon have already
[tired but they] didn’t pay, already like
that [that is, it’s like that].

Bu Saryono (J)
21 [ iki wis (.6) Juli loh Bu’ =

It’s already July, heh Bu.

Bu Tri (NJ)
22 = Ha =

What?

Bu Saryono (J)
23 = iki Juli loh =

It’s July, heh.

Bu Tri (NJ)
24 = lah iya ora opo opo | toh’

Yeah, that’s right [but] it doesn’t
matter, does it?
As can be seen in lines 15-16, 24, 31 and 40-42, Bu Tri’s talk with her Javanese interlocutors is characterized by a heavy use of ngoko Javanese forms and ambiguous forms. Again, such usage is surprising given that Indonesian is the ideologically prescribed medium of communication in such ‘inter-ethnic’ conversations. From a situated discourse standpoint we can see that neither participant finds the use of ngoko Javanese or ambiguous forms strange, nor is the use of pause indicative of any problems in the talk.

This ‘normality’ is further supported if we bring in ethnographic information. In my post-interaction conversations with participants, none commented on the language used. I didn’t hear of any gossip about Bu Tri and her
language use. She did not avoid the other participants nor did they avoid her in any subsequent RT meetings and functions. Moreover, I and my research assistants regularly observed usage of this medium in subsequent interactions involving these participants in a number of other settings (Goebel 2000:225-66). In other words, usage of this medium was habitual and authentic and, as with the previous extract, we could classify the above language alternation as ‘alternation as the medium’ rather than as code switching.

Thus far we have seen conversations between non-Javanese and Javanese participants making heavy use of ngoko Javanese and ambiguous forms. Such practices were also observed in conversations among participants where neither participant claimed to be Javanese, as can be seen in Extract 5. In this extract Pak Abdul (the Buginese in Extract 3) is now interacting with Mas Putu, who identified himself as Balinese. This interaction is taken from the same card game as Extract 3. This conversation occurs just after a new game has started.

Extract 5. Inter-ethnic talk in a card game in RT05

Pak Abdul (NJ)
1  belum apa apa udah masuk [I] haven’t done anything yet [and I] already
2  → sangono loh’ (1.3) delapan have this much, heh, 85 points.
3  puluh lima’ =

Mas Putu (NJ)
4  = †wah iki† (.7) tinggal Wow [look at] this [card], all that is left [is]
5  nutupké iki Pak’ (.3) to close this, Pak [that is, to declare that
you’ve won].

In summary, Extracts 3-5 support the argument that there is no fixed one-to-one relationship between language and ethnic identity (Auer 1995; Sebba and Wootton 1998; Gafaranga 2001). This is so because we have those who have identified themselves as non-Javanese using ngoko Javanese forms. Moreover, such usage was habitual and thus authentic, and represents acts of ‘adequation’ rather than ‘styling the other’. Thus, in this context it appears that these links aren’t salient in the talk at hand. While the above gives us some insights into the conduct of situated inter-ethnic talk, it does leave open the question of why non-Javanese use ngoko forms instead of Indonesian ones when talking with their Javanese neighbours. This question seems especially interesting given that all participants were competent in Indonesian and thus could have conducted monolingual conversations in Indonesian had they chosen to do so (for details see Goebel 2000:150-60). In comparing male talk in the two RTs, it also leaves open the question of why there is a tendency to use a style that has a high frequency of Indonesian forms in RT08 and a high frequency of ngoko Javanese forms in RT05.
Accounting for language use

In this section I would like to account for the different patterns of language choice found in the talk examined thus far. In doing so I am moving from a situated discourse view to an ethnographic one that places these conversations in their wider cultural context. In particular I will argue the following:

1. That the Indonesian state plays an important role in the formation of community groupings and thus ‘conditions of production’. Such a position draws on Bourdieu’s ideas (1994) about the genesis of social structures;
2. That participants’ income has an influence on interaction insofar as it determines where people live and thus also contributes to the conditions of production of talk (see Giddens 1973);
3. That income has other influences in these two neighbourhoods, especially with regard to how frequently and in what contexts members of these two RTs interact;
4. That the examination of participants’ daily social lives also helps account for the language choices described in the previous section. For example, the routinization of social action in time and space allows for the reproduction of certain social relationships;
5. That participants’ ideas about self and other interactions influence their access to situations where they could learn ngoko Javanese.

Taken together, these factors represent the forces that contribute to the formation of communities of practice and their associated styles. Just as importantly, these five points also suggest broader patterns of interaction (and language use) that highlight the usefulness of incorporating insights from class-based interpretive frameworks, such as that offered by Milroy and Milroy (1992).

Conditions of production: the state, income, and residency patterns

In New Order Indonesia (roughly 1965-1998) the state played a large role in facilitating structures that allowed the implementation of government politics and policy at the local level. For example, the processing of kartu tanda penduduk (KTP, national identity cards) required to secure goods and services, such as credit, driving licences, and medical care, was initiated at the rukun tetangga level (an RT, often equated with one complete street of houses and their occupants). These political structures contributed to the formation of groupings of people who under other circumstances may not have had any reason to establish and maintain the types of social interaction I describe below. These structures are summarized in Diagram 1. For a detailed account of the RT system, see Sullivan 1992.
The role of the state in determining conditions of production can be directly seen in this case, given that the two RTs where I conducted this research were part of a government housing estate, Perumnas Plamongan (Perumnas is an acronym for perumahan nasional ‘government housing estate’). This housing estate was built to provide housing for people falling into two broad income categories, middle to upper (menengah ke atas), and middle to lower (menengah ke bawah). Thus, here the state also played a role in bringing together different groups of people who may not otherwise have come into contact. At the same time this practice provided linguistic resources or labels for members of these RTs, and Indonesians in general, to categorize social distinction. Income also contributes to the formation of conditions of production in Semarang by determining where people live. For example, rents and house prices are
vastly different in RT08 and RT05. Access to income thus helps determine in which RT someone would live. Comparatively speaking, the higher-priced houses (RT08) use around three times more space than houses in RT05. This use of space in turn influenced the likelihood that neighbours would interact. For example, within RT05 the combination of the closeness of houses, their low roof design (which made them extremely hot inside), the distance of the house to the road, the absence of fences or gates, their height and width, and the length of the street, made it much more likely that neighbours would have contact with each other at some time during the day (see Plates 1-3).

Just as income influenced ability to buy or rent a house in a certain area, and in turn the design of housing influenced the likelihood of neighbours in these RTs interacting, income together with different working hours also predisposed members from each RT to being involved in different RT settings. For example, because of the minimal infrastructure in each neighbourhood, these RTs had to collectively organize construction and maintenance of street lighting, sewerage, and security. The planning and implementation of this was carried out through social activities, such as government-sanctioned and encouraged monthly RT meetings, working bees, and nightly security patrols.

In RT05 low incomes and shorter working hours resulted in members being unable to pay for outside help to do these tasks, but they did have time to participate regularly in meetings and to carry out these activities themselves. Those who were regularly involved in formal RT activities also tended to be involved in other social activities (chatting, playing cards and marbles, volleyball, badminton). Social life in RT05 appeared to contrast considerably with the more affluent RT08, whose male members worked longer hours, preferred to pay hired help to do all RT maintenance, and who preferred to socialize with people from outside their RT. In fact, they interacted at best on a monthly basis at formal RT occasions, and even then, many male members of this RT didn’t attend. These factors tended to orientate members away from frequent interaction.

Thus far I have argued that the state and patterns of consumption played a role in the production of certain social structures such as RT and neighbourhood organizations within these RTs. This is not to suggest a totally deterministic view – that consumption as a phenomenon of class is the only determiner of the ways people speak – but rather to highlight the fact that these factors put people in certain situations. Moreover, we have not only seen that the existence of these structures was on a scale from weak (RT8) to strong (RT5), but that it is just as important to see members’ interactions or lack thereof as playing an important role in the maintenance or reproduction of these social structures (Giddens 1984). That is to say, without members actively participating in meetings and discussing RT business, these RTs would only exist on paper as statistical communities in the lurah’s office (see Diagram 1).
Plate 1. RT05

Plate 2. A typical middle-income house in RT08, situated to the left of the house in Plate 1
Daily life, routinization, and the reproduction of social relationships

In this section I take a look at the daily lives of the participants discussed thus far. I will concentrate mainly on the daily lives of the non-Javanese. A detailed account of the other participants’ daily social lives can be found in Goebel 2000:115-46, 161-206, 225-66). I will argue that among the males of RT05 and among the females of RT08 there is a history of frequent and intensive interaction (that is routinization) which contrasts significantly with the daily lives of the males of RT08.

A look at the daily social lives of Pak Abdul, Pak Madi, and Mas Putu (Extracts 3 and 5) reveals that Pak Abdul was unemployed and had given up looking for work in Semarang shortly after he and his spouse had moved to Semarang. Pak Abdul noted that he wasn’t particularly concerned about continuing to look for a job because of his spouse’s employment as a relatively highly paid public servant. Instead, he stayed at home and looked after his three-year-old son, often with the assistance of neighbours after about ten in the morning. Indeed, Pak Abdul had a lot of spare time on his hands each day after ten in the morning. This spare time was mostly spent with his neighbours – mainly Javanese – many of whom were either unemployed or university students. On my frequent visits to this RT in the mornings, Pak Abdul
and his neighbours could be found involved in recreational activities, such as card games, marbles, video games, watching sports on television, listening to music, karaoke singing, or just chatting. This would often go on all day.

Mas Putu was studying to be a sailor and had lived in this RT for a year and in another city of Central Java with his sister for two years prior to that. He spent much of his spare time interacting with Pak Abdul and other neighbours, especially in the recreational activities noted above. Similarly, Pak Madi, who worked as a part-time pro-bono lawyer, would participate in any of the recreational activities noted above when he was at home. If none of these RT members had work commitments, these recreational activities would continue until *Maghrib* (the Islamic prayer at dusk), when people would go home. After about seven in the evening the group would get together again at either Pak Abdul’s house or at the guard post, and resume playing cards or chess, until around eleven or twelve o’clock. During this evening period, many other members of the RT often joined them, and there were regularly more than fifteen people sitting around and interacting. On weekends Pak Abdul, Pak Madi, and Mas Putu were engaged in similar activities, and indeed on Saturday nights Pak Abdul’s house was often the hub of activity, with many other RT members coming to either play cards or watch a game in progress.

By looking at Bu Tri’s history and her daily social life within RT08 we arrive at an interpretation similar to that reached about Pak Abdul and Mas Putu, namely that frequent interaction was an important determinant of language choice. Bu Tri was the next-door neighbour of Bu Nur, the Javanese with whom she exchanged Javanese in Extract 4. Bu Tri, Bu Nurholis, and Bu Toro were original inhabitants of the RT, and Bu Saryono and Bu Joko had lived in RT08 for the last five years. Being neighbours for periods ranging from five to eight years gave them many opportunities for interaction, and Bu Tri regularly interacted with Bu Nurholis on Saturdays and Sundays when she shopped at the fresh-produce seller who cycled by every morning. Bu Tri almost never missed any of the formal RT activities (Goebel 2000:115-49, 225-66), which gave her numerous opportunities to interact with the other Javanese with whom she is speaking in Extract 4.

In contrast Pak Feizel (in Extract 2) rarely interacted with his Javanese neighbours despite living in this neighbourhood for eight years. This was due in part to his place of work: it was located two hours drive outside of Semarang. This had led him to board during the week for a number of years and then, during the period of this research, to commute, leaving home very early in the morning and returning late in the afternoon. He also owned a small travel business which had him regularly repairing his vehicle in the afternoons and on weekends. And when he wasn’t doing that, he and his family spent weekends with relatives from Kalimantan on picnics or at religious gatherings.
In this section we have seen how social life led to the routinization (or to the lack thereof) of some forms of social interaction. In particular we have seen how this relates to the formation of bonds of intimacy or friendship among neighbours. How this relates to language use can be seen more directly if we look at these people’s views about self, other, language, and learning.

Views about self, other, language and learning in RT05 and RT08

In this section I argue that orientation toward the patterns of interaction described above is facilitated by different ideas about how much one should interact with neighbours and the type of language one uses with neighbours.

While all of the non-Javanese participants above noted their need and wish to adapt to their new environs, including learning a local language, they had conflicting ideas about how regularly one should interact with one’s neighbours. For example, in RT08 many members noted the importance of *jaga jarak* ‘keeping one’s distance from others in order to guard against unwanted outcomes’ with one’s neighbours. In some instances this was linked to a fear of neighbours asking for a loan of money or equipment. A number of members of RT05 (including the participants discussed above) viewed RT08 members’ ideas on this and their infrequent interactions as indicating an unfamily-like and individualistic neighbourhood.

In RT05, on the other hand, one was *sungkan* ‘embarrassed, uneasy’ about not regularly interacting with one’s neighbours and not making financial or material help available when asked. Such regular interaction among neighbours contributed to the formation of close friendships among neighbours. For example, Pak Abdul, Pak Madi and Mas Putu (in Extracts 3 and 5) spoke of themselves as *cehes* ‘close friends’. They were also classified as such by others from this RT. When explaining what it meant to be ‘*cehes*’ they noted that it meant the same thing as being *akrab* ‘close’ and that the more often one interacted with someone the more *cehes* one became.

They went on to say that the more *cehes* one was with one’s Javanese neighbours the more one needed to use *ngoko* Javanese in interaction with them. In contrast, continued use of Indonesian with a Javanese with whom one frequently interacts would be interpreted as *kagok* ‘strange, not appropriate’, or worse, *nggak ramah* ‘not friendly’. In other words, using exclusively Indonesian would fail to reflect the closeness of the relationship.

This conception of self-other relations and the role of language use also seemed to hold when these same participants filled out questionnaires containing transcripts of other conversations and were asked to note the relationships that existed between speakers using *ngoko* Javanese and Indonesian. For example, Pak Abdul, Mas Putu and Pak Madi all noted that in the case
of speakers using *ngoko* Javanese, the speakers were close friends, while in the case of speakers using Indonesian, the speakers were just acquaintances. I conclude that they recognized the use of *ngoko* Javanese as indicative of a speaker’s familiarity or friendship.

Such a relationship between language choice and social relations was also observed in the case of Bu Tri and her Javanese interlocutors in Extract 4. When evaluating transcribed conversations, they noted that in inter-ethnic interactions Indonesian could be used to indicate relative unfamiliarity (*kenal tapi tidak akrab*), while the use of *ngoko* Javanese could be used to indicate friendship. These views also reflected practice, and indeed, while Bu Tri (the non-Javanese in Extract 4) could and regularly did use *ngoko* Javanese in her interactions with her Javanese neighbours in RT meetings and other settings, she also appeared to prefer to use Indonesian rather than *ngoko* Javanese with those with whom she rarely interacted (Goebel 2000:150-60, 225-66).

What I have illustrated in this section is how people at the local level linked social relationships with language use. These people were aware of the context-creating capabilities of language use. That is to say, they were aware of the different social relationships that could be brought about through the use of Indonesian and *ngoko* Javanese. This parallels my earlier discussion of the enregisterment process whereby a regional language – in this case Javanese – was associated with ‘us’ while Indonesian was associated with ‘them’. I suggest that this is an example of how government language policy has led to unintended associations, which have been adopted in talk. Put a slightly different way, some of the meaning potentials of *ngoko* Javanese and Indonesian were used by non-Javanese participants to do ‘intimacy’ rather than ‘ethnicity’ work (in the case of *ngoko*) and ‘unfamiliarity’ work (in the case of Indonesian).

**Conclusions**

In this paper I have explored the links between language, ethnicity and class in Indonesia by placing them within a framework that allows insights into the complex relationships between action and social structure generally. I have shown that, while the Indonesian government’s language policy and its implementation through education and the media has helped reproduce associations between language and ethnicity, such relationships only represent knowledge to be appropriated in situated interaction. Indeed, in the case of language and ethnicity we have seen that at the situated discourse level there is a tendency toward ignoring such associations.

However, in accounting for this divergence between ideology and practice, we have seen how the state plays a part in the formation of other struc-
tures – such as RTs – which in turn have a role in influencing who interacts with whom. Factors such as income play a part in determining settlement patterns and the formation of neighbourhood social organizations. I have argued that the above partially represent the ‘conditions of production’ of situated talk. These conditions of production also contributed to the routinization of certain activities in space and time and the reproduction of certain social relationships and language ideologies in these two neighbourhoods. Routinized social interaction appears to contribute to the maintenance or reproduction of structures such as RTs and certain styles.

In summary, the development of style appears to relate to local-level communities of practice (COP), as suggested by Eckert (2000) among others. The relationship between these local-level COPs and the development of broader patterns of style can inform and reproduce language ideological notions of ‘style as distinctiveness’ (Irvine 2001), which can be interpreted in terms of social class. While such a position might give the impression of a cause-and-effect relationship between structure and action – as might my discussion of the role of the media and education – we need to keep in mind that it is not only possible but likely that participants recontextualized their knowledge of enregistered varieties (gained through their experiences at school and as media consumers) to do all sorts of meaning-making work. Moreover, in other settings these participants may appropriate these forms to do other identities, such as class, ethnic membership, or educational level (as has been discussed in work on styling the other and adequation: Skapoulli 2004; Sweetland 2002; Bucholtz and Hall 2004).

Finally, in this paper I have ignored other equally interesting relationships. For example, the difference between the speech of women and men in RT08 raises questions about language and gender. Such questions further emphasize the complexity of the relationships that exist between action and social structure.
Appendix

Transcription conventions

→ point of analysis
# . surrounding an utterance or word lowering of volume
.+ surrounding an utterance or word raising of volume
’ after a word final falling intonation
? after a word final rising intonation
> at the start and end of an utterance > utterance was spoken faster than the previous one
< at the start and end of an utterance < utterance was spoken slower than the previous one
: within a word vowel or consonant preceding the semi-colon has been drawn out
= latch, that is there is little or no pause between speaker turns
{ squiggly brackets indicates an overlap in the talk, with one person starting to talk before the other has finished
. between words indicates a pause longer than a latch but shorter than 0.3 seconds
Brackets with a number (.4) length of silence in tenths of a second between utterances and words
Brackets with three ?, that is (???) represents a word that could not be transcribed
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