

BAHASA GADO-GADO IN INDONESIAN POPULAR TEXTS:
EXPANDING INDONESIAN IDENTITIES
THROUGH CODE-SWITCHING WITH ENGLISH

By

Nelly Martin

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy
(Second Language Acquisition)

at the

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-MADISON

2017

Date of final oral examination: 5/11/17

The dissertation is approved by the following members of the Final Oral Committee:
Katrina Daly Thompson, Professor, African Cultural Studies
Monika Chavez, Professor, German, Nordic, & Slavic
Ellen Rafferty, Professor (Emeritus), Asian Languages and Cultures
Mariana Pacheco, Associate Professor, Curriculum and Instruction
Francois Tochon, Professor, Curriculum and Instruction

Untuk Bapak, walau kita terjarak mata dan dimensi, doa dan cinta Beliau adalah cahaya.
Untuk Ibu, yang keringat, doa, dan air matanya adalah penyemangat dan penerang jalan. I love you, Bapak dan Ibu.
Untuk Lesky, untuk dunia dan rasa yang selalu terasa lebih baik, bahkan saat mereka membelakangi.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS	i
Acknowledgments	iii
Abbreviations and Acronyms	v
ABSTRACT.....	vi
INTRODUCTION.....	1
The New Order era	5
Code-switching in the Reformasi Era	8
The multilingual turn.....	13
Outline of the dissertation	15
CONTEXTUALIZING INDONESIAN, ENGLISH, AND DISCOURSES OF SEXUALITY	18
Contextualizing Indonesia.....	19
Discourses of sexuality	26
Discourses of homosexuality	33
Linguistic diversity in Indonesia's history	38
A sociolinguistic profile of English in Indonesia.....	42
English in Indonesia	44
Conclusion.....	48
FRAMEWORK, METHOD, AND TEXTS.....	50
Research on multilingualism and code-switching in written texts	52
Code-switching and social constructs	57
Language ideologies.....	62
World Englishes	63
Post-structuralism and language selection	66
Critical Applied Linguistics	67
Critical Discourse Analysis	68
The texts	70
Methodology, data collection, and research positioning.....	75
Conclusion.....	77
THE POWER OF ENGLISH	79
The power of English in the <i>Ms. B series</i>	80

The power of English in <i>9 Summers, 10 Autumns</i>	86
Metalinguistic discourse in Indonesian popular texts	103
Conclusion.....	108

***BAHASA GADO-GADO* IN DISCUSSIONS OF SEXUALITY, GAY IDENTITIES, AND LOVE 110**

Background	112
<i>Love expression</i>	113
<i>Women's sexuality</i>	114
<i>Homosexuality</i>	114
Indexing Indonesianness	115
Code-switching to mediate verbal expressions of love.....	122
Code-switching to discuss sexuality	130
Homosexuality in the <i>Arisan!</i> films: The roles of code-switching	139
Conclusion.....	155

***BAHASA GADO-GADO*: LANGUAGE SELECTION AND HYBRID IDENTITIES..... 158**

Identity	158
Modernness	160
Hybrid identities	165
<i>Affinities between two-worlds</i>	166
<i>The Ownership of English</i>	175
Conclusion.....	185

CONCLUSION 189

Visible transgression in printed texts	189
Suggested Further Research	197

BIBLIOGRAPHY 201

Shout Outs 224

Acknowledgments

Alhamdulillah. Terima kasih, Allah SWT. My most sincere gratitude goes out to Allah, the owner of my soul.

Never did I imagine that I would actually come to this stage in my Ph.D. life: that I would write the acknowledgments page to the people I owe so much. The Ph.D. journey has felt like moving through a long dark tunnel; now I am finally seeing the light at the end. Since beginning this journey back in 2011, I have been imagining a gracious exit and thinking about the people who have helped me on the way. As the African proverb says, it takes a village to raise a child. And it takes a village to make one Ph.D. This journey could never have been completed without the support, love, encouragement, and wisdom of the following people:

In the academic world, my most heartfelt, sincere gratitude and appreciation go to my very intelligent and wonderful adviser, Professor Katrina Daly Thompson. My scholarly quest owes much to her dedication, support, and detailed and thorough feedback. She is the best and the most supportive academic adviser an advisee could ever ask for. It was Summer 2014 when she agreed to take me on to work under her supervision. These years of writing under her guidance surely have not always been bright and easy, yet they have been rewarding every single step of the way. Never will I forget our first and second dates at cafes back in Madison. She has been continuously accessible via Skype, emails, and phone calls despite her hectic schedule and distance between the Midwest and the Pacific Northwest. I will forever be indebted to her. Her feedback, suggestions, and support have pushed me to shape who I am now. She has been very generous with her time and thought-provoking conversation. Thank you so much, Katrina. Words fail me when it comes to express how grateful I am to be one of your advisees.

My appreciation is extended to my committee members: Professors Monika Chavez, Ellen Rafferty, Mariana Pacheko, and Francois Tochon. I also would like to thank SLA professors Junko Mori, and Dianna Murphy for the opportunity to work under their supervision as a graduate project assistant. Through them I learned how to be professional and effective. Special thanks to Wendy Johnson for her encouragement and support.

My gratitude also goes out to Professors Richard Young, Monika Chavez, and Francois Tochon for their guidance and support during the first years of my PhD training. I also thank Professor Jane Zuengler, whose Global Spread of English class inspired me to pursue this field, and who gave me the opportunity to teach this course in Spring 2013.

I would also like to extend my sincere gratitude to the generous financial supports provided by the Fulbright Program, the Language Institute, the Second Language Acquisition program at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, and the conference award from the University of Montana. Last but not least, my heartfelt gratitude goes to my family who always believes in me. This journey would have never been made without their supports.

Note on Spelling, Pronunciation, Names and Indonesian Terms

Indonesia has gone through a number of spelling systems, and up to today, considerable inconsistency persists in the public use of these systems. This is to say that, for many Indonesians, variant spellings are easy to overlook. The original spellings of the first two Indonesian presidents are *Soekarno* (the first president of Indonesia preceding Suharto) and *Soeharto* (Indonesian's second and longest-serving president), following the old spelling system. In 1972, a change in Indonesian spelling systems resulted in the "oe" henceforth being written as "u," among other spelling changes. Following the current spelling system, I use *Suharto* and *Sukarno* throughout, even when referring to times prior to 1972, except when quoting from others who use the old spelling system.

Many Indonesians refer to themselves by a single name, a practice that often causes confusion among readers from cultures where a surname is common. Although many families have begun using a family name or last name, a handful of people, usually among the older generations and the Javanese, adhere to the single-name convention. This explains why Presidents Suharto and Sukarno have only one name.

Abbreviations and Acronyms

CJI	Colloquial Jakartan Indonesian
EFL	English as a Foreign Language
EMI	English as the Medium of Instruction
ESL	English as a Second Language
FPI	Front Pembela Indonesia (The Islamic Front Defenders)
IDR	Indonesian Rupiah (Indonesian currency)
GBHN	Garis-garis Besar Haluan Negara (The Broad Outlines of State Policy)
KBBI	Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia (<i>The Great Indonesian Dictionary</i> , a national reference dictionary for Indonesian language published by the Department of Education and Culture, Republic of Indonesia)
LGBT	Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender
LSF	Lembaga Sensor Film (The Film Censorship Foundation)
USD	United States Dollar
UUD 1945	Undang-Undang Dasar 1945 (The 1945 Constitution)
UU No. 24/2009	Undang-Undang No. 24/2009 (The Language Law No. 24/2009)
UU APP/2008	Undang-Undang Anti Pornografi dan Pornoaksi (Anti Pornography and Pornoaction Bill) passed in 2008
UU Sisdiknas No. 20/2003	Undang-Undang Sistem Pendidikan Nasional No. 20/2003 (The Educational Law No. 20/2003)
SBI	Sekolah Berwawasan Internasional (International Standard Schools)
SLA	Second Language Acquisition

ABSTRACT

This study explores the relationship between language selection and identity construction in contemporary Indonesia through an examination of the function of English, a language that still receives stigma from many Indonesians and the government, particularly in Indonesian popular texts published after 1998. Utilizing hybrid critical approaches and interpretive textual analysis, I examine how the socio-political situation has influenced language selection in the period following Suharto's rule (1966-1998), popularly known as the Reformasi era. During both the Suharto (the New Order era) and the post-Suharto (the Reformasi) eras, language use has been central to the construction of a government-imposed national identity. During the New Order era, the authoritarian government passed a language law and other laws to regulate language use in printed and cinematic works. The attitude of the current government in the Reformasi era towards *bahasa gado-gado*, however, still imitates the New Order era by restricting the use of English and reinforcing the use of Indonesian as the official language. Currently, both the government and many Indonesians see the use of English in otherwise Indonesian texts as a sign of interference with the national identity. In this light, the top-down approach constructs national identity as homogenous, while popular texts demonstrates that Indonesian identities are in fact multi-faceted. Although *bahasa gado-gado* often receives social censure, I argue that its use does not make its speakers "un-Indonesian" but rather functions as a strategic mechanism to expand our understanding of what it means to be Indonesian. I shed light on *bahasa gado-gado* as a strategic mechanism of resistance toward policies and social norms that privilege monolingualism. My project contributes to existing research on Indonesian popular culture within literary and cultural studies, adding a new focus on discourse analysis that

combines social, political, and cultural perspectives with sociolinguistic analysis. In addition, my project contributes to a small but growing body of literature on written code-switching, which has been less researched than oral code-switching in the field of Second Language Acquisition.

INTRODUCTION

More than half a century later, after 32 years of authoritarian rule under Suharto and his New Order (1966–1998), Indonesians are crazy about many kinds of freedom (kebebasan)—freedoms that are subjective and sexual as well as public and political.

—Tony Day, *Identifying with Freedom*

After many years away from Indonesia, in 2014 I returned to the capital city, Jakarta, where I met a metropolis that had undergone many changes. Changes are inevitable, and the Hotel Indonesia roundabout, famous as the heart of Jakarta, could not escape them. Hosting a monument called *Selamat Datang* (Welcome), the roundabout has become a symbol of new freedoms. Between 1966 and 1998, years when the authoritarian president, Suharto, was at the helm, this landmark functioned as a symbol of Indonesian harmony, welcoming visitors to the city, and making itself a popular image in postcards. But since 1998, this roundabout has served as a venue for street strikes (or as Indonesians often call them, *demos*, taken from the English *demonstrations*) where citizens openly voice their opinions of the government. Demos as public expressions of opinion were an unthinkable phenomenon prior to 1998, when people often held secret meetings and were worried about being kidnapped just for having opinions critical of the government (Forshee, 2006). Since Suharto stepped down from his presidency in May that year, demos have become routine, and this roundabout has witnessed people's change of opinion and actions almost daily. Over the years, the roundabout has seen Indonesia's dramatic change from a muted and highly restricted nation to one embracing freedom of speech and expression, and it has become a potent symbol of Indonesia's move from numerous restrictions to more freedom. The generation that grew up during the New Order (1966-1998) witnessed Indonesians learning to speak up and use their voices. Now, one can see or participate in regular demonstrations

expressing any opinion in the Hotel Indonesia roundabout, a freedom that has recently expanded into the realm of various social media platforms.

My astonishment did not stop at the roundabout. I was taken aback by another symbolic and dramatic change, visible in major bookstores such as the many owned by Gramedia, a prominent publishing company. Along with freedom of speech has come new ways of speaking, including more frequent use of English, a language that had been previously encouraged only for education and international communication, not for intranational use. Gramedia displayed a number of books of Indonesian fiction, and I noticed that a large number of them had English titles, another phenomenon unthinkable during Suharto's reign. I noticed the same was true for the movie theaters, which displayed and screened Indonesian films, but often with English or mixed English-Indonesian language titles. The hybrid titles suggest to me that my generation is coming up with a new language—one that can accommodate our true selves. The increasing trend of mixing Standard Indonesian, colloquial Indonesian, and English can be considered one among many after-effects of the collapse of authoritarianism embodied by Suharto's New Order government. Indonesians have named this new period *era Reformasi* 'the reformation era or the reformed era' (hereafter, Reformasi era), which also symbolically functions as a farewell bid to the New Order era, the period defined by Suharto's military-based, dictatorial government. Now twenty years into the Reformation Era, Indonesian society is still celebrating a freedom of expression that feels new.

What I saw at the Hotel Indonesia roundabout, bookstores, and movie theaters indexes the many changes that have occurred since the end of Suharto's reign in 1998. The end of the New Order era has encouraged the frequent and noticeable use of not only more open communication but also more English(es) in public spaces. In both ways, Indonesia is

celebrating a new wave of freedom and ease. As the book and movie titles I noticed suggested, freedom of expression is accompanied by new ways of using language, especially by the younger generation, those who grew up during the New Order era. This study investigates these new uses of language in the contemporary Indonesia as represented in Indonesian popular texts published post-1998.

The popular texts that I investigate in this study include five print texts and two films published or produced after the year of 1998, which I chose both because they are widely read or watched and because of their heavy use of code-switching, a juxtaposition of two or more languages both within and beyond the sentence boundaries. The print texts include four novels, *Ms. B: "Panggil Aku, B"* (PAB; 2004), *Ms. B: "Will You Marry Me"* (WYMM; 2004), and *Ms. B: "Jangan Mati!"* (MBJM; 2006) by Fira Basuki; *9 Summers, 10 Autumns* (9S10A; 2011) by Iwan Setyawan; and a short story, "Madre" (2011) by Dewi Lestari. The other two texts are films, *Arisan!* (2004), written by Nia Dinata and Joko Anwar, and *Arisan! 2* (2011), written by Nia Dinata. I discuss my selection of these texts in greater detail in Chapter Two.

In examining these texts, I ask what they reveal about the relationship between language use and Indonesian identities in the Reformasi era. I show that language selection in popular texts sheds light on an important arena of social struggle, revealing the ways in which code-switching indexes social identity, domination, resistance, and submission. With the new freedoms that began in Indonesia in 1998, language choice has become an ideal space for many Indonesians—particularly Jakartans, those who were born in the big cities, and bilinguals as represented by the majority of the characters in the texts I analyzed—to both expand and contest imposed meanings of Indonesianness. While Standard Indonesian has played a dominant role in nation building (Anderson, 1983), my analysis shows that code-switching contests a normative

and hegemonic conception of national identity: expanding understandings of what it means to be an Indonesian, challenging the domination of Standard Indonesian, and rejecting the stigma of foreign influence. Moreover, because it is often used to discuss controversial issues, code-switching offers an alternative, more positive, perspective on topics that would be taboo to discuss in Standard Indonesian. Bilingual writers, who have more freedom now, are producing and utilizing an alternative and creative language as a space to challenge and re-define chauvinistic ideas of Indonesianness in a post-Suharto era that reflects the legacy of New Order regulations. Drawing on Bhabha's (2004) definition of hybridity and "third culture," I show that popular texts depict an alternative or "third" culture, reconstructing and renegotiating Indonesian identities in cosmopolitan spaces. Language in print fiction and films, while playing an important and omnipresent role in public space, is perhaps the least analyzed object of study in relation to Indonesia's identity construction and nation-building project.

The policies installed by the New Order government have impacted many facets of life in Indonesia, and their impact can still be seen today in the Reformasi era. The New Order era applied strict censorship to the national media and publicly accessed platforms that regulated both content and language use (Kitley, 2000). The censorship of the New Order era contributed to ideologies of authenticity, purity, and Indonesianness that persist today. At the same time, some Indonesians are reacting against those ideologies through public expression involving codeswitching (e.g., Muslich, 2010; Rosidi, 2010).

Examining Indonesian-English code-switching in its social, political, and historical context allows us to see how social identities, social struggles, and power relations are reflected in language selection. By exploring language selection in a broader context, I hope to open up a conversation about the borders and limitations set by the government, which label many people

“inauthentic Indonesians.” The relevant contexts include the development of Indonesianness during the New Order era and ongoing struggles over which languages should represent Indonesian identities in the Reformasi era.

The New Order era

Dominant understandings of homogenous Indonesianness, a national identity that developed during the pre-independence era, were created and controlled during the New Order era, and have continued to thrive in the Reformasi era. The Indonesian language was a key factor in its creation.

For more than a hundred years, Indonesian has been linked to the government’s imposition of a homogenous national identity. In 1928, before Independence from the Dutch colonizer, young Dutch-trained intellectuals (referred by many Indonesians as *Western-educated*) chose Indonesian to unite the nation, despite the linguistic diversity that the nation had (Errington, 2000; Sneddon, 2003). The declaration is known as the Youth Pledge (*Sumpah Pemuda*). Even today, Indonesia celebrates *Hari Sumpah Pemuda* (the Youth Pledge day) to remind the young generation about the importance of Indonesian as the national and official language and Indonesia as a nation. In the independence era, the status of Indonesian as a national and official language was officially acknowledged in the 1945 Constitution (*Undang-Undang Dasar 1945* or UUD 1945). Furthermore, Suharto, through laws and language policies that include the State Broad Guidelines, Enhanced Indonesian Spelling System (*Ejaan Yang Disempurnakan*, EYD) since 1972, and its “good and proper Indonesian” policy (*Bahasa Indonesia yang baik dan benar*), made Indonesian the medium of instruction in all Indonesian schools, often at the expense of regional languages. He believed that Indonesia’s national

identity could be constructed through such a policy. Although Indonesians speak many different languages, the government constructed the ability to speak Indonesian as closely related to being an Indonesian (Gunarwan, 1993).

Not only did Suharto dictate language choice, but he also dictated what topics were appropriate for public discussion. *Restriction* was the buzzword. Severe restrictions were placed on virtually every facet of Indonesian life. A capitalist semi-military regime rigidly controlled and monitored political and cultural expressions with the aid of military surveillance and national censorship, an attempt to project an image of Indonesia as a cohesive and stable nation and to “protect” the Indonesian citizens whom the government considered vulnerable and prone to “Western influence” (Sen & Hill, 2000, 2007; Kitley, 2000). Media were an effective weapon to homogenize national cultural identity (Sen & Hill, 2000, 2007).

Cultural productions were also subject to government surveillance (Kitley, 2000; Sen & Hill, 2000). In 1990, the Department of Information issued Decree No. 11 stating that all film industry and television programs were to be directed and programmed to support the 1945 Constitution and the state ideology Pancasila, not to promote any issues that can violate moral and religious values, and to avoid any issues that could create “racial” tension (Sen & Hill, 2007). All television broadcasting, the film industry, and other cultural works were to promote the image of a normative “authentic Indonesian” and a harmonious, unified Indonesia. Thus, television programs, print publications, films, and other cultural products were the result of a “normative relationship between programs and the state ideology of Pancasila and the national constitution, human rights, moral values, culture and worldview, religion, lifestyle, customary norms and practices, major differences of opinion and belief, and matters of legality” (Direktorat Televisi 1972, as cited in Kitley, 2000, p. 41). Put it simply, the New Order government treated

the creative creations beyond their function as cultural works, but rather as the political substances that necessitated a governmental scrutiny.

In particular, the New Order government feared that foreign films would promote leftist (communist) and “Western influences,” and thus they surveilled them closely and often censored them. The government believed “Western culture” could weaken national culture, character, and strength (Kitley, 2000; Sen & Hill, 2000; 2007). In Indonesia, the term “Western” is widely used to refer to the United States and Britain, i.e. places where English is spoken as a first language, and the primary exporters of English-language media to which Indonesians have access. Fearing that that *budaya Amerika* ‘American culture’ can interfere with an essentialized “Indonesian culture,” the New Order passed law No. 1/1964, and Presidential Mandate No. 012/1964 to transfer the authority of the Censorship Board from the Department of Culture to the Department of Information (Lembaga Sensor Film, 2016). Perceiving films, television programs, and broadcasts as political materials instead of cultural works, the government entrusted censorship to the Department of Information to censor any media that the government reckoned was promoting an antinationalist ideology (Sen & Hill, 2000; 2007; Lembaga Sensor Film, 2016).

The government also tightly controlled the use of language in the film industry and publishing media by regulating the use of *Bahasa Indonesia yang baik dan benar*, or “good and proper Indonesian” (Sen & Hill, 2007). Other languages were permissible but limited. In films and TV programs, foreign languages (predominantly English) could be present as secondary languages, but had to be accompanied by Indonesian subtitles, while regional languages were reserved for non-political content and expressing “traditional” values (Sen & Hill, 2007).

The government applied the same degree of monitoring to print. The Department of Education has regulated the language policy through the Enhanced Indonesian Spelling System

(*Ejaan Yang Disempurnakan*, EYD) since 1972. One of its regulations is to italicize any language other than “good and proper Indonesian” in books, novels, newspapers, and other print materials (Alwi, 2000). The italicization indexes Otherness of the foreign and regional languages by drawing attention to the fact that they are not Standard Indonesian. To date, the current government still applies the regulation, as we will see in the print texts I examine in later chapters.

New Order censorship was related to the government’s obsession with neatness (*ketertiban*), uniformity (*kesatuan*), and unity (*persatuan*). While the “neatness” of the system was actually in disarray, the Suharto government sought to make society neat and “tidy” (*tertib*) by controlling almost every aspect of life (Cribb, 2011). This obsession with “tidiness” involved restrictions on language and content in not only the media (Sen & Hill, 2000; 2007), but also in virtually every facet of life. Indonesia still favors these qualities thanks to Suharto’s three decades of influence (Forshee, 2006; Cribb, 2011; Suryakusuma, 2011).

The New Order’s focus on order meant that the government saw code-switching as a form of disorderliness. The Suharto government assigned fines for any English usage on signboards in Jakarta (Heryanto, 1995), and many people came to see code-switching as un-Indonesian, a label that extended to those who use it. Those who code-switch to English were often treated as semi-lingual and arrogant. Such attitudes have largely continued in the Reformasi Era.

Code-switching in the Reformasi Era

The Indonesian term for code-switching with English, *bahasa gado-gado*, suggests a little bit of everything, in this case referring to both Indonesian and Western cultures, indexing

in-betweenness or inauthenticity. Thus, this term is often used in a pejorative manner, its use comparable to *mongrel* in American contexts (Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, 2017). However, I argue that the practice of *bahasa gado-gado* actually expands the meanings of being an Indonesian. In many Indonesian newspapers and research articles, *bahasa gado-gado* refers to the mix of Indonesian and any other languages (Ilmi, 2016; Wahyuningkintarsih, 2016). However, many Indonesians define *bahasa gado-gado* more specifically as a mix of Indonesian and English (Ahnar & Galih, 2011; Kusno, 2014). I use *bahasa gado-gado* in this sense, and reserve the word *code-switching* for other forms of language mixing that are not limited to Indonesian and English. Whereas the term *bahasa gado-gado* is sometimes used pejoratively, I argue that the practice should be seen in a positive light.

It is also in this context that I treat *bahasa gado-gado* and *bahasa gaul* 'language of sociability' as two different language practices, following Nancy J. Smith-Hefner (2007). The latter is an Indonesian-language based language with a number of borrowings from other languages, particularly Jakartan dialects and English, but unlike *bahasa gado-gado*, the pronunciation and spelling have been adopted and bent to the Indonesian (or Indonesian slang) spelling and phonology systems, thus blurring the boundaries among its components (cf. García & Wei, 2014).

Despite the stigma attached to *bahasa gado-gado* and the focus on Indonesian as the language of national unity, the shift from the New Order era to era Reformasi has encouraged many Indonesians to utilize a mix of languages that include not only Standard Indonesian but also Colloquial Jakartan Indonesian, English, and regional languages. Yet ambivalent attitudes toward such linguistic disorderliness continue. English and code-switching that mixes English with local languages are often perceived as vehicles of "Western values" (Gurnawan, 1993) that

may undermine Indonesianness.

To be an “authentic Indonesian” in dominant understandings means to reject negative cultural influence, especially “Western culture,” to be a responsible human being who prevents liberal and “irresponsible” “Western influence” (Sen & Hill, 2000; 2007), and to live by “Indonesian culture” (Kitley, 2000). Conflating “Indonesian culture” with an essentialized “Eastern culture,” many Indonesians see “Western culture” as “troublesome, a threat towards the traditional values [which] must be prevented from affecting the Indonesian youth” (Danadharma, 2011, p. 11). The guidelines for being an “authentic Indonesian” are stated in the the Broad Outlines State Policy (*Garis-Garis Besar Haluan Negara* or GBHN) and the state ideology (the Five Principles, known as *Pancasila*). The 1999–2004 GBHN defines an Indonesian as believing in God, noble in character, intelligent and skilled, and physically and mentally healthy. Similarly, the state ideology, Pancasila, states that every Indonesian should believe in one and only God, be a just and civilized human, be united with other Indonesians, be guided in democracy by the inner wisdom of deliberations of representatives, and experience social justice.

Language also plays a role in authenticity. The current government’s stand on language policy mimics that of the New Order era. Via UU No. 24/2009 or the language law and others, the current government has assiduously propagated the construction of a “true Indonesian,” emphasizing the use of Indonesian and the role of Islam. Perhaps most importantly, the language law reinforces Indonesian as the language of the nation, while limiting the use of foreign languages, especially English, in public use.

The relevant articles of UU No. 24/2009 demonstrate how top-down regulation affirms the indispensable role of Indonesian, alienating regional and foreign languages. The language law officially obligates all Indonesian citizens to speak Indonesian, while limiting the use of

other languages to purposes such as specific scientific research publications (Article 35), specific linguistic landscapes, e.g., public buildings, facilities, and street signs as secondary languages (Articles 36 & 38), descriptions and explanations of services and products (Article 37), and specific foreign mass media (Article 39).

The laws thus construct and uphold a sociolinguistic gap between the use of “good and proper” Indonesian, and the use of CJI and English. Each language carries its own ideological attachment: English, as the language of the Other or “the West,” is relevant to discussions of anything related to “foreign culture” or “un-Indonesian values”; “good and proper” Indonesian fits its role as the language of formalities; and CJI is the language for relaxed, colloquial, and informal events.

Because of the role that Indonesian plays in homogenized national identity formation, one of the most problematic aspects of the increasingly common practice of *bahasa gado-gado* is that its users risk their identities being rejected as inauthentic and understood as evidence of in-between-ness. This risk derives from the implication that mixing languages throws into question the Indonesianness of those who use English (cf. Hill, 1999). For the majority of Indonesians, English is still a foreign language, and many people, from laypeople to educators and linguists, see shuttling between languages as betraying one’s Indonesianness (i.e., Buchori, 1994; Muslich, 2010; Rosidi, 2010). Since the Reformasi Era began, even high-ranking officials who use *bahasa gado-gado* have received unfavorable reactions from many Indonesians.

Many people growing up in the 1990s received significant English exposure through Hollywood movies and sitcoms. In fact, for many Indonesians and the government, English represented “the West” and its presence encouraged Indonesians to *keinggris-inggrisan atau keamerika-amerikaan* ‘act like English people or Americans’ (Gurnawan, 1993, p. 670). Many

people still perceive the values embedded in exported American popular culture to be Western values that can diminish one's Indonesianness, and English is seen as the vehicle of these negative influences. In this light, many Indonesians use the term *Western* interchangeably with the term *American*, an essentialized term that is often correlated with negative values. Thus, the New Order government assiduously campaigned through the slogan, *Ambil yang baik, buang yang buruk* 'Take the good influence, toss the bad one', to prevent the negative effects of "Western culture."

What it means to be Indonesian in a multilingual context is not straightforward. Indonesian identities are located at a busy intersection where a national language, regional languages, and a global language are competing with each other. Many Indonesians consider Indonesian, as the national language, to occupy a strategic position in the local and national constellation. This prestigious position has been challenged by the appearance of English as a global language that promises more and better opportunities. The inequality between Indonesian and English provokes prejudice among those Indonesians who believe that shuttling between languages indexes a traitorous act. When *bahasa gado-gado* is used, contextual connections are made among languages, identities, and "(in)authentic Indonesianness." Thus, switching to English from Indonesian is not only a negotiation of what it means to be Indonesian and bilingual but also an act of social and cultural transgression. While many Indonesians see such negotiations and transgressions as dangerous, in this project I read them more positively, as an opening up of what it means to be Indonesian today.

The popular texts I examine in this study, all published or produced in the Reformasi Era, adopt a number of significant English switches in narration, often when presenting taboo and controversial topics that during the Suharto era would have been subject to censorship. The

language selection of popular works reflects layers of negotiation of the state's regulations and the social norms and values represented by the publishers, the government, and the writers themselves (Kelly-Holmes & Pietikànen, 2013). The result of this negotiation is reflected in *bahasa gado-gado* which helps Indonesians mediate conversation about topics that some see as foreign influences on Indonesian culture or as otherwise culturally unacceptable—such as homosexuality, promiscuity, or speaking about love in a public space. Thus, I examine how language selection can function as a means to show resistance, participation, and reconstruction in the shaping of local and global language ecologies, especially those that are deeply impacted by governmental policies (Heller, 2007; Blommaert, 2010).

The multilingual turn

Examining code-switching among Standard Indonesian, Colloquial Jakartan Indonesian (CJI), and English is a space to research second language use. This study builds on the shift in the field of second language acquisition (SLA) from studies that assumed monolingualism as the norm to a more multilingualist and pluricentric approach (e.g. Canagarajah, 1999, 2004, 2013; Pennycook, 2001, 2003; Higgins, 2009). An extensive body of research exists on multilingualism researching English and other languages, analyzing, for example, language use in hip-hop, film, and music (e.g., Pennycook, 2003; Sarkar & Winer, 2006; Lee, 2007; Higgins, 2009; Sarkar & Low, 2012), but there has been little work on Indonesian popular texts.

My project builds on the growing number of studies which advocate for a pluricentric approach to English in its capacity as a global language, inspired by the work of Braj Kachru (1982, 1985, 1990, 1991, 2005, 2008). Second language acquisition scholars have critiqued the monolingual bias of seminal linguistic studies (e.g., Labov, 1971; Weinrich, 1953, 1968,

Selinker 1974, 1992). Following the work of Kachru (1982, 1990, 2005, 2008), which called for a focus on multilingualism in the field of applied linguistics, researchers have begun viewing second language users through a multilingual lens (e.g., Pennycook, 1998, 2001, Cook, 1999, 2016; Block, 2003; Canagarajah, 2004; Higgins 2009). My project contributes to this literature on multilingualism by examining how second language users interact in and manipulate multiple languages.

Current trends in SLA highlight language diversity and multilingualism in the context of globalization (Pennycook, 1998, 2001; Blommaert, 2005, 2010, 2012). The multilingual and pluricentric approach in the field has furthered the development of a social approach to investigating code-switching. Earlier code-switching studies showed a monolingual bias with researchers regarding code-switching as a deviant phenomenon (e.g., Weinreich, 1953, 1968; Labov, 1971). The new multilingual paradigm has led to new studies on code-switching from the perspective of grammaticality (Poplack, 1980), contextualization (Gumperz, 1982), conversation analysis (Auer, 1998), rights and obligations (Myers-Scotton, 1993), identity, power, and bilingual solidarity (Mahootian, 2005, 2012; Jonsson, 2010, 2012, 2014; Montes-Alcalà, 2012), a rule-governed language phenomenon highlighting bilingual creativity (Kachru, 1982, 1990), a group marker (Myers-Scotton, 1993; Mahootian, 2012; Montes-Alcalà, 2012), and a voice amplifier (Jonsson, 2012).

“World Englishes” is one approach that has provided space in SLA and applied linguistics to problematize multilingualism within the context of English as a global language (e.g., Kachru, 1982, 1990, 2005, 2008). A sizeable body of research has extended Kachru’s work by exploring English in the various countries where it is spoken, the developments of local variants, or the attempt to detach English from Western geographical territories (Norton Peirce,

1995; Higgins, 2003). Furthermore, proponents of World Englishes view English speakers as claiming ownership of (their own variants of) English (Norton Peirce, 1995; Higgins, 2003, 2009). Drawing from the World Englishes framework that approaches English from a multilingual and pluricentric view, by investigating the use of English in Indonesia, I argue that Indonesia can also claim its own variant of English. My project thus responds to Jan Blommaert's (2005) call for more studies from outside North American and European countries to understand how speakers from other regions use English, while adding a new focus on a variety of Southeast Asian English, Indonesian English.

Outline of the dissertation

Given Indonesia's linguistic diversity, why does English play such an important role? I will discuss the country's political and linguistic background and discourses of sexuality in greater detail in Chapter One. The socio-political and linguistic background is necessary in order to understand the discussion in Chapter Three, where I examine the symbolic power of English as reflected in Indonesian popular texts. The discourses of sexuality is a necessary background to understand how taboo topics may influence language selection. In Chapter Four, I show that because English in Indonesia is associated with "the West," and by extension with open expressions of love, extramarital sexuality, and homosexuality, it has become the ideal language through which Indonesians can discuss these issues. But rather than simply using monolingual English to do so, they mix English and Indonesian, thereby retaining their Indonesianness. At the same time, they resist norms of "tidiness" that would keep English and Indonesian, "the West" and Indonesia, sexuality and Islam, completely separate from one another. By resisting local norms that uphold such dichotomies, popular artists like novelists and filmmakers are creating a

new way of being Indonesian. When addressing sensitive issues, switching from Indonesian to English appears to be less morally and culturally problematic than using Indonesian, a language rooted in hegemonic notions of homogenous “Indonesian culture.” English is a language that is ostensibly not related to Indonesian identity and therefore it can be used to express values that are outside of Indonesian norms. In this light, English seems to be liberating writers and filmmakers. This will be the topic of discussion in Chapter Four. Transgressing the government’s imposition of “good and proper” Indonesian, English may also work to expand the meaning of Indonesianness. With the position of Indonesian as the official and national language vital for an understanding of national identity as homogenous, the prevalence of English in otherwise Indonesian texts invites an investigation of how language selection can index power, submission, resistance, and attachment; as well as how it is used to construct heterogenous social and cultural identities, the topic of Chapter Five.

In brief, the core of this dissertation is divided into five chapters, followed by a conclusion. In Chapter One, I explore the construction of a homogenized national identity, Indonesian societal and governmental attitudes towards foreign influence and English, and how power and identity in popular works are closely related to political and social issues in Indonesia during the New Order and post-New Order periods. I also provide a demographic overview of Indonesia as a country, a history of its linguistic resources and discourses of sexuality.

In Chapter Two, I introduce post-structuralism as a theoretical framework, the methods I used to select and analyze popular texts, and my research positioning. I define the central terms of my study (language, code-switching, and bilingualism), review relevant literature, and explain my research questions in further detail.

In Chapter Three, I use examples from popular texts to demonstrate that English is a language of power that positions English-Indonesian bilinguals as a privileged group, concomitantly marginalizing those who are not English speakers. Using Foucault's (1980) conception of power and Bourdieu's (1991) theory of symbolic capital, I show that English is a linguistic resource that can convert linguistic ability into economic and cultural symbols. To this end, I demonstrate how characters' language attitudes towards English (revealed through metadiscourse) reflect its status as a language of both fear and opportunity. This discussion serves as the background for Chapters Four and Five.

In Chapter Four, I analyze *bahasa gado-gado* in popular texts, showing how it relates to the textual construction of love, sexuality, and homosexuality. I argue that the use of *bahasa gado-gado* renegotiates, redefines, and challenges state-imposed constructions of national identity and mitigates taboos surrounding controversial issues, thereby celebrating freedom.

Chapter Five explores how *bahasa gado-gado* indexes both a cosmopolitan identity and a rejection of the national triumphalism of the Indonesian government via decentering Standard Indonesian in Indonesian mainstream popular texts. Furthermore, I demonstrate the existence of Indonesian English as an emerging variant of English resulting from bilingualism and show how *bahasa gado-gado* is an effort to detach English from the territory of the West.

In the Conclusion, I summarize the overall endeavor, recapitulate my findings and major conclusions, explain their importance, address some of the questions this research raises, and make suggestions for further research.

CHAPTER ONE

CONTEXTUALIZING INDONESIAN, ENGLISH, AND DISCOURSES OF SEXUALITY

Language does not function in a vacuum, but rather both impacts and is impacted by society, politics, and history. Therefore, in this chapter I offer demographic information related to Indonesia's historical, economic, political, religious, and linguistic shifts that will help us understand how the practice of *bahasa gado-gado*—juxtaposing Indonesian, CJI, and English—indexes power dynamics, socio-economic gaps, and cultural imbalances in popular texts post-1998. Since the collapse of the New Order era, the position of Indonesian has been noticeably challenged by English, a language that entered Indonesia's linguistic landscape quite late. Being a plurilingual country where competition among languages happens on a daily basis, Indonesia has experienced social and political turmoils which influence the language change and shift at a societal level. As we have already seen, 1998 marked a political and social transition that has had a strong impact on language use in print fiction and films. Locating language in this larger context allows us to see that social, political, and historical frames of reference play important roles in the popular texts I will examine in subsequent chapters.

In particular, I argue that increased freedom of speech allows bilingual writers, filmmakers, and characters to discuss non-normative topics, including extramarital sex and homosexuality. I thus introduce locally dominant discourses of sexuality and homosexuality in which popular texts are embedded and which, I argue, they resist. Moreover, I discuss the linguistic diversity in Indonesia, with special references on Indonesian, a language playing such a vital role in constructing dominant understandings of national identity as homogenous, and English, a foreign language for many Indonesians. Only by understanding normative values

related to dominant constructions of a homogenized national identity, can we fully understand the discussion and analysis in the chapters to follow which will show how that identity is being questioned and replaced with heterogeneous identities.

Contextualizing Indonesia

Indonesia's geography, social structure, political system, and history are all important context for understanding contemporary language use. The popular texts I analyze in later chapters are set in Indonesia, located in Southeast Asia and straddling the equator. Indonesia is a tropical archipelago that consists of approximately seventeen to nineteen thousand islands lying from Sumatra in the west to Papua in the east, with only six thousands of them inhabited (Sneddon, 2003; Forshee, 2006; Smith-Hefner, 2007; Badan Pusat Statistik (BPS), 2010; Luvaas, 2012; Vickers, 2013). It shares borders with Papua New Guinea, East Timor, Brunei Darussalam, and Malaysia. It has thirty-four provinces, two hundred cultural and language groups, and about 252 million people in total (World Bank, 2015). This number makes Indonesia the world's fourth-most-populous country, ranking behind only China, India, and the United States (Errington, 1998; Renandya, 2004). It is also geographically large, consisting of more than 5 million square kilometers, of which almost half are land and the remainder water. Its five major islands are Java, Sumatra, Borneo, Celebes, and Papua (see Figure 1). Java is the most populous island, with 107 million residents constituting fifty percent of all Indonesians (Forshee, 2006; Vickers, 2013). Despite the country's geographic and ethnic diversity, Javanese culture appears to dominate (Vickers, 2013). Jakarta, the capital city, is the most populated city in the country, home to approximately ten million people (BPS, 2010).



Figure 1. A Map of Indonesia. Reprinted from *Mapcruzin*, by Michael Meuser. Retrieved March 26, 2017, from <http://www.mapcruzin.com/>. Copyright 1996 - 2017 by [Michael Meuser](#). Reprinted with permission.

Indonesia has a Muslim majority, with Muslims accounting for almost ninety percent of the population (Forshee, 2006; Luvaas, 2012; Vickers, 2013). The constitution mandates that everyone in Indonesia have a religion, and the government acknowledges six religions from which Indonesians may choose: Islam, Catholicism, Protestantism, Hinduism, Buddhism, and Confucianism. There are many unacknowledged others (Luvaas, 2012; Vickers, 2013).

It is important to note that even though Muslims comprise a vast majority of the population, Islam is practiced in pluralistic and syncretistic ways. Moreover, although Indonesia is home to the largest Muslim population in the world, it is not an Islamic state (Vickers, 2013). Indonesian religions are “multi-layered” in the sense that there are extremists, conservatives, liberals, and moderates in between (Forshee 2006, p. 29). In other words, the continuum lies

from “fanatical” adherents to those who are *Islam abangan*—Muslim on their identity cards, but still believers in some local values, Javanese cultural rituals, and spiritual ideas that may contradict normative Islamic values (Cribb 1995; Luvaas, 2012). In between, there are Muslims who value the importance of rituals (such as praying five times per day and reciting the *Al-Fatihah*, the first verse of the Qur’an) as important symbols that should be done in conventional ways (Bowen, 2000). Other more extreme sects such as Salafis and Wahabis (sects that encourage the purification of Islamic teachings and are heavily influenced by the Arab world) also exist in Indonesia. Compared to Islam in much of the Middle East, Islam in Indonesia is relatively moderate. Most Indonesian Muslims are accepting of a diversity of Islamic interpretations, and of non-Muslims and secularity (Cribb 1995; Luvaas, 2012; Vickers, 2013). As we will see in Chapter Four, Islam plays a crucial role in the state’s construction of a homogenous national identity, which affects how characters utilize *bahasa gado-gado* when engaging in or discussing taboo activities that do not fit the dominant definition of Indonesianness.

In order to understand how Indonesia’s language policy has impacted language use, we also need to understand the country’s political and historical situation. After 350 years of Dutch colonization and a brief period of Japanese colonialism, Indonesia gained its independence in 1945. It was during the Japanese occupation that educated (mostly European-educated) youths harnessed nationalist sentiment for a three-year fight for independence under the charismatic figure people referred to simply as “Sukarno” (Vickers, 2013). The Netherlands did not recognize Indonesian sovereignty until 1949, the year that Sukarno became the first president of Indonesia. Sukarno reigned from 1949 until 1966, when a futile coup by the communist party in 1965 allowed Suharto to seize power (Vatikiosis, 1993).

It was under Suharto's leadership that many contemporary Indonesians formed their linguistic attitudes. Suharto's leadership was notoriously known as a dictatorship. With the help of military forces, Suharto maintained unity throughout the archipelago merely for the sake of himself, his family members, and his cronies. The centralized system generally benefitted the people in Java and the majority, marginalizing the eastern parts of Indonesia—so much so that Benedict Anderson (1990) argues that the eastern parts of Indonesia experienced a new form of colonization. Through the centralization system, the New Order government made Jakarta the center and point of reference for any political, economic, social, and cultural decision.

Another arena for government centralization and control was education. Suharto's government adopted a system in which schools across the nation used one curriculum. The government used education as a means to control and discipline, trying to create obedient citizens (Ena, 2013). Language did not escape the centralized curricular policy. Just as it imposed centralized economic resources, the government also tried to impose a central language policy. Through standardization and modernization of Indonesian, the New Order government viewed the language project as essential as economic development (Sneddon, 2003). The government believed the use of “good and proper” Indonesian played a vital role in the nation building and in constructing a homogenized national identity. Therefore, in 1970, Suharto via the Language Center (*Pusat Bahasa*), implemented a national development project, mandating the use of Indonesian throughout the archipelago, most notably in government affairs, education, print publication, and mass media. Examples of Language Center projects include the weekly TV program *Pembinaan Bahasa* [Indonesian building] which started to air in 1970 through, at that time, the one and only national government-owned TV channel, TVRI; and an annual Language Month (*Bulan Bahasa*) celebrated every October together with the Youth Pledge

commemoration. Additionally, in 1988, the Department of National Education and Culture, via the Language Center, launched the first publication of a Standard Indonesian dictionary (Sneddon, 2003). The grand project, however, was the dissemination of “good and proper” Indonesian through the language policy imposed on public schools from primary to university, in which formal and Standard Indonesian was the language of instruction and a mandatory school subject (Sneddon, 2003). Standard Indonesian was to be used in formal and official events, ceremonies, and classrooms. The mastery and proficiency of Standard Indonesian was indexed one’s level of education. To date, the current government still reinforces the policy via UU No. 24/2009, the language law which emphasizes the use of “good and proper” Indonesian for official, formal occasions, and as a classroom language. Children generally do not learn “good and proper” Indonesian until they attend primary schools. In some regions, they either speak the regional language (their mother tongue or the regional language their parents speak) or non-standard varieties of Indonesian (*bahasa sehari-hari* ‘daily Indonesian’). As a result, everyone who grew up during the Suharto era experienced the government’s engineering, formalization, and standardization of the language (Errington, 1998; 2000).

In the Reformasi era, Standard Indonesian is still a compulsory subject and the medium of instruction in public schools. The government has encouraged parents to speak only Indonesian at home in order to maximize students’ acquisition of Indonesian. As a result of this policy, a number of regional languages have been lost, particularly in big cities, like Jakarta, where some people speak only Colloquial Jakartan Indonesian (CJI), and are unable to speak the regional languages their parents use (Sneddon, 2003).

After living for nearly four decades under Suharto’s regime, Indonesians eventually saw a new wave of freedom upon his resignation in 1998. The Reformation Era marked a turning

point in Indonesian history. The new government immediately made drastic changes in all aspects of social life by removing censorship and repression. Presidents were limited to two terms (10 years maximum), individuals could finally express political opinions without the fear of punishment, and the media could critique government policy thanks to new freedom of the press. In politics, the number of opposition parties mushroomed to 48 (O'Rourke, 2002). All in all, Indonesia now enjoys a greater level of freedom than it did in the Suharto era, and society is experimenting with new ways of expressing that freedom in language.

This decentralization and freedom, however, caused some negative effects both for the government and the society. The Reformasi Era government decentralized power to the provinces outside Java in an attempt to allow more freedom. Political and governmental affairs are no longer based in Jakarta and Java, giving regional offices and districts more power and decentralization encouraged East Timor (now Timor Leste) to gain its independence in 2002. Aceh and West Papua exhibit other instances of serious disintegration. Among innumerable other political, social, cultural, and economic problems, the New Order era's dark legacy persists in the form of strong international pressure to account for the human rights violations committed under its rule.

The current government appears to grant social freedom so generously that extremists (commonly referred to as *pemerintahan jalanan* 'the street government') may take action, without repercussion, on anyone or any organization they deem to violate Islamic norms (Robinson, 2009; Benningshof, 2012). If, during the New Order era, it was Suharto's regime that restricted freedom of expression, it is now the Muslim hardliners, the Islamic Defenders Front (*Forum Pembela Islam*, FPI), which acts like a national watchdog (Wilson, 2014). For example, Dinata, the filmmaker and scriptwriter whose work I will examine in later chapters, argues, "The

government let the people do whatever they like, maybe that is even part of their strategy. Instead of fixing the problem the government influences certain communities to stop film festivals and boycott movies” (Benningshof, 2012, para. 10). Whereas the New Order regime used the National Censor Board (*Badan Sensor Nasional*) to control and censor the media, after 1998, censorship arrived via community demands, concerns, and intervention: now “calls for film censorship are more community driven” (Lindsay, 2011, p. 182). As we will see in Chapter Four, unofficial censorship by Islamic militants is part of the plot of Dinata’s film *Arisan! 2*.

After almost two decades of generally positive changes, Indonesia is still undergoing social, cultural, and religious conflicts. While the current government allows freedoms that were prohibited in the New Order era, these freedoms are continually under threat from FPI, Islamic extremists who do violence to individuals and organizations that appear to fall short of their religious standards or show inclinations towards Western culture. They are infamous for forcefully closing any open restaurant during Ramadan, closing down bars and convenience stores selling alcohol, and attacking filmmakers whose films portray homosexuality or promiscuity. The current government appears to be powerless to counter this conservative organization. The silence of the government towards the actions of FPI has empowered the group to influence anti-pornography legislation and to put pressure on the government to ban cultural events. For example, American artist Lady Gaga was forced to cancel her performance in Indonesia in 2012 (Wilson, 2014). These sorts of actions have been justified on Islamic grounds, and the current government’s non-intervention suggests its silent approval, even though Islam is not the only religion in Indonesia. In this light, the community plays a stronger role in influencing media discourse, in which the interpretation of religion plays such an important role.

Discourses of sexuality

While the New Order government attempted to limit and homogenize Indonesian identities, linking national identity in part to appropriate forms of sexuality, new freedoms of the current era have encouraged a more open discourse on sexuality.

First and foremost, it is important to keep in mind that religion is an important lens through which Indonesian's view sexuality. Dominant conceptions of sexuality were formed in relation to the New Order's policies and propaganda and by sermons delivered by religious figures that infiltrated the national culture (Blackwood, 2007). Islam and "traditional values" are still the primary lenses through which Indonesians understand how sexuality operates and why many Indonesians view sexual discourse as taboo (Blackwood, 2007). The majority of Indonesian Muslims interpret religious values as moral ones that work as communal standard, a set of customary values (*adat istiadat*) (Boelstorff, 2005; Blackwood, 2007). To be an Indonesian, one needs to observe the *adat istiadat* and national cultures (Boelstorff, 2005). Within these moral and religious values, any sexual relationship consummated outside of marriage is considered deviant. Thus, sexuality, religion, and *adat istiadat* are closely intertwined in shaping national identity. While sexuality is perceived as a taboo topic (Bennet, 2005, 2015), the discourse and surveillance of sexuality is a public matter regulated by both community and government (Davies, 2015).

Despite being taboo topics, sex and homosexuality are still *seksi* topics to discuss. *Seksi*, an Indonesian term, is originally a loan word from the English word *sexy*, but over time it has received its own place in Indonesian discourse, even included in the Great Dictionary. A *seksi* topic refers to a matter that norms forbid one to discuss, but that many people often discuss anyway, usually in a secretive manner, with a secret code. In spoken language, the words *sexy*

and *seksi* are pronounced identically, obscuring the boundaries between English and Indonesian. Thus, although my focus is on code-switching, it is important to note that sometimes one cannot distinguish between two discrete codes, a concept captured by the term *translanguaging* (García & Wei, 2014).

To be familiar with how the discourse of sexuality works in Indonesian society, we need to understand the role of politics and religion in shaping social attitudes towards sexuality, homosexuality, and emotionality. As I will show in later chapters, these attitudes have impacted the language selection in the popular texts. Sexuality as a discourse operates through multiple mechanisms that create knowledge of sex (Foucault, 1980). In Indonesia, sexuality works through a number of forms, including the state, family, community, and religion, leaving the individual constrained when it comes to his or her sexuality (Bennet, 2005; Bennet & Davies, 2015). Additionally, sexuality in most cities in Indonesia exists within social, cultural, and religious boundaries (Bennet, 2005). Gender and sexuality are always constructed by the spectrum of local values (*adat istiadat*) and national cultures; every Indonesian is expected to observe both local and national cultures (Boellstorff, 2005). Also, due to religious norms, which are often misconstrued as “Indonesian culture,” many Indonesians consider any representation of sexuality to be pornography. Moreover, sexuality as a discourse tends to be silent at the official or state level, suggesting that conversation or public discussion about sexuality is discouraged. Moreover, for many Indonesians, the open discussion of sexuality is closely intertwined with Westernness (Parker, 2008).

I find it productive to problematize the concept of sexuality in Indonesia, which is different from that of the United States, the latter being both a frequent point of reference in the texts I analyze and the place from which I am writing. Unlike in the States, where sexuality can

be scrutinized in its own right without necessarily adopting a religious lens, in Indonesia, like many other Muslim-majority societies, it is virtually impossible to view sexuality without religion (Bennet, 2005; Parker, 2008; Davies, 2015). As we saw earlier, people's everyday conduct is meant to abide by the principle of the state ideology Pancasila, which includes believing in God, and by extension, avoiding any sexual encounter outside of (heterosexual) marriage. In other words, normative interpretations of Islam play a powerful role in shaping social attitudes towards sex and in shaping the discourse of sexuality overall (Bennet, 2005; 2015; Robinson, 2015). Shame (*malu*) is “a key regulatory mechanism operating in Indonesia, shaping all aspects of behavior, not least sexuality” (Bennet & Davies, 2015, p.13). Sexuality is still subject to *malu* (or embarrassment) in public discussions (Davies, 2015). Thus, one of the aims of my study is to explore if *bahasa gado-gado* may act as a shield, enabling writers to discuss sex publicly by strategically mitigating the taboo using English as a secret code.

As we saw in the Introduction, the New Order's obsession with “tidiness,” Suharto's policies have muted many “disorderly” conversations, especially those relating explicitly to gender, sexuality, and love (Bennet, 2005; Suryakusuma, 2011). One of the impacts of the government's obsession over “tidiness” is that Indonesians do not openly discuss “messy” sexual matters in public spaces (Bennet, 2005). In fact, sex is still considered something private and secret (Bennet, 2005; Blackwood, 2010; Danadharta, 2011; Schonhardt, 2013). If one does talk about sex openly, she or he will be stigmatized. Even in academia, sexuality as a research topic receives a suspicious eye and attitude from the Indonesian Association of Muslim Intellectuals (*Ikatan Cendekiawan Muslim Indonesia*, ICMI) (Oetomo, 2015). Furthermore, many Indonesians regard the formal discussion of sexuality, even in an academic setting, as a method to promote homosexuality and promiscuity (Oetomo, 2015).

Restrictions on sex and sexual discourse are also accomplished via societal surveillance, stigma, and shame. Many Indonesians, especially women, do not discuss sex publicly and explicitly (Bennet, 2005, 2015; Davies, 2015). I use Davies's (2015) definition of surveillance, which defines it as the "monitoring of people to regulate and govern their behavior" (p. 43). Women experience more surveillance and more shame around their sexual behavior than men do. Especially in rural areas, extramarital sexual encounters are subject to surveillance from family members and the community (Bennet, 2005; Davies, 2015), with women receiving more monitoring than men because their virginity is thought to reflect on their families. Women who choose to be sexually active outside marriage are stigmatized for being inappropriate and immoral (Bennet, 2005; Parker, 2008). In some parts of Indonesia, especially the smaller towns, a woman's loss of virginity via extramarital intercourse can cause her to be labeled *hancur* (damaged) or a *wanita jalang* (slut), and her family may receive social ridicule as well (Bennet, 2005). The virtue of being a virgin until marriage is constantly reinforced through informal conversation, public advertisements, and routine Qur'an study. The construction of the "good woman" relies on her being a virgin until her wedding night, whereupon her virginity is divinely dedicated to her husband. Practicing abstinence is highly emphasized and expected by most parents, with premarital sex strongly discouraged or even cursed (Bennet, 2005).

The close surveillance of women on the communal level is the result of state-level policies introduced in the New Order era. In 1973, Suharto re-emphasized women's contributions to the nation through the family in the Broad Outlines State Policy (GBHN). From 1983 through 1987, women started to contribute more publicly and economically in addition to their roles in the family. In the 1993 GBHN, women's roles had developed towards equal partnerships with their husbands, with an emphasis on holding up their own and their husbands'

kodrat (nature), *harkat* (dignity), and *martabat* (status). To be bold about their sexuality or socially assertive is seen as against women's nature (*kodrat*) (Hatley, 2002). In a general sense, for the state and many Indonesians, sexual and social boldness are considered to be essentially un-Indonesian, and leaning towards both the West and the leftist Communism—both ideologies rejected by the Indonesian state. While unmarried women have freedom over their bodies, that freedom does not include sexual freedom (Bennet, 2005). In other words, the good Indonesian woman is pure and virtuous, an image created in direct opposition to the threatening, sexually promiscuous Western woman Indonesians see, for example, in Hollywood cinema. Such portrayals in cultural imports have encouraged many Indonesians and the government to link the West with a free lifestyle, or, to use the Indonesian-English term, *free sex*, a lifestyle that permits women and men to be sexually involved outside of marriage.

Thus, post-Suharto, sexual freedom, especially for women, remains entangled with notions of Westernness. Even now, the government goes so far as to regulate the virginity of female police officers by requiring them to take the *test keperawanan* 'virginity test', as mandated in the 2010 Indonesian policewomen's handbook. The handbook states that unmarried female police candidates must undergo "a bodily check as a procedure to ensure their hymen is intact" (cited in Davies 2015). For any prospective candidates who have lost their virginity but still hope to pass the test, Davies notes, there are some "expensive operations available to women who need to replicate an intact hymen" (2015, p. 33). Overall, women's sexuality is regulated through punitive shame mechanisms because their bodies are subject to public denunciation for any decision they make that is deemed immoral (Bennet, 2015). We will see in Chapter Four how *bahasa gado-gado* plays an important role when it comes to a woman's discussions of sexual autonomy.

The state continues to regulate representations of sex and sexuality, deeming undesirable representations “pornography.” From 2002 to 2006, a debate raged on various drafts of the Anti-Pornography and Pornoaction Bill (*Undang-Undang Anti Pornografi dan Pornoaksi*, or UU APP), not only among legislators but also in popular discourse. In 2008, the government eventually passed the bill as law, stipulating that materials for public access should not offend ethics/morality, modesty or politeness. Anyone found producing, distributing, or selling material deemed pornographic is subject to prosecution. The anti-pornography guidelines uphold decency, propriety, and morality and prohibit nudity, kissing, real or simulated intercourse, and images showing body parts that “usually arouse lust, such as thighs, buttocks, breasts, and genitals” (UU APP, 2008).

Prior to the anti-pornography law’s passage in 2006, the bill stirred up a hotly debated controversy throughout Indonesian society. Conservative Muslims argued that pornography, which they believe to be evidence of unwanted American influences, should be eradicated. The fear harbored by extremist and conservative Muslims in Indonesia toward Western values and influence derives from the belief that Western influence and values threaten the nation and could lead to “the dangers of anarchy, hedonism, free sex, obscenity, globalization, and the degenerate West” (Allen, 2007, p. 104). On the other hand, more moderate Muslims did not share this view, and secular groups tended to see this bill as an act of a police state (Allen, 2007).

Muslim clergymen, who have a significant impact in the society, also participate in the sexuality discourse. In 2011, an Indonesian Ulama Council issued a fatwa (an Islamic legal opinion) outlawing all publications, including writing, painting, journalism, broadcasting, advertisements, and sounds that depicted sex or were designed to arouse lust. Thus, post-Suharto, the discourse of national identity which includes discourse about sexuality, is no longer shaped

solely by a top-down approach but is more a community-driven matter.

In order to prevent the negative effects of Western culture, the New Order government assiduously campaigned on the slogan, “*Ambil yang baik, buang yang buruk*” (“Take the good influence, toss the bad one”). The bad influences included, but were not limited to, cohabitation, premarital sex, and public discussion of sex (Bennet, 2005). Such a lifestyle is still prohibited: indeed, a recent draft of legislation, presented by the current government for congressional approval in August 2015, proposed criminal penalties for a couple reported to be living together outside of marriage. The maximum sentencing for such a crime is one year or a fine of up to fifty million rupiahs (USD 5000). Furthermore, articles 522 and 523 of the Book of Criminal Act Law (*Kitab Undang-Undang Hukum Pidana*) list immoral activities, including singing sexual songs, giving sex-related speeches, and showing pictures and drawings depicting sexual content; these crimes carry a punishment of at least two months of jail time, or paying a fine of about up to three hundred rupiahs (USD 25).

In all these ways, we see that the New Order government treated sexuality as a political, public, and national concern rather than a personal, private, and individual matter, and that its influence continues today. The government together with the religious teachings have infiltrated women’s domain to constrain their sexuality under the state and communal surveillance. While the Reformasi era has seen some space for freedom of expression, Indonesian women are still under surveillance to some extent, which has continuously affected their sexual autonomy and expression. Yet, as I’ll show in Chapter Four, *bahasa gado-gado* has enabled female characters to express their sexual independence by strategically working around the taboo issues using *bahasa gado-gado* as their alternative language.

Discourses of homosexuality

In addition to “pornography,” homosexuality is another taboo and controversial topic for many Indonesians. For many people, homosexuality is a “deviant” practice that contradicts Islamic values, and by extension, challenges Indonesianness. Only by apprehending the perception of many Indonesians towards homosexuality, we can then understand how code-switching in which English plays a crucial key may act as a strategic mechanism to disguise the taboo, to conceal the controversy, and by extension, to expand the meaning of being an Indonesian.

Like pre-marital sexuality, same sex relationships remain a sensitive, controversial, and taboo topic in many conservative regions of the country. While not officially prohibited, homosexuality is nevertheless socially discouraged and stigmatized, so many homosexuals do not come out. Indonesia as a nation does not prohibit or criminalize homosexuality (Blackwood, 2007), with the exception of Aceh province, which adopted a version of Sharia law that included an anti-homosexuality law at the end of 2015 (BBC News, October 23, 2015). In fact, “the Indonesian state has maintained a neutral stance towards homosexuality” (Blackwood, 2007, p. 294). In many Indonesians’ interpretation of Islam, homosexuality is frowned upon and is considered a sinful action. In 2008, the government passed the Pornography Act (UU Pornografi and Pornoaksi) emphasizing that homosexuality is a “deviant” sexual practice. It has remained a hotly debated and controversial issue in Indonesia, especially since the 2015 U.S. Supreme Court ruling in favor of marriage rights for same-sex couples. Even as same-sex marriage is becoming more talked about and the media increasingly addresses lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) issues, they are still sensitive topics for public discussion.

In late January 2016, LGBT rights again became a hot topic of public debate in Indonesia. From *Jakartapost*, an English-language newspaper, I learned that students at the University of Indonesia, one of the nation's leading public universities, were protesting a newly emerged LGBT organization named the Support Group and Resource Center on Sexuality Studies (SGRC). The Technology, Research, and Higher Education Minister, Muhammad Nasir, weighed in, saying that LGBT students and the organization should be banned from universities in Indonesia, arguing that the LGBT community would corrupt the morals of the nation. He further argued that a university should be able to uphold moral values and the values of the nation's ancestors, implying that the existence of this organization is against those values and threatens Indonesianness. Since then, the debate on LGBT rights in newspapers and social media, of which many Indonesians are active users, has been prominent, with anti-LGBT groups dominating. My social media feed is full of memes rejecting LGBT groups and condemning individuals, groups, and institutions that support LGBT people. One of the most debated suggestions is to urge the government to censor anything that depicts the practice of homosexuality and to limit the work of transgendered artists. Despite such suggestions, people in cities like Jakarta are relatively open-minded and largely accept the LGBT community.

Due to homosexuality's public stigma, coming out is still a fantasy for many LGBT Indonesians. I myself have been trying to refrain from making an open and explicit comment about my support to LGBT groups, worrying about the possibility of losing my Indonesian friends. In this context, the problem of coming out may not belong only to those who are LGBT but also to their allies, whom some Indonesians regard as infidels to Islam. Another illustration of anti-LGBT polemic is seen in the boycotting of Starbucks and the social media app LINE, both of which publicly support LGBT rights. It has not taken long for religious figures and

national newspapers to express their opinions about LGBT rights, basing them on normative interpretations of Islamic values labeling not only LGBT people but also their allies as immoral, and un-Islamic. All of this goes to illustrate how the LGBT community is still a stigmatized group with very limited room in society, and subject to public threats. (Sears, 1996). Thus, LGBT is also still an invisible group in the sense that they cannot show their public display of affection in public spaces. As we will see in Chapter Four, this is an important background that plays a vital role to understand how *bahasa gado-gado* functions as a shield to mediate the taboo-themed conversation.

As the pros and cons about LGBT are increasingly debated, 2016 is a sensitive and trying period for the Indonesian government due to pressure from two ends: one is from anti-LGBT groups, which represent the majority of Indonesians, asking the government to condemn LGBT people, and the other is from the Human Rights Watch, which has urged Jokowi, the current president, to protect LGBT rights (Karmini, 2016). Many Indonesians are worried that the country will legalize gay and lesbian marriage (“Anti Gay Actions in Indonesia Threaten a Fragile Population,” 2016). There have been several polemics expressed by Indonesian laypeople, including activists, researchers, and professors, whose opinions are expressed in national newspapers and other media. At the time of this writing, the current government has not yet made an official statement about homosexuality in Indonesia. Nevertheless, some prominent governmental figures have made strong comments about the LGBT movement. For example, defense minister Ryamizard Ryacudu said that homosexuality is “a form of modern warfare, an attempt by Western nations to undermine the country’s sovereignty” (BBC News, February 29, 2016). In other words, LGBT people are seen as a threat to the nation. Similarly, the current vice president, Jusuf Kalla, blames “American culture” for bringing negative influences to Indonesia.

He believes that any kind of foreign influence should be eradicated because foreign values are not in accordance with Indonesian values. Additionally, many people label LGBT people as “diseased,” in need of a cure and rehabilitation to be “normal” (BBC News, February 29, 2016). Such statements conflate “deviant” sexuality with Westernness, and understand both as threats to a homogenized national identity. Likewise, in the university setting, the government, represented by a legislative body from the Prosperous Justice Party (*Partai Keadilan Sejahtera*, PKS), a purist Muslim party, condemned the creation of the Support Group and Resource Center on Sexuality Studies (SGRC) as an indirect recognition of the LGBT rights movement in Indonesia. Protesters argued that the LGBT community is a serious threat to the nation. As we will see in Chapter Four, the bias against LGBT individuals is reflected in the *Arisan!* films.

This controversy has resulted in high tensions, even though LGBT-supporting organizations in Indonesia are not a new phenomenon. The nation’s biggest LGBT organization, known as GAYa NUSANTARA, was established in 1982 by the well-respected openly gay researcher, linguist, professor, and LGBT activist, Dede Oetomo (Oetomo & Beollstorff, 2015). The attitudes of Indonesians, especially those who are Muslims, towards the LGBT movement is not homogenous (Burhanudin & van Dijk, 2013). One day in 2012, the Islamic Defenders Front (*Front Pembela Islam* or FPI), a group of Indonesian Islamic extremists, raided the book signing event of Irshad Manji, an openly lesbian Canadian author who was promoting her book *Allah, Love, and Liberty* in Jakarta and Yogyakarta, Indonesia. In this time of crisis, the organizers asked for help from the moderate Islamic organization Nahdlatul Ulama (NU), which agreed to provide security support. While Muslim extremists showed a strong anti-LGBT bias, more moderate Islamic organizations, such as NU, were in favor of supporting the LGBT community.

This heterogeneity is also displayed by the characters in the *Arisan!* movies, in which two characters, Andien and Meimei, are shown offering support towards LGBT organizations.

In relation to socio-cultural norms, many Indonesians perceive gays and lesbians to be acting against national values, constitutional law, and the state ideology *Pancasila* (Five Principles). Polemics against the LGBT movement have been persistent in newspapers and social media, exposing many people's strong condemnation of it and a view of homosexuality as a "sickness" that needs to be cured (Boellstorf, 2005b). In a similar light, Boellstorf (2005a, 2005b) reports on Indonesian attitudes towards the gay community, finding that many Indonesians view gay culture as a "Western" import that should be eradicated from Indonesia; moreover, they understand being gay as not a human right, but as a sinful sexual orientation. Basing their homophobia on a conservative interpretation of the Qur'an, most Indonesian Muslims believe that homosexuality is against what the Qur'an has prescribed. According to the Pancasila, the 1945 Constitution, GBHN, state laws, and conservative interpretations of the Qur'an, Indonesians must refrain from "immoral" homosexual activities. Yet the *Arisan!* films resist these normative values, which is partly indexed by the occurrence of *bahasa gado-gado*, as we will see in Chapter Four.

Combatting the supposedly negative impact of Western influence, the government continues to use the Censorship Board to "protect" Indonesian citizens and sustain its construction of national identity as homogenous. While the Reformasi era offers more social freedom than previous eras, the government's attitude toward cinema remains like that of the Suharto era. In addition to the 2008 law regulating pornography, Undang-Undang Anti Pornografi dan Pornoaksi, or UU APP, the government passed Film Law 33/2009, which restricts movie makers from expressing their opinions and voices, especially in ways that might

be considered pornographic, a restriction justified by the purpose of sustaining a singular Indonesian national identity and its attendant cultural values.

Opinions regarding the Censorship Board have divided filmmakers into two groups. The older generation of moviemakers, in spite of their open-mindedness and criticism of New Order policy and the current government's censorship policy, is still in favor of the Censorship Board (Sen & Hill, 2007). They believe that the main purpose of censorship is to protect society from negative (Western) influences instilled by movies (Sen & Hill, 2007). The younger generation, however, has fought to eliminate film censorship and proposed a categorical rating system instead. This group includes filmmaker Nia Dinata, whose *Arisan!* films I will analyze in later chapters. The younger generation's view on censorship is line with Sen's (1992) argument that the government is controlling filmmaker's creativity, rather than protecting society.

Linguistic diversity in Indonesia's history

Indonesian's status as the sole official and national language, belies the fact that Indonesia is incredibly linguistic diverse. Such diversity is also masked in popular texts, which privilege Indonesian and CJI, the Jakartan dialect. A brief review of Indonesia's linguistic history will help make sense of the tension between Indonesian, English, and CJI. I use the positions of Indonesian and English to examine code-switching in the texts in which English is the marked language of the *mélange*. Understanding how Indonesian has acted an essential national identity emblem will help us understand how *bahasa gado-gado* is sometimes interpreted as disloyalty to the nation, Americanization, or a lack of Indonesianness.

Indonesia has a sizeable number of regional languages numbering between 550 (Sneddon, 2003; Smith-Hefner, 2007) and 707 (Ethnologue, 2016). Each of Indonesia's islands

is home to various ethnic groups, each with its own language. These languages are vehicles for cultural traditions and customs, playing an important role in ethnic identities. As we saw earlier, a regional language is usually the first language that people speak in their homes. The regional languages exist alongside the official and national language, Indonesian, which public schools teach as a core subject. In most small areas and islands, the relationship between Indonesian and the regional language has remained the same over time. In addition to Indonesian, other languages that are commonly studied in school are English and Arabic, the latter learned for religious reasons.

The making of Indonesian as a single official and national language is notable in the face of such linguistic diversity, making Indonesia the “envy of the multilingual world” (Fishman, 1978, p. 333). Despite people’s ethnic differences, many Indonesians believe that language functions as an important facilitator of unity (Diah, 1982; Errington, 2000; Muslich, 2010). In 1950, the government adopted the slogan *Bhineka Tunggal Ika* [Unity in Diversity] which means every Indonesian is meant to have both a regional identity and a national one.

Long before the Dutch came to colonize the archipelago, Indonesian, which at that time was called *Bahasa Melayu* [Malay], had already served as a lingua franca among locals, foreigners, and traders arriving from China, India, Saudi Arabia, and Europe (Alisjahbana, 1976); it was also a literary language in one region of Sumatra (Teeuw, 1984; Sneddon, 2003). In the nineteenth century, when the Dutch took over Indonesia from the Dutch East India Company, the Dutch government had to somehow bridge those who spoke Dutch (the official language), Indonesian, and the hundreds of regional languages (Alisjahbana, 1976). Indonesian had already acquired status as a lingua franca, and many people used it across the archipelago as a trading language (Alisjahbana, 1974; Errington, 2000; Sneddon, 2003). Due to this function, the Dutch

selected Indonesian as an additional official language in Dutch-occupied Indonesia (Alisjahbana, 1974; Lowenberg, 1985).

Having two official languages created competition between Dutch and Indonesian in the 19th and 20th centuries. Because it wasn't associated with Dutch colonizers, Indonesian began to represent independence and a nationalist identity separate from the colonizers (Alisjahbana, 1974; Lowenberg, 1985). In 1925, as Indonesian became more popular, the Dutch government responded by taking steps to promote Dutch (Alisjahbana, 1974; 1976). However, these measures eventually backfired, for as the number of Indonesians who could speak Dutch increased, more Indonesians qualified for promotion to important and higher positions in the government (Alisjahbana, 1974; 1976, 1977). Alarmed, the Dutch began to promote Indonesian again, to the pleasure of nationalists (Alisjahbana, 1974; 1976). The Dutch then restricted the use of Dutch for wider communication among native Indonesians (Errington, 2000).

The year 1928 was an important one for young Indonesian nationalists who chose Indonesian as the national language during their second youth congress. Indonesian was only spoken by five percent of the population as a first language, whereas Javanese was spoken by 47 percent of the population, and Sundanese by 15 percent (Moeliono, 1985). In fact, the small number who spoke Indonesian as a first language was what made it a safe choice: revolutionary Indonesia's founding fathers believed Javanese speakers would have an advantage if their language was chosen, a situation that could lead to mistrust and a disadvantaged situation for non-Javanese speakers (Nababan, 1982; Moeliono, 1985; Errington, 1998; Sneddon, 2003; Pauuw, 2009). Finally, on October 28, 1928, the young nationalists officially declared Indonesian an official national language (Errington, 2000). From that point on, Indonesian

successfully constructed and shaped an understanding of national identity as uniform and made vulnerable the colonizers' power.

Another important feature of Indonesian made it a desirable choice: its non-hierarchical structure. Indonesian does not differentiate social status of interlocutors, and thus, the Dutch-educated young intellectuals considered it to be egalitarian. Its perceived egalitarianism suited the project of nation building, ostensibly eliminating ethnic differences and linguistic hierarchies; therefore, it would function as a linguistic symbol to build a national identity (Errington, 1998; Kroskrity, 2000).

Though Indonesians nominally acknowledged Indonesian as an official language in 1928, it was not until 1945 that it actually functioned as one. After defeating the Dutch in 1942, Japan colonized Indonesia until 1945. The Japanese occupation played a crucial role in making Indonesian a national language. During its brief rule, the Japanese government forbade the use of Dutch as the official administrative language, expecting to eventually replace it with Japanese. But Japan only had three years to apply this policy, which inadvertently encouraged Indonesian to develop and grow as a transition language (Alisyahbana, 1974, 1976, 1977; Lowenberg, 1985; Sneddon, 2003; Paauw, 2009). Now that Indonesian was widely used as the language for wider communication, it became at independence it became the sole official language and the “language of unity” (Sneddon, 2003, p. 6). However, during Japanese rule, it still lacked adequate vocabulary for education, politics, and commerce. Thus, in late 1942, the Japanese colonial government created *Komisi Bahasa* (The Language Commission), whose task it was to record and standardize its grammar and create and expand its lexemes (Lowenberg, 1985; Marcellino, 1990; Sneddon, 2003).

As this history reveals, Indonesian did not function as the national language all at once.

Turning it into the official language involved many events and many figures: not only the young nationalist intellectuals who declared the Youth Pledge in 1928, but also the Dutch and Japanese governments. Indonesian's status as the national language was due to the people's readiness to embrace a language they saw as their own, over that of the colonial language, Dutch. Indonesian functioned as not only a communication tool but also a nationalist symbol during the colonial period, and eventually a symbol of national identity.

Today, Indonesian continues to be cultivated and developed as both the national and official language. The government, through *Badan Pengembangan Pembinaan Bahasa*, the Bureau of Language Development and Maintenance and the Department of National Education and Culture, assiduously promotes the use of Standard Indonesian. Standard Indonesian is the language of the law, policy, and the state-owned media, while ordinary people use colloquial variants in their daily lives. The Jakartan dialect, CJI, is the most "fashionable" variant and represents an "upbeat" lifestyle; it also the most prestigious variant of Indonesian, as it is mostly used by urbanites residing and working in Jakarta. Modern Indonesian is a lively language used in different forms and variants.

A sociolinguistic profile of English in Indonesia

Alongside Indonesian, foreign languages also play important roles in Indonesia's linguistic landscape. English has played an important role in education, social life, and economics. Indeed, it is perhaps because of its increasing importance that the use of English stokes tensions and provokes stigma.

Aside from English, other foreign languages are available in high school; for example, Chinese, which was once restricted by Suharto, has started to gain popularity. Arabic, French,

German, and Japanese are among the languages that are taught for at least two hours a week in senior high schools. Many people perceive Arabic, the language of the Qur'an, to be the language of Islam; the majority of Indonesian Muslims are taught to read the Arabic alphabet in order to recite the Qur'an without necessarily understanding it or speaking the language. Yet English, above other foreign languages, has social and economic currency (Lie, 2007) among many, especially those living in major cities.

Being imaginarily located in the Expanding Circle in the Kachruvian English circles, I find the concept of "World Englishes" is productive for problematizing the position of English in Indonesia and understanding how English is being appropriated locally. A prominent figure in the study of "World Englishes," Braj Kachru (1982, 1990, 2005, 2008) divides the speakers of English into three imaginary English "circles." The first circle is "the Inner Circle," native speakers in countries such as those of Great Britain., the U.S., New Zealand, Australia, and Canada. These native speakers are the norm providers, and the teaching of English around the world has privileged them as the source of all standards, including learning objectives, materials, teaching methods, and assessment. The second circle is "the Outer Circle," speakers of English as a second language in countries where English is a former colonial language, such as Malaysia, India, Singapore, and many countries in Africa (Kachru, 1982, 1990). The third or "Expanding Circle" refers to speakers of English in countries where English is taught as a foreign language—these countries are a recipient of Standard English norms taught by English native speakers, and tend to be powerless when it comes to English teaching. Indonesia is one of the Expanding Circle countries, and tends to be more accepting of Inner-Circle norms, including Inner-Circle pronunciation, than it is toward other variants of English, such as those coming from the "Outer Circle," like Singaporean English or even its own Expanding Circle varieties, such as the code-

switched forms I examine in this dissertation. Many Indonesians, especially those who can afford private schools, still prefer English modeled by native speakers from Great Britain or the U.S., to the point where only British or American English “counts” as English.

English in Indonesia

In the Reformasi era, English has become one of the most visible foreign languages displayed in public spaces in Indonesia, as we saw in the Introduction. Global forces have encouraged Indonesia to participate in world affairs globally and internationally, and the government views English as a language that can provide access to international markets, scientific knowledge, and international networking (Lauder, 2008). The influence of English comes from a multitude of arenas, such as politics, diplomacy, international trade and industry, commerce, science and technology, education, the media, information technology, and popular culture (Huda, 2000; Crystal, 2003; Jenkins, 2003; Sneddon, 2003). The fact that English has such a global economic currency has anchored it as a primary foreign language subject in many schools in Indonesia.

Despite being the primary foreign language, the position of English in the Indonesian education sector is complex. It is notable in the sense that English has never been officially placed as a mandatory subject in the public elementary schools as opposed to other Southeast Asian countries (Kirkpatrick, 2012, 2014). However, English has been taught in middle and high schools as a primary foreign language for six consecutive years since the beginning of the independence era (Sneddon, 2003; Kirkpatrick, 2014). In fact, English has been taught as a foreign language (EFL) in middle and high schools since the 1950s; it was the first foreign language started in junior high (class 7 and up, from age 11 to 17) (Sneddon, 2003). English language skills prepare students to read English textbooks in university, and many job vacancies

list English as one of the top requirements (Lie, 2007). Although the government made English a compulsory subject in middle and senior high schools in the 1950s, it is hard to generalize about the status of English today. Some researchers propose the elevation of English to “additional language” status due to its prevalent usage in public space (e.g., Lowenberg, 1991; Lauder, 2008), while other researchers believe that English is still a “foreign language” (e.g., Nababan, 1982; 1985; Darjowidjojo, 2000, Renandya, 2004; Lie, 2007). This split opinion reflects the fact that most Indonesians do not have the foundation to confidently use English in the public and, most notably, in official domains—unlike people in neighbouring Outer Circle countries like Malaysia and Singapore (Nababan, 1982; 1985; Darjowidjojo, 2000).

In the Reformasi era, there has been a growing tendency to also teach English in elementary schools, especially private ones. In 2006, the government began requiring English as a subject in public elementary schools. This policy had mixed results, leading the Department of National Education and Culture, in 2013, to eliminate English as a subject in public schools and offer it instead as an extra-curricular subject. Since 2014, however, the Department has required schools to re-apply the 2006 curriculum, except for some schools that have applied the 2013 curriculum for more than one semester. This decision gives some elementary schools the option to teach English as part of required lessons, while giving others the option to not teach it. Thus, the decision to teach English is effectively left to the schools themselves, which has resulted in several private “international” schools using English as the language of instruction, and positioning Indonesian as merely a subject that students need to study (Muliastuti, 2016).

Furthermore, in the Reformasi era, the government via the Department of National Education and Culture implemented the policy of English as the medium of instruction (EMI). This policy was designed to respond to the increasing demand for quality English instruction that

has led to the rise of public schools being leveraged into “international standard schools” (*Sekolah Berwawasan Internasional, SBI*) prototype, especially since the passage of law No. 20 in 2003, and the 2005-2009 Main Policy and Strategy of Department of National Education and Culture (*Kebijakan Pokok Pembangunan Pendidikan Nasional dalam Rencana Strategis Departemen Pendidikan Nasional Tahun 2005-2009*). In SBI schools, teachers in elementary schools were to use English when teaching science and mathematics beginning in Year 4. English was also to be used as a medium of instruction for teaching science, mathematics, and core vocational subjects in junior high schools, senior high schools, and vocational schools (Coleman, 2009). The goal of SBI was to prepare Indonesian youth to be smart Indonesian figures and internationally competitive (Haryana, 2007), implying English as the main resource for global and international networking, relations, and success. The government had given full authority to the school principles of SBI schools to charge fees to the students of their schools. SBI schools in cities like Jakarta can charge up to IDR 1.5 million (USD 150) as their monthly fee (Coleman, 2009). But due to public polemics, the Constitutional Court cancelled the policy on SBI in 2013, stating that education should not only equip students to be internationally competitive but also to instill “national identity” and “Indonesian culture.” (Berita2Bahasa, January 2, 2013).

There is no any official EMI regulation applied to universities even though there have been growing demands from prospective students’ parents to have EMI in universities (Kirpatrick, 2014). Despite the lack of official regulation, a number of prominent universities in the nation have taken the initiative to offer classes with English as the medium of instruction (labeled as “international undergraduate programs”) in addition to their regular or local programs. A number of universities, such as Universitas Brawijaya in 2006, Universitas Indonesia in 2014,

and Universitas Islam Syarif Hidayatullah, Universitas Trisakti, and Universitas Gadjah Mada in 2016, have begun offering international programs, while still maintaining their regular programs. The international programs are generally attended by local or domestic students, but there are some international students, notably from Malaysia attending the program. The universities charge higher tuition for the international programs (Mawungtyas, 2006; Sukmawijaya, 2016). In order to be admitted to international programs, universities require students to pass the minimum TOEFL score (Kirpatrick, 2014). As we will see in Chapter Three, TOEFL not only functions as a benchmark to assess one's English ability, but also cultivates bilinguals' preference towards an American variant of English.

English acquisition depends on exposure to and interactions with native speakers (Jazadi, 2000). For example, lecturers in two different undergraduate pre-service English teacher institutions in Yogyakarta and Bandung told me that they envision students speaking English with American speakers, and therefore need to teach their students American culture. Similarly, several Indonesian public school teachers in Jakarta told me that their students are very concerned about the variant of English they learn and eventually speak, with either British or American English(es) as the prestige varieties. In order to guarantee that they are exposed to "the correct English," students demand their teachers play Hollywood films, from which they hope to get both language exposure and cross-cultural understanding. In terms of textbooks, lecturers in two universities informed me that their curriculum requires them to teach an essentialized American culture through cross-cultural understanding (popularly known as CCU) classes with books titled *Understanding the American way* and *Beyond language, cross cultural communication*, as the main textbooks. Both universities require such classes to be taught either by an American professor or an Indonesian professor graduating from an American university or

with an American Studies background, at the very least. A recent study investigating English teachers from Indonesia shows that teachers' perception towards both variants of English (British and American English(es)) is primarily due to the textbooks available, which are primarily published by British or American publishers (Dewi, 2017). Similarly, English teachers in elementary to senior high schools prefer to use readings from Inner Circle countries to guarantee students' exposure to native speakers' English, believing that local textbooks are superficial and lack native speakers' input and modeling (Jazadi, 2000). Thus, many English teachers and students in Indonesia are operating under the impression that "English" means British or American English (Dardjowidjojo, 2000); the concept of World Englishes is a foreign one for many. However, as I will argue in later chapters, *bahasa gado-gado* has created a new form of Indonesian English that can be understood as a form of World English(es).

Conclusion

Language does not stand alone, isolated from other social factors. Indonesia is a pluralistic, linguistically rich, socially and economically stratified, and religiously varied country. The social, cultural, historical, and economic background of Indonesia helps us to understand the position of Indonesian and English and people's perception of it, and the ambivalent attitude of many Indonesians towards the use of English in codeswitching.

Despite its linguistic richness, Indonesia has only one official and national language; this has produced a sociolinguistic dynamic that needs further academic study. Additionally, the socially and culturally diverse nation has undergone many political changes occurring since its independence in 1945. The transition from the New Order era to the Reformasi era has

tremendously impacted the nation not only in socio-cultural, economical, and political arenas, but also Indonesians' language use.

This chapter has also shown that there are at least three forces at play in the construction of Indonesianness: the state, nationalist Indonesians, and conservative religious groups such as the Islamic Defender Front (FPI). These forces impose and enforce their notion of Indonesianness and concurrently reinforce the ideology that using Indonesian is essential to being an Indonesian.

CHAPTER TWO

FRAMEWORK, METHOD, AND TEXTS

Bahasa gado-gado is now more easily found in popular texts than it was in New Order era. From newspapers and magazines to the 21 Cinema, Indonesians encounter titles and headlines juxtaposing Indonesian and English, a mix of languages which for some people indicates inauthenticity or a loss of Indonesianness.

In this chapter, I explain the approaches and method I use to investigate this phenomenon. My aim is to explore and explain the relationship between identity and language selection, as well as other nuances revealed by the use of English in otherwise Indonesian-language popular texts. I use a hybrid approach and interdisciplinary framework, drawing from a poststructuralist approach to critical applied linguistics. Existing studies of Indonesian-English code-switching focus mainly on oral interaction (e.g., Yassi, 2001; Sumarsih et al., 2014), classroom interaction (e.g., Pradina et al., 2014), and computer-mediated communication (e.g., Isharyanti & Càrdenas-Claros, 2009). Only a few scholars have examined code-switching in Indonesian novels (e.g., Arimasari, 2013; Meilisa, 2013), while other studies investigating Indonesian films focus on the socio-cultural aspects other than language (e.g. Munir, 2011). Most studies of code-switching view it through linguistic and socio-linguistic lenses; what remains underexplored is the social, political, and historical context for code-switching between Indonesian and English. Moreover, the language selection in the realm of popular written texts impacted by social and political events is still underexplored. Additionally, studies of Indonesian films post-Suharto have mainly examined them from a cultural studies perspective, with little attention paid to language use in narration and dialogue (e.g., Clark, 2008; Hanan, 2008; Heryanto, 2008; Jurriëns, 2008; Munir, 2011). Building on these existing studies, I offer another

lens to focus on code-switching, through an examination of its use in popular written texts, placing linguistic selection squarely at the center of the study. Utilizing an eclectic critical perspective, I examine texts (both films and print fiction) which juxtapose English and Indonesian.

Language does not operate in a vacuum. I understand language as both impacting and impacted by society, politics, and history. Thus, my analysis not only addresses language choice, but also elaborates on the social, political, and historical motivations that impact it. I examine the occurrence of English and Colloquial Jakartan Indonesian (CJI) in otherwise Standard Indonesian texts in relation to language ideologies, ownership of language, identity, and power. Only by examining language choice from various approaches can we understand how Indonesians manipulate languages to expand national identities.

Because of my interest in social and political influences on language use, I consider governmental policies, laws, moral values, language ideologies, and the top-down national identity paradigm in relation to the occurrence of English. Many Indonesians perceive *bahasa gado-gado* as something negative, due to the degree to which English has decentered Indonesian, the national and official language. This is a key issue in national identity making. I demonstrate that *bahasa gado-gado* in literary and cinematic works often functions beyond stylistic purposes and is purposefully and strategically exploited to diversify Indonesian identities.

As we saw in the Introduction, young people have created new, hybrid modes of expression, reflected in the popular texts. The hybrid titles I saw in bookstores and cinemas when I returned to Indonesia made me ask several questions.

1. Given the negative perception that surrounds English in Indonesia, what function does English perform in texts written and published after the New Order era?

2. Is there a relationship between *bahasa gado-gado* and discursive topic?
3. What is the relationship between language use and identity construction?
4. How does Indonesian English differ from Inner Circle or Outer Circle variants of English?

To address these questions, I used a multifaceted paradigm to analyze Standard Indonesian, CJI, and English in popular texts by drawing on World Englishes theory (including the “ownership of English”), the concept of language ideologies, and a poststructuralist approach to critical applied linguistics. These approaches allow me to discuss the identities, ideologies, and power indexed by language selection. I explore several key constructs that have evolved from critical perspectives on multilingualism, all of which share the view that language cannot be detached from its social, cultural, and political contexts.

Research on multilingualism and code-switching in written texts

As code-switching can only be performed by people who know two codes, any investigation of code-switching necessitates a discussion of bilingualism (Wei, 2000; Bullock & Toribio, 2009). In other words, a basic requirement of code-switching is to be bilingual, and the speaker’s ability to code-switch depends on his or her level of bilingualism (Wei, 2000; Gardner-Chloros, 2009).

Many people, even some linguists, mistakenly treat bilingualism as a special case—a view grounded in a monolingual perspective (Wei, 2000; Bhatia & Ritchie, 2004; 2006). In fact, the world hosts more than seven thousand living languages (Ethnologue, 2015). Europe has the least number of languages at about 285, whereas Asia has the most at more than two thousand (Ethnologue, 2015). Given so many languages in the world, it is inevitable that most people will

encounter more than one language. Bilingualism is a worldwide phenomenon, and it is the norm in many societies (Grosjean, 1982, 2010; Bhatia & Ritchie, 2004); one in three of the world's population is a functional bilingual, defined as “someone who can operate in two languages with or without full fluency for the task in hand” (Wei, 2000, p. 5).

Linguists used to define bilingualism very narrowly, as “native-like control of two languages” (Bloomfield, 1933, p. 56), but today it is more common to take a broad view, to ascribe bilingualism to any individual in “possession of two languages” (Wei, 2000, p. 6) or who interacts in two or more languages (Auer, 1984). For the purposes of this study, I define bilinguals as those who can use and choose from different languages (or dialects) to interact with other individuals in both speech and writing.

Many researchers have argued about the term *code* versus *language*. Several scholars have used *code* as an umbrella term that covers language, dialect, register, and style (Gardner-Chloros, 1987, 1997, 2009; Wardhaugh, 2011). For this study, the term *code* in code-switching is used to refer to both language(s) and dialect(s).

Researchers have offered various definitions of code-switching. Sociolinguists emphasize the social factors underlying the switching occurrence, i.e., in what situation, why, and while interacting with whom (Gumperz, 1982; Grosjean, 1982, 2010). Those interested in grammar define code-switching as a rule-governed behavior that allows the juxtaposition of two or more languages occurring in the same word, phrase, or sentence (Poplack, 1980; Myers-Scotton, 1983, 1993a, 1993b; Gardner-Chloros, 1997, 2009). Furthermore, Myers-Scotton (1993) and Gumperz (1982) define code-switching as the selection by bilinguals and multilinguals of forms from an embedded variety (or varieties) of utterances during the same conversation. Most code-switching experts define their subject as the selection of two languages or codes from one's linguistic

repertoire, not necessarily motivated by lack of competence. Rather, the practice springs from the complex bilingual skills of the speaker (Cook, 1992, 2001; Myers-Scotton, 1993; Eldridge 1996; Skiba 1997; Auer, 1998; Romaine, 2000; Sert, 2005; Cantone, 2007; Conteh, 2007; Moodley, 2007).

I follow the aforementioned researchers in viewing code-switching not as a deficit, but rather as an additional resource for the expression a range of social and rhetorical meanings; and one that involves skilled manipulation of overlapping sections or two (or more) languages, regardless of the speaker's proficiency in the two languages. Also, in this study, I do not treat any English terms that have been adopted and adapted into Indonesian spelling and listed in the *Great Dictionary* (KBBI), as code-switching. The same is true for the loan English words that are not italicized in the printed texts indicating they are no longer considered foreign terms.

Two questions are frequently asked about the practice of code-switching. Why do bilinguals switch back and forth between languages? And what communicative functions does this shift fulfill? Various theories have attempted to answer these questions, motivating a sizeable body of research (e.g., Poplack, 1980; Gumperz, 1982; Grosjean, 1982, 2010; Myers-Scotton, 1983, 1988; Romaine, 1995, 2000; Zentella, 1997; Heller, 2007; Jonsson, 2010, 2012, 2014; Montes-Alcalà, 2012).

Some linguists used to have a negative attitude toward and misunderstanding of code-switching (e.g. Weinreich, 1953, 1968; Labov, 1966, 1971), but attitudes have shifted since the early 1990s. However, many laypeople continue to have negative attitudes. Even bilinguals who engage in code-switching often label the practice as peculiar, random, bad, or negative (Myers-Scotton, 1993; Milroy and Muysken, 1995; Bhatia & Ritchie 2004; Gardner-Chloros, 2009; Jonsson, 2010). Additionally, they may perceive code-switching as lazy, wrong, embarrassing,

impure, or even dangerous (Grosjean, 1982; Edwards, 2004, 2006; Gardner-Chloros, 2009), citing “lack of education” or “bad manners or improper control of the two grammars” (Gumperz, 1982, p. 62). Bilingual code-switchers themselves may erroneously attribute their code-switching practice “to illiteracy and poor linguistic competence” (Montes-Alcalà, 2012, p. 68). From the perspective of some monolinguals, code-switching produces “a grammarless mixture of two languages, a jargon or gibberish that is an insult to the monolingual’s own rule-governed language” (Grosjean, 1982, p. 146). Moreover, some monolinguals still believe that code-switching demonstrates a lack of proficiency in one or both languages (Grosjean, 1982; Wei, 2000). Many people, including linguists, have assigned names to these mixtures, such as Tex-Mex, Spanglish, Franglais, Singlish, Chinglish, and others (Grosjean, 1982; Zentella, 1997; Edwards, 2004, 2006; Montes-Alcalà, 2012). Many people perceive those who code-switch as lacking skill in both languages and eloquent in neither. Because those who code-switch often receive social censure for code-switching (Grosjean, 1982; 2010; Bullock & Toribio, 2009), many bilinguals report that they tend to limit the practice or avoid it altogether (Grosjean, 1982, 2010) and generally disapprove of it (Gardner-Chloros, 2009). Within an Indonesian context, scholars have shown that many laypeople attribute code-switching to insufficient English ability (Lie, 2007), anti-nationalism, a loss of Indonesianness (Muslich, 2010; Rosidi, 2010), Westernization (Muslich, 2010; Rosidi, 2010), exhibitionism (Buchori, 1994; Rosidi, 2010), attention-seeking (Buchori, 1994; Rosidi, 2010), or inferiority complexes (Buchori, 1994; Muslich, 2010; Rosidi, 2010).

In spite (or perhaps because) of its stigma, code-switching has attracted a great number of studies that have researched this language phenomenon from multiple perspectives. Studies focusing on the grammatical features of code-switching include those of Poplack (1980),

Mahootian (1993), Myers-Scotton (1993, 1995), and Muysken (2000). Other studies have discussed the social aspects and functions of code-switching (e.g., Gumperz, 1982; Grosjean, 1982, 2010; Myers-Scotton, 1983, 1993; Auer, 1984, 1995, 1998; Bentahila & Davies, 1992; Wei, 1994, 2000; Gardner-Chloros 1997; Jonsson, 2010; Montes-Alcalà, 2012). Many researchers still utilize grammatical and social distinctions in approaching code-switching data (e.g., Poplack, 1980; Azuma, 1997; Gardner-Chloros, 1997; Macaro, 2001; Macswan, 2004; Backus, 2006; Chuchu, 2007).

Researchers often problematize the distinction between code-switching and code-mixing. Many researchers prefer the term *code-mixing* to denote intra-sentential switches, reserving *code-switching* for any sentence-boundary switches (e.g., McClure, 1981; Bhatia & Ritchie, 1996, 2004, 2006). Additionally, some argue that code-mixing occurs “when a person is momentarily unable to access a term for a concept or when he lacks a term in the code he is using which exactly expresses the concept he wishes to convey” (McClure, 1981, p. 86), a phenomenon Zentella (1997) calls “crutch-like code mixing.” According to this explanation, code-mixing compensates for the loss of a word in the moment, while code-switching is fully and intentionally executed. In contrast, and following the convention set out by Bhatia & Ritchie (1996, 2004, 2006) who have categorized code-switching, code-mixing, code alternation, and code-shifting under the blanket term of code-switching, I use *code-switching* for the use of two or more languages at the word, phrase and/or sentence levels because code-switching covers the aforementioned language selection phenomenon in a broad manner. In other words, I treat code-switching and code-mixing interchangeably. Additionally, because of the Indonesian context for my study, I use *bahasa gado-gado* to refer to code-switching that involves Standard Indonesian, CJI, and English.

Code-switching and social constructs

There is an extensive body of research on oral code-switching that examines naturally occurring discourse data, with research dating back to the 1970s (e.g. Valdès-Fallis, 1976; Poplack, 1980; Gumperz, 1982; Grosjean, 1982, 2010; Auer 1984, 1995, 1998; Myers-Scotton, 1993; Wei, 1994; Romaine, 1995; Zentella, 1997; Heller, 2007, among others). However, most of the research on written code-switching has emerged only recently, especially in the past decade (e.g. Lee, 2002, 2004, 2006, 2007; Callahan, 2004; Moody 2006; Chan, 2009; Jonsson, 2010, 2012, 2014; Mahootian, 2012; Montes-Alcalà, 2012). An exception to this timeline is an earlier study of written code-switching conducted by Valdés-Fallis (1976), examining Chicano poetry as a form of language contact within the Mexican-American community.

Numerous studies have contributed to the discussion of code-switching as a type of language selection in written texts; however, these studies still treat scripted texts, such as poems, songs, and screenplays, as similar to spontaneously occurring speech phenomena. In his discussion on the language selection on Hindi-English advertisements, Bhatia (1987) reported that ninety percent of product names used English rather than Hindi and that English served a stylistic purpose, associated with symbols of prestige, modernism, and power. Montes-Alcalà (2000) examined Spanish-English personal journals, electronic mail, personal notes, and letters. Bhatia argued that written code-switching functions as a stylistic device and an identity marker. She also found that while code-switching in Spanish-English bilingual texts is becoming less stigmatized and more legitimized, bilingual texts have not yet become a norm, in comparison with monolingual texts. Lee (2002) argued that English in Japanese and Korean popular culture is an expression of creativity and cosmopolitanism in a global and local world. Callahan (2004) worked on written code-switching by investigating bilingual English-Spanish novels and short

stories using Myers-Scotton's (1993) Matrix Language Framework, a grammatical approach developed to account for grammatical code-switching in bilingual conversation. She proposed that code-switching in written texts shares the same linguistic and sociolinguistic functions as oral code-switching. Mahootian (2005) analyzed a Spanish-English magazine popular among female bilinguals in the United States, and proposed that code-switching functioned as a bilingual identity marker. Lastly, Jonsson (2012) investigated the local and global functions of code-switching in two multilingual literary works using Peter Auer's framework (1984). In this context, the term *local* means 'linguistic', while *global* means to see language beyond its communicative function but also as a symbolic function. Jonsson argues that the use of code-switching appears to be both a marketing device and a way of giving voice to minority and marginalized groups.

The aforementioned studies of written code-switching approached it using Gumperz's, Auer's and Myers-Scotton's frameworks, originally developed for studies of interaction. In other words, while significantly contributing to the study of code-switching, these studies still treat code-switching in written texts as similar to oral code-switching, despite the recognition that the nature of spontaneous and pre-planned/scripted interaction differ from one another (Sebba, 2012). Building on the existing studies on written code-switching, I approach code-switching in popular texts as scripted sources of data.

When writing for a larger audience, language users tend to be mindful of words and style, as opposed to more spontaneous, intimate utterances. Indeed, features of spoken and written data differ enough, researchers have argued, that they must be treated differently (Sebba, 2012; Jonsson, 2012; Mahootian, 2012). Many researchers have since explored the differences between oral and written code-switching. In oral code-switching, a speaker may utilize code-switching to

show “dispreference” or turn down an offer in a conversation (Wei, 1994; 2000). Another pervasive difference is the lexical gap, which appears to be more justified for oral code-switching than for written code-switching (Chan, 2009). In oral code-switching, the speaker may not find the accessible equivalence in the dominant language and thus switches to another code (Grosjean, 1982, 2010; Wei, 2000). But this justification seems less pertinent to formal written code-switching due to the ample time that writers have to compose a text, as is the case with songs, screenplays, and novels (Lee 2004, 2006; Chan, 2009; Jonsson, 2010). In written texts, researchers have suggested, code-switching primarily acts as an identity marker and stylistic tool (Valdés-Fallis, 1976; Bhatia, 2000; Jonsson, 2012, 2014; Mahootian, 2012, Montes-Alcalà, 2012).

Multilingual writing offers an arena for investigation (Mahootian, 2012; Sebba, 2012). Such writing indexes language contact, providing insight into the relationship between social processes and linguistic forms, as both social and linguistic boundaries tend to be more evident in multilingual than in monolingual settings (Heller, 1988). Linguistic varieties come to symbolize social situations, roles, and statuses, as well as their attendant rights, obligations, expectations, and assumptions. Thus, code-switching as a language contact phenomenon reflects not only individual multilingualism, but also societal multilingualism.

Analyzing code-switching in multilingual texts allows us to uncover social and political imbalances (Mahootian, 2012; Jonsson, 2010, 2012). Code-switching can also be an indicator of social and ethnic group membership (Myers-Scotton, 1997), and a communicative or social strategy to show speaker involvement, mark group identity, exclude certain readers, raise one’s status, and show expertise (Gumperz, 1982; Grosjean, 1982, 2010).

Because each language carries its own economic values and symbols, the tangible social evidence in written code-switching makes it a robust domain of investigation (Wei, 2000; Mahootian, 2012). We can analyze code-switching to more fully understand identity formation and expression in bilinguals and multilinguals (Tabouret-Keller, 1997; Sebba & Wootton, 1998; Mahootian, 2015; Montes-Alcalà, 2015).

The existing literature on written code-switching in Asia (Korean-English, Cantonese-English, and Hindi-English) has argued that English is used for symbolic, stylistic, and commercial uses. For example, for Korean listeners of Korean-English songs, English serves a symbolic function, invoking a modern and cosmopolitan identity (Lee, 2007). Likewise, Chan (2009) argued that English use in Hong Kong popular songs does not fill lexical gaps, but rather projects a stylistic effect. In a similar vein, Bhatia (1987, 1992, 2001) claimed that English in Indian advertising acts as a cosmetic marker and that English produces a favorable psychological effect on targeted audiences.

On the European continent, Martin's studies (2002a, 2002b) helpfully explored the use of English in French advertising. Martin concluded English in the French products at that time was generally considered to be a symbol of modernization, efficiency, and reliability. Most recently, a study by Raedts et al. (2015) on the use of English in television commercials broadcast in Belgium, France, Italy, the Netherlands, and Spain confirmed that English is closely associated with its influential cultural images. English is by far the most examined language within this literature, and researchers have shown it is often used to project and construct a cosmopolitan and modern identity.

Another study by Ingrid Piller (2003) has argued that code-switching functions to claim one's authenticity. According to Piller, code-switching in English-German advertisements aimed

at bilingual business executives show the code-switching person to be a figure of quality, tradition, and authenticity. In contrast, Lee's (2004) study of English-Korean code-switching in Korean pop (K-pop) songs demonstrated that many Koreans perceive code-switching artists to be "international, progressive, futuristic, and fun-loving" (p. 63) but also regard them as non-traditional and inauthentic, suggesting that being an international persona, for some people, means to be less local and by extension, less authentic. Similarly, my analysis will show that knowing and using English is linked to being modern in contemporary Indonesian society, and that code-switching between Indonesian and English helps to construct, deconstruct, and reconstruct the meaning of authenticity.

In the current era, English is a global language. Yet, while the number of speakers increases every year, one cannot conclude that the appearance of English in all societies around the world equates to full bilingual competence among all speakers. Research has shown that English use is a marker of modernity, internationalization, and perceived or desired superiority. Recent studies on code-switching also provide insightful information about the ever-increasing penetration of English in global media; and highlight the functionally symbolic value of English in countries where it is still a second or foreign language. Building on these existing studies, I bridge sociolinguistic analysis with social, political, and cultural theories to examine the functions of code-switching in Indonesian-English written texts.

In terms of language representation, English is the most-well researched language, followed by Spanish, German, and French. There is a need to study non-Western languages as well. Asia is represented by studies from South Asia (India) and East Asia (Korea and Japan). Yet the languages of South Asia and East Asia—and their dynamics with English—are different in Southeast Asia: English is a second language in India, while English is still a foreign language

in Korea and Japan, part of the Expanding Circle. More research needs to be done to understand how English is used in Southeast Asia. This study investigates the function of English use in Indonesian popular texts, an area that remains largely unexplored by linguists and where the scope for future work is considerable.

My analysis attends closely to how language choice in fiction can illuminate the variety of Indonesian identities that are presented in their texts. I view language use as a form of social action with social consequences (Gumperz, 1982a, 1982b; Woolard, 1985; Heller, 1988; Duranti, 1997). Language users—writers and the characters they create—are thus social actors (Duranti, 1997, 2009). Language production cannot be understood except from within the sociocultural context where it was produced (Auer, 1998). In grounding the analysis thus, my strategy is to analyze language selection to explore language users' constructed personal, social, cultural, and collective identities.

Language ideologies

In relation to the juxtaposition of Indonesian (and CJI) and English—a marked code for many Indonesians—I find it productive to investigate how language selection impacts and is impacted by language ideologies, social, cultural, moral, ethical, and political systems of ideas and sets of beliefs held by a group of speakers (Silverstein, 1979; Irvine, 1989; Schieffelin & Woolard, 1998; Kroskrity, 2000). As I explore the set of identities that emerge from the written texts examined in this study, I find language ideology to be a useful critical concept to problematize the language selection in the texts I investigated in which English, as a language of the Other, plays a vital role. I argue that the set of personal, societal, and communal identities indexed by Indonesian-English code-switching, which may reflect power, resistance, and

submission, are derived from the ideologies attached to English as the most sought-after foreign language in Indonesia, as opposed to Indonesian, the official and national language.

The concept of language ideology can help explore a linguistic phenomenon in a socio-political context (Kroskrity, 2000). Language ideologies grant a space to see how speakers articulate their language selection in ways that reflect their attitude towards a language (Silverstein, 1979). Moreover, the language ideology framework not only tackles languages as linguistic resources, but also the connections between language and identity, morals, and aesthetics. Thereby, it enables researchers to explore the association between speakers' perception of certain values towards languages that are socially, culturally, politically, and economically motivated (Woolard, 1998). I have selected language ideologies as one of the frameworks with which to approach my data to examine how and why Indonesian and English are being utilized in a specific context. In other words, drawing from this concept, I show how Indonesian is understood as a vehicle of “morally good” values and English as a vehicle of social and economic values and benefits vis-à-vis language selection.

World Englishes

I also utilize the concept of “World Englishes” to explore the “ownership” of English in Indonesia, an emerging variant of English that Indonesian linguist Yassi (2001) refers to as *Indonesian English (Indolish)*.

It was post-World War II when English spread throughout many parts of the world, with the aid of the economy, technology, and popular culture (most notably Hollywood films). An inevitable consequence of the global spread of English is the emergence of variants of “new Englishes” or “World Englishes.” Due to extensive and intensive research, the study of these

new variants has become a field of research in sociolinguistics (Kachru, 1985, 1990; Jenkins, 2003).

It has become customary these days to refer to English in the plural, *Englishes*, suggesting that English is no longer a language with only one standard form that belongs to the British or North Americans (Widdowson, 1994; Jenkins, 2003). Due to its many variants, English begs for a pluricentric, multilingual approach (Kachru, 1990, 1991; Jenkins, 2003; Higgins, 2009).

The issue of authority, normativity, and standardization of English is centered on the distinction between its native and non-native speakers. In a generative linguistic approach, or the traditional SLA perspective, new variants of English or New Englishes were once considered an *interlanguage* phenomenon, a term coined by Larry Selinker in 1972 (Kachru, 1994).

Understood as the non-native speaker's inability to perfectly imitate an ideal native speaker's pronunciation, interlanguage is a monolingual-norm-based judgment. It was not until the 1980s that new variants were recognized as New Englishes, with Kachru's seminal study of World Englishes (1986).

In the Outer and Expanding Circles, nativization, or the process of acculturation between English and the local languages after regular usage, is a sociolinguistic phenomenon.

Nativization, not an interlanguage, is a natural consequence in this World English paradigm. In some Outer Circle countries such as India, Tanzania, and Singapore, many bilinguals have spoken English for decades and have integrated their local taste and values into their English discourse (Kachru, 1986; Higgins, 2009; Park & Wee, 2012). In a similar manner, many bilinguals in Expanding Circle countries such as South Korea and Japan have infused their English use with local values (Lee, 2004; 2006; Moody, 2006). Because the number of English

speakers in the Expanding and Outer Circles is greater than the number of English speakers in the Inner Circle countries, nativization is occurring and is an expected consequence (Kachru, 1992; Jenkins, 2009; Seidlhofer, 2009). Outer Circle English speakers have created their own varieties of the language as they have indigenized and institutionalized it (Kachru, 1992). Furthermore, many studies have identified emerging variants of English, each with its own local flavor, in Expanding Circle countries (e.g. Lee, 2004; 2006; 2007; Park, 2012).

Many scholars whose area of research is the Expanding Circle have not recognized variants of Englishes emerging in this territory as legitimate forms of English (Dardjowidjojo, 2000; Lee, 2004; 2007; Lie, 2007). These researchers still treat English as a foreign language, spoken only by a minority, and treat the hybrid variants emerging from these Expanding Circle countries as inferior to the variants in the Inner and Outer Circles (Jenkins, 2009).

English is both an international language that needs to preserve a common standard for effective communication, and a language adopted and appropriated by diverse speakers simultaneously indexing their cultural values, sense of community, and local conventions. This infusion of local values in the global spread of English poses questions about the ownership of English. The Ownership of English framework critically disputes the privileging of native speakers as power holders in English and the emerging non-native speakers from Outer and Expanding Circles who have outnumbered the Inner Circle speakers (Crystal, 1997; Jenkins, 2003; Murata & Jenkins, 2009). Moreover, English is not an object that can be only owned by only one group: Widdowson (1994) refers to this concept as the custody of English, while Norton (1997) claims this under the Ownership of English paradigm. Anyone who can speak the language can claim their sense of ownership or sense of custody of English (Widdowson, 1994; Norton 1997). As a language that has globally spread and is spoken by many people across the

world, it has inescapably dispersed into mutually unintelligible varieties. Now that English has become an international language that has been globally adopted and adapted into many varieties with their locally infused values, is it still logical to confer legitimate custody only to its native speakers?

Language and identity are both personal and national practices, a set of fluid practices in which every Indonesian has their own agency to re-define their own “Indonesianness.” Post-structuralism, Critical Applied Linguistics (CALx), and Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) are frameworks that work well with the interpretive textual analysis as a method to approach my data and critically examine the construction of Indonesianness via language selection in popular written texts.

Post-structuralism and language selection

Inquiring into issues of power, resistance, submission, bilingual identities, and language ideologies is crucial to a critical examination of language use. I turn a critical eye to subcultures that exist alongside, sometimes in opposition to, mainstream and normative cultures that stigmatize those who juxtapose English and Indonesian. Thus, to explore the language selection in popular texts post-Suharto, I employ a post-structuralist paradigm that repudiates essentialism and mainstream judgments. Moreover, post-structuralism fits with other paradigms such as Critical Applied Linguistics and World Englishes, the concept of language ideologies, and the method of Critical Discourse Analysis.

As an epistemology, post-structuralism questions the generalizations and existing structures that many people take for granted; these may include existing social arrangements, such as race, gender, and ethnicity (Pennycook, 2001). As a reaction to structuralism, which

views language as a discrete issue, unrelated to social and political contexts, post-structuralism relates language, subjectivity, social organization, and power (Weedon, 1997). Post-structuralism views language as a mechanism for responding to non-linguistic issues and supplies questions that enable us to deconstruct existing power systems (Crystal, 1997; Weedon, 1997). This approach removes the author as subject or central focus of textual inquiry, and replaces it with the reader. In this case, the meaning of a text is subject to the reader's interpretation, regardless of the writer's intention, which in any case, we may not know. This view also emphasizes that subjectivity is not innate, but rather, socially produced. That is, identity is not as personal as we think it is—our “subjective” experience is shaped by the linguistic, cultural, and political forces around us, just as everyone else's is. This view works well beside other perspectives, such as World Englishes (the ownership of English), Critical Applied Linguistics, Critical Discourse Analysis, as post-structuralism too, sees language as a complex and ongoing social and political process, rather than as a set of fixed categories. It is through language that we can see how an individual constructs her subjectivity and her understanding in relation to the world. Subjectivity is discursively constructed and is socially and historically motivated (Weedon, 1997).

Critical Applied Linguistics

Language operates differently from one environment to another, resulting from (and in) social, historical, and political differences (Blommaert, 2005). Simply put, there is an interdependence between language and context: language choice both mediates and is mediated by its social, political, cultural, and historical context (Fairclough, 1995; Gee, 1996; Locke, 2004). To explore language from this post-structuralist point of view, I find Critical Applied Linguistics (CALx) a productive framework. This approach works well with post-structuralism

as the epistemology of the study, as CALx is also calling for a further examination of existing and “fixed” characteristics of social arrangements.

CALx constructs a reciprocal relationship between theory and practice. It addresses issues of power, resistance, and inequality. Drawing on ideas from feminism, antiracism, post-colonialism, post-structuralism, post-modernism, and queer theory, CALx “views language as inherently political; understands power in terms of its micro operations in relation to questions of class, race, gender, ethnicity, sexuality, and so on; and argues that we must also account for “the politics of knowledge” (Pennycook, 2001, p. 42). CALx is a dynamic approach that treats languages as constantly shifting and dynamic entities and interrogates how language works in multiple contexts. What Alastair Pennycook (2001) offers in this approach, as opposed to “traditional” applied linguistics, is making linguistics politically accountable. CALx provides a useful approach for exploring language in social contexts.

CALx is a fitting framework because it approaches language as a socio-politically motivated resource. Pennycook urges us to see language as productive and performative, and identity and subjectivity as multiple and contradictory. Gender and sexuality, for example, are not static categories but shifting and dynamic spaces of engagement. This approach also suggests that there are multiple ways of bringing about social and political change.

Critical Discourse Analysis

While practitioners of CALx argue for the need to unpack how power relations that may not be immediately evident are—or should be—resisted in order to make social change, CDA provides a specific method to do this unpacking (Pennycook, 2001). Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is a useful method for investigating power, inequality, and dominance in texts (Van Dijk,

1984). Practitioners of CDA understand texts as vital barometers for uncovering the social, political, and historical movements in which they are produced (Fairclough, 1992; 1995).

Practitioners of both CALx and CDA work to unravel and describe imbalances and inequalities as products of perception, policies, and languages Norman Fairclough (1995) explains that CDA aims to explore the non-transparent relationships between events and texts. CDA also examines how power works through language in a broadly-conceived social and political context.

Additionally, this framework explores the power relations and processes that have ideologically shaped and influenced the texts.

Moreover, I use CDA to investigate and explore how domination, submission, and resistance are produced within English and Indonesian due to the perceived inequalities of both languages. Furthermore, CDA enables an investigation into how the same language may operate differently from one variant to another (Blommaert, 2005). With the position of English as a global language spoken and manipulated by many Indonesian bilinguals, I find CDA suitable for unraveling how bilingual Indonesians exploit English in the absence of English native speakers.

Popular texts serve here as linguistic evidence of their creators' bilingual trajectories and identities as well as those of the characters they create. Moreover, the language selection of popular works also demonstrates negotiation of governmental regulations, policies, normative cultural values, and the writers themselves (Heller, 2007; Blommaert, 2010; Kelly-Holmes & Pietikànen, 2013). Fictional texts present discursive evidence that identity and other social and cultural issues are revealed and created (Bucholtz & Hall, 2004, 2005).

I analyze this textual data qualitatively, combining critical discourse analysis (CDA) and interpretive textual analysis to interpret the texts. CDA is ideal for my investigation, as it is a tool to describe, interpret, and analyze (Fairclough, 1992; Gee, 1996, 2011; Blommaert, 2005) that

uses not only linguistic features, but also wider social, cultural, political, and historical contexts to understand the meanings of a text at a certain historical moment. This set of theories, then, offers a good wheelhouse for this study—i.e., identities imposed by decades of government engineering. The following sections will explore the texts, methodologies, and research positioning of this study.

The texts

Popular texts are one medium through which *bahasa gado-gado* is visible in contemporary Indonesian society. Such texts provide examples of written *bahasa gado-gado*, an authentic form of code-switching that reflects the writers' life experience and voice (Callahan, 2004; Jonsson, 2005, 2010, 2012). Popular texts demonstrate the linguistic sources and trajectories of the writers, characters, publishers, and governments (Heller, 2007; Blommaert, 2010; Kelly-Holmes & Pietikànen, 2013). In printed texts—novels and short stories—one can immediately see how governmental regulations of language affects texts, indicated by the typographical differences between Indonesian and English, based on the Enhanced Spelling System (Alwi, 1972). Indonesian linguist Felicia N. Utorodewo argues that *bahasa gado-gado* in printed texts should be regulated, and that printed texts should instead use *bahasa yang sesuai kaidah yang benar* 'language that follows the standardized grammar rules' (qtd. in Wahyuningkintarsih, 2016). Language use in printed popular texts merits investigation because it is influenced by both the state and the writers' own choices coming from two different poles of power: the top-down and bottom-up bodies of agencies. Put simply, the language use in popular texts is sociolinguistically wealthy, as part of contemporary usage within a given society (Lee, 2004; 2012; Lee & Moody, 2012). Films, in particular, are productive sources for studying the

global and local spread of English because they have been one of the primary media to disseminate English (Pennycook, 1984).

In this dissertation, I present my analysis of seven texts. The first three texts I examine are part of a series of novels by Fira Basuki: *Ms. B: "Panggil Aku, B"* [Ms.B: "Please call me, B"] (2004; hereafter, PAB); *Ms. B: "Will You Marry Me?"* (2004; hereafter, WYMM), and *Ms. B: "Jangan Mati"* [Ms. B: "Please don't die"] (2006; hereafter, MBJM).

I chose the *Ms. B series* for analysis not only due to its heavy use of *bahasa gado-gado* between Indonesian, CJI, and English, but also due to the themes and topics of the conversations among characters, expressing the characters' identities in a liberating manner. The main character of the series is Ms. B, a graduate of Columbia University in the United States. From the first book in the series, *Ms. B: Panggil Aku B*, we learn that Ms. B worked at a fashion magazine and for a clothing line company in the United States for a year upon her graduation. After five years of living in the United States, she decides to return for good to Indonesia, where she lands a job as a managing director of an American-owned fashion magazine. Upon her return, she experiences reverse culture shock and constantly compares her current life with her life in New York. In these three novels, the narrator describes Ms. B's personal and professional daily life, through which we encounter her memories from New York alongside her current life in Jakarta. Other main characters are Fifin (Ms. B's close friend, flat-mate, and an American graduate working for a Dutch company in Jakarta), Bunny (Ms. B's close friend, flat-mate, and office mate, and Matt (also known as Ahmad, Ms. B's fling).

The fourth text I examine is *9 Summers, 10 Autumns: Dari Kota Apel ke The Big Apple* [9 Summers, 10 Autumns: From the City of Apples to the Big Apple, henceforward 9S,10A, 2011], a novel inspired by the life of its author, Iwan Setyawan. In this novel, narrated in the first

person, the author uses real names, stories, and places. Although I am tempted to call it a memoir, the publisher labels it a novel inspired by true stories (Setyawan, 2011). Iwan, the main character and narrator, grew up in the small town of Batu, near Malang, East Java, in a very poor but loving family. His father is a minicab driver and his mother is a housewife. Despite their financial struggles, Iwan completed his education in good public schools in Batu. Due to his intelligence and hard work, Iwan graduated from a well-regarded Indonesian university as one of the highest ranked graduates. With his college diploma, he obtained a job at an international company located in Jakarta. Building on an already successful career, he accepts a job at Nielsen Consumer Research in New York, where he lives and works for ten years before deciding to quit and return to his hometown. The story is set mainly in New York, Batu (Malang), and, briefly, Jakarta. I chose this novel because of its frequent use of English.

The fifth text I examine is “Madre,” the title story in a short story collection by Dewi Lestari (2011), which tells the story of an adventurous young man, Tansen, who loves his freedom and regularly blogs about his travel experiences. There are three main characters in this text: Tansen, Pak Hadi, and Mei. Tansen is a third-generation owner of a bakery in Jakarta, the golden days of which are past; it could not survive after his grandmother, the artisan and the heart of the business, passed away, nor could it compete with ballooning modern bakeries. When Tansen returns to his grandmother’s bakery and makes a new sourdough recipe, together with Pak Hadi, he writes about his successful experience on his blog. Mei, a young entrepreneur residing in Jakarta and the owner of a chain of modern bakeries, has been a longtime fan of Tansen’s blog. When she sees his post, she becomes interested and attempts to contact him. After several exchanges, Mei successfully convinces Tansen to undertake a joint business venture. While the story is mostly about how the third-generation artisan successfully revives the old

bakery, it also captures a romance between Tansen and Mei, and the affection between Tansen and his grandmother's assistant and elderly employees. I selected this text due to an explicit statement from Mei articulating a preference for English over Indonesian due to its status as the language of prestige and marketing.

The sixth and seventh texts I examine are two films, *Arisan!* (2004) and *Arisan! 2* (2011), which touch upon the most taboo and controversial topics in Indonesian society. Traditionally, the term *arisan* refers to a regular social gathering organized by a group of people (usually women) with common interests who meet on a regular basis at one house (*Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia* (the Great Dictionary, 2017). Each participant contributes into a pool an equal amount of money, and decides one winner who will get the entire aggregate sum of money or convert it into some goods. These days, *arisan* has entered modern, cosmopolitan lives and the films capture this. It has become an event in which participants can make fashion statements and show off their social and educational status. I selected these films because they display frequent switches between Standard Indonesian, CJI, and English, with characters discussing pre- and extra-marital relationships and homosexuality in English, and less controversial topics in Standard Indonesian. This feature alone deserves careful attention, for the question of “Indonesianness” comes into play through the frequent use of English both in those scenes which exhibit exclusively English narration and dialogue and in those which exhibit a mix of English, CJI, and Standard Indonesian. Moreover, the characters are mostly portrayed as smart, modern, and successful professionals who can speak English fluently. They lead a modern and established life, living in luxurious houses and apartments, and frequenting upscale restaurants and cafes.

The main characters of the two films are Meimei, Sakti, and Andien, who have been friends since they were in high school. Meimei and Sakti are the co-owners of an interior design

and architecture firm. Meimei, a smart and wealthy woman, works as an interior designer. Sakti is an architect raised singlehandedly by his mother in a wealthy family. Sakti is in denial about his homosexuality until he meets Nino, a film producer who is an openly gay man. Andien, who is married to a CEO of a big company, leads *arisan* gatherings. She marries a wealthy old man to elevate her social status and keep up with Sakti and Meimei, who come from more affluent backgrounds. Her marriage has made her a socialite housewife. She leads a seemingly perfect life with her smart children and her husband, until she learns that her husband has had an affair. The social issues depicted and elaborated upon in this film include friendship, marriage, adultery, and homosexuality. Because English plays a dominant role in addressing these themes and topics, *Arisan!* and *Arisan! 2* make fitting subjects for my study.

I selected these texts based on year of publication or launch, language selection, themes, and popularity. All were written in the post-Suharto era, with publication years ranging from 2004 to 2012. The time of publication is one of the most important issues in this analysis, due to the social and political changes affecting language use in the media and society at large in the Reformasi era. Additionally, among other texts that may share similar qualities, I selected these ones due to the taboo and controversial topics they address. Moreover, I selected the texts due to the language ideologies they implicitly and explicitly address. Alongside the themes and language selection, popularity is another factor: these texts are readily available to a wide readership, because they are published, produced, and distributed by prominent publishers and film producers. As for the printed texts, all five are published by Gramedia and Bentang Pustaka, whose networks and bookstores can be found throughout the country. The novel *9 Summers, 10 Autumns* in particular is a best-seller that had been reprinted six times as of July 2011 since its original publication in February 2011 (Setyawan, 2011). Likewise, both *Arisan!* films were box-

office hits (Dinata, 2004; Munir, 2011). As we will see in Chapters Four and Five, the status of these texts as mainstream popular works is crucial for understanding their use of *bahasa gado-gado*, a stigmatized language selection.

Narration and dialogue in popular texts offer rich sociolinguistic data because they are dense with opinions and emotions about language. These perspectives are often highlighted and emphasized by the occurrence of English in these predominantly Indonesian-language texts.

I will show how the use of English code-switching in these seven texts sheds light on an important arena of social struggle: one that can reveal much about social identity, domination, resistance, and submission towards the government and social norms. Additionally, I argue that these texts' narration offers a celebration of post-New Order euphoria, embracing cosmopolitan identities mediated by *bahasa gado-gado*, thereby decentering Indonesian as the national and official language.

Methodology, data collection, and research positioning

I approached the transcription of the films and the text of the printed texts as discourse that can reveal social meanings (Gee, 2009). I approach the data by combining discourse analysis and an interpretive textual analysis as methods of this study. First, I noted down all the switches from the novels as my notes and transcribed the films and use notes and transcription to mark, code, and categorize. Then, I read and re-read the seven texts and marked any important features. Next, I collected personal and background information about the authors as they related to the texts they produced. I sought to interpret their meanings in relation to the social and historical context in which they were produced. In the interpretation process, I identified cultural references and took note of linguistic features and rhetorical mechanisms.

Chapters Three, Four, and Five present the analytical results of these methods. For Chapter Three, I examined the key terms used when the characters discuss English, approaching their metalinguistic discourse as representing their perception of English as a linguistic resource that reveals symbolic power. For Chapters Four and Five, to examine the strategic functions that English and Indonesian serve, I analyzed the selected texts both inductively and deductively (Merriam, 2009). As I read and re-read the texts, I noticed motifs that combined to create repeated themes. I highlighted the places where *bahasa gado-gado* occurs and identified the coded themes that arose in each case, noticing patterns, similarities, and differences. Later, I used *Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia* (or *KBBI*, the Great Dictionary by Department of Education and Culture) to crosscheck uses of English that might have been characterized as borrowing rather than code-switching. I will discuss specific methods further in each respective chapter.

When grounding the analysis, I interpreted the meaning of the words, phrases, and sentences in *bahasa gado-gado* practice. I examined any switch to find the integrated and situated meaning by determining the significance of the terms, unpacking the characters' or the narrators' identities when using them, locating the characters', narrators', and writers' relationships to their audiences, and identifying how they use each term as a politically and socially constructed action (Gee, 2009, 2011). Specifically for Chapter Four, to cross-check my insider intuition, I asked for insight from other Indonesians on several online forums such as *Living in Indonesia Expat Forum*, an English-mediated site, and *Kompasiana*, an Indonesian-mediated forum.

In presenting the analysis, I translated the Indonesian passages of all of my examples into English to serve the English readers of my work. Specifically for *9 Summers, 10 Autumns*, I

compared my own translation with the novel's English edition published under the same title. If the novel's translation is better than my own, I use the published version for better readability.

Conclusion

Treating the dialogue and narration in popular texts as written *bahasa gado-gado* for a large audience, as opposed to a spontaneous-occurring interaction, this study seeks to characterize *bahasa gado-gado* using linguistic, social, cultural, and political frameworks. I utilize Critical Applied Linguistics as the framework, and include post-structuralism, World Englishes, and Critical Discourse Analysis as parts of CALx, while also harnessing the concept of language ideology. This set of frameworks and concepts allows me to examine, investigate, and interpret language selection with attention to power. By applying this set of paradigms, I will discuss how English as the main code in *bahasa gado-gado* functions, beyond cosmetic or stylistic purposes, as a strategic mechanism to deconstruct the meaning of Indonesianness, thereby expanding its definition.

Drawing upon these frameworks, I view language and identity as dynamic and fluid constructs. I view identity as a social and subjective construct, as opposed to fixed or pre-determined. The foregrounding of subjectivity then becomes an essential part of my study, as I am analyzing social constructs in a critical manner. Moreover, these frameworks accommodate the hybridity, fluidity, and dynamism of language, the recognition of which is vital for a comprehensive evaluation of *bahasa gado-gado* in Indonesian texts.

By adopting a method that allows me to critically examine language selection wherein English, a language of the West and of economic opportunity, plays a dominant role in otherwise Indonesian-language texts, I will show that language selection is not merely a linguistic action,

but is also socially and culturally motivated. By examining the strategic roles of English in the mix among English, Indonesian, and CJI, I argue that popular texts uncover social phenomena, and can unravel the power domination, social and economic gaps, and cultural inequalities caused by dominant language ideologies.

CHAPTER THREE

THE POWER OF ENGLISH

The aim of this chapter is twofold: to unpack language use in contemporary Indonesia with special reference to English, and to provide an overarching linguistic background that contextualizes the role English plays in *bahasa gado-gado*. To this end, I analyze the symbolic power of English as reflected in popular texts published after 1998, and unpack the metalinguistic discourse of English in these texts as it simultaneously resonates with and reinforces a communal sociolinguistic reality: the concerns and fear experienced by many Indonesians when learning English.

In Indonesia's multilingual society, Indonesian, CJI, and English are valued differently, and this uneven distribution of linguistic symbolic power is readily apparent in contemporary popular texts. Despite its relatively late entry into Indonesia's linguistic landscape, English makes a noticeable appearance in contemporary Indonesian popular texts, particularly those published after Suharto's reign collapse. The characters' attitudes towards English represent, echo, reinforce, and even contribute to a communal sociolinguistic reality. In addition, their worries about mastering English highlight popular fallacies about English language education. Using critical discourse analysis, I demonstrate that popular texts can serve as effective sociolinguistic resources. These texts enable readers or viewers to connect with, relate to, and view the characters' struggles, efforts, and achievements—while simultaneously building awareness of accessibility and inequity issues in relation to English acquisition and mastery. This chapter functions thus uses the texts themselves to offer background on English's status in Indonesia, which will help contextualize the analysis in Chapters Four and Five.

The *Ms. B* series and *9 Summers, 10 Autumns* are representative texts for this analysis. They both grew out of their authors' personal life experiences, they realistically and sympathetically portray the daily struggle to master English, and they demonstrate how language plays a significant role in societal advancement.

There are seven examples in this chapter that I divide into two sections: First, I use six examples from the texts to show the power of English. Second, I demonstrate one example supported by a number of references from the texts to buttress my discussion of the metalinguistic discourse of English and fallacies in English language education. I present each example in two parts: the excerpt from the original text, followed by an English translation. Language switches are italicized in the original text, and I preserve the italics in my translation. Some words, like *minimum*, may appear to be English words, but in fact have been borrowed into Standard Indonesian and thus are not italicized in the original.

The power of English in the *Ms. B* series

The connection between language selection and power distribution through the aid of linguistic resources is evident throughout the popular texts I examine, but here I focus on the *Ms. B* series as representative texts. There are two underlying themes in how these texts depict English: ideology and power. I present interconnected arguments that demonstrate the dynamic power of English, as opposed to other languages and dialects like Standard Indonesian and the non-standard variants of Indonesian. The texts demonstrate that English, as linguistic capital, can help bilinguals gain socioeconomic benefits, reproduce intergenerational power, land well-paying jobs, and cross borders. By understanding power and language ideologies in these texts,

we can also learn about the challenge to Indonesian posed by those who use English and *bahasa gado-gado*.

Language and power are interdependent. Indonesian popular texts rely on various linguistic resources, including Standard Indonesian, Colloquial Jakartan Indonesian, English, and regional languages. Building on Foucault (1978, 1980), who argues that power exists in all social relations and is manipulated and negotiated in each relation and context, on Kachru's theory of "Power of English" (1990), and on Bourdieu's (1991) theory of symbolic power, I show that English is more powerful than Indonesian languages in converting symbolic power to cultural and economic capital. Many Indonesians celebrate English due to its association with socioeconomic power, while at the same time disparaging it due to its association with Westernization.

To fully understand why English for many Indonesians can be a language of both envy and opportunity, it is important to understand the position of English within Indonesia. Only 5% of Indonesians are English-Indonesian bilinguals (Dardjowidjojo, 2000). Those who pursue higher education in an English-speaking country such as the United States, Australia, the U.K, Canada, or New Zealand often become elites upon their return to Indonesia (Sneddon, 2003).

Because English mastery is a device for elevating one's socio-cultural status, it acts as a language of success and opportunity and becomes a tool for redistributing power. In the following excerpt from *Ms. B: Panggil Aku, B* (henceforth, PAB), English is depicted an indispensable asset for Ms. B, giving her an edge over her colleagues. Due to her English skills and her American degree, she secures a well-paying job and a high-ranking position in a multinational company. Her English skills not only mediate transnational access to knowledge, but also provide socio-cultural and economic value necessary for her to compete in an

increasingly globalized world. Ms. B defends her position and the symbolic power of English in

Example 1.

Example 1. (PAB, 79-80)

Begini, misalnya, jika Merry menyindir soal cerita posisiku yang katanya *kok* bisa lebih tinggi dari dia, pasti aku ‘titipan’ orang alias ada nepotisme. Mungkin aku perlu bilang, “Aku lulus dengan *Summa Cum Laude* di Amerika. Kamu tahu itu apa? Lulusan terbaik. Malah dua semester sebelum lulus itu, aku dapat beasiswa karena memang nilai-nilaiiku baik. Tak kalah, aku bukan anak kemarin sore. Sebelum lulus pun aku bekerja di koran kampus, kontributor beberapa media di Amerika. Plus, aku sempat kerja di New York. Orang Amerika saja kesulitan untuk mencari pekerjaan....”

Begitu? Mungkin harus begitu. Orang Jakarta sering meremehkan orang, disangkanya sekolah di Amerika gampang. Tapi tempat aku kuliah, Columbia University adalah universitas negeri. Sama dengan di Indonesia, untuk masuk universitas negeri. Sama dengan di Indonesia, untuk masuk universitas negeri ya harus ada seleksi ketat. Untuk pelajar asing, nilai hasil Test of English as Foreign Language (TOEFL) minimum harus 600. Apalagi aku di Columbia School of Journalist, yang harus terus-terusan berbahasa dan menulis Inggris dengan tata bahasa yang baik dan benar. Nilai TOEFL ini termasuk tinggi, biasanya universitas negeri lain minta 520-550. Banyak teman Indonesiaku yang akhirnya sekolah di universitas privat dengan uang kuliah mahal, atau ikutan kuliah jarak jauh. Tidak mudah.

[Let’s say, if Merry accused me of getting this higher position than hers through nepotism. Should I just say, “I graduated *Summa Cum Laude* in America. You know what? I am the best graduate. Not to mention that two semesters prior to my graduation, I received a scholarship due to my good grades. Furthermore, I am not a young kid anymore. Before graduating, I worked at the campus newspaper, as a contributor to many media sources in America. Plus, I even worked in New York, while there are many Americans who cannot find a job...”

Should I do that? Jakartans like to underestimate others, they may assume that studying in America is easy and trouble-free. But [they should know] that I graduated from Columbia University, a good school. Just like in Indonesia, in order to be admitted into a good school, we need to pass a competitive exam. For the international students, the minimum score for the Test of English as Foreign Language (TOEFL) is 600. Let alone, I graduated from Columbia School of Journalism, which requires us to speak a good and standard English at all times. This school requires a higher TOEFL score, unlike other schools that only require 520-550. Many of my Indonesian friends eventually decide to go to a private university with more expensive tuition, or decide to register in a long-distance university. It is not easy.]

For Ms. B, English clearly conveys power. To her mind, an American degree and English have given her an edge over her competitors for jobs. In her own estimation, her English skills, evidenced by her TOEFL score, have increased her competitive value by enabling her to pursue her degree in the States, receive a scholarship, and achieve a prestigious position in a multinational institution. She believes that English knowledge determines one's access to success. Second, Ms. B claims that Jakartans tend to feel insecure about English bilinguals. She takes advantage of this insecurity by making sure others know she is bilingual, believing that English will impress her insecure Jakartan colleagues. Ms B has accessed the power of English, through which she projects herself as a person who “speaks not only to be understood but also to be believed, obeyed, respected, [and] distinguished” (Bourdieu 1991, p.648).

Ms. B's knowledge of English—and high TOEFEL score—enabled her to attend an Ivy League university. This, in turn, has given her a high social status upon her return to Indonesia, where she entrenches herself in the upper class with its attendant social, cultural, and financial security. She simultaneously suggests that her colleagues lack her proficiency in English and may only speak Indonesian. In in this context, Indonesian is a less-favored language, putting them at a competitive disadvantage. Being an English-Indonesian bilingual allows Ms. B to negotiate her position in unevenly distributed social relationships (cf. Norton, 2016). She views her knowledge of English as setting her apart linguistically, socially, and culturally (cf. Kachru, 1990).

Placing English in a transnational setting also helps us to see beyond the Indonesian scale. Ms. B believes that her English skills give her an edge in the American job market. She points out that knowledge of English was the first skill she had to acquire prior to any other employment requirements. Without any English skills, she would not have presented herself as a

candidate. I read this as a counterargument to the scepticism of purist educators, linguists, and ordinary Indonesians, who see the global spread of English as a threat to (essentialized) Indonesian values and culture (see Muslich, 2011; Rosidi, 2011). Ms. B represents the positive side of English as a global language. She argues that being an English bilingual coming from a non-English speaking country enhances her job candidacy and that her linguistic capital has conferred transnational privilege.

At the societal and national level, Ms. B's story demonstrates how speaking a Western language in a non-Western country can create tension. In the above example, Ms. B considers how to respond to her colleagues' envious attitudes. In a later passage, Ms. B shares her experience a few months after coming back to Jakarta. Her habit of using phrases like "Holy Cow!" and "Red Neck" perplexes her colleagues, even though she works in a multinational company where English is one of the dominant languages (WYMM, 26). Ms. B is fully aware that some of her peers are unable to decode her American English expressions, and for this reason she often feels good about her distinct linguistic abilities. Ms. B uses her ability to speak English to position herself as an elite among her Indonesian colleagues. In a plurilingual country like Indonesia, where languages are competing with each other, a bilingual Indonesian like Ms. B may receive either direct or indirect praise. She presumes that her colleagues are praising her, although this is via inferred envy. She also speculates that her non-English-speaking colleagues feel a degree of inferiority. In this context, her use of inaccessible English epitomizes the unequal distribution of resources, linguistic and otherwise, between herself and her colleagues.

Likewise, Matt, Ms. B's friend and a former model, claims that he has been recruited and hired by *Bold* magazine due to his English ability. Matt is an Indonesian university graduate; his degree in English makes it possible for him to land a job there (PAB, 91). English creates an

invisible boundary between those who have access to it and those who do not (cf. Thompson, 2012), and Ms. B, and to some extent Matt, use that boundary to construct their own statuses. This gap between English and non-English speakers feeds into the commodification of English. Ms. B, well aware of the benefits English can confer, capitalizes on her skills so that she may feel hierarchically valued by her colleagues. Language, in this light, is an identity marker that has symbolic functions. English is functioning as a symbolic vehicle, something that people utilize to distinguish themselves from others (Bourdieu, 1977; Edwards, 2009).

Ms. B's story also shows how power is reproduced with each generation. Because she comes from a wealthy family, Ms. B had access to a quality English-language education and was even able to pursue her undergraduate education overseas. Her job guarantees her continuing access to social and economic status and power. Such reproduction of power highlights the role of English in creating social inequality (Park & Wee, 2012). This connection between English and the symbolic power of earlier generations is also demonstrated through Fifin (Ms. B's best friend), Sakti and Meimei in the *Arisan!* films, and Mei in "Madre." These characters are English-Indonesian bilinguals with strategic positions in their offices. With the exception of Iwan in *9 Summers, 10 Autumns*, who secures a prestigious job without parental support or any intergenerational wealth, the characters in popular texts demonstrate that English is an essential commodity that can help reproduce the symbolic power attained by older generations. In this sense, English mastery carries an economic advantage that reveals broader social phenomena, which include but are not limited to the unequal distribution of English language education, intergenerational power, and the socio-economic gap between the monolinguals and bilinguals, among others (Heller & Duchêne, 2012). Across popular texts, as characters construct English as an index of social inequality and class, we see that the resources to study Standard (Inner Circle)

English are unevenly distributed (cf. Blommaert, 2003). Such inequality garners prestige for English-language speakers while creating linguistic stratification (Bourdieu, 1990; Pavlenko & Blackledge, 2004).

The power of English in *9 Summers*, *10 Autumns*

If the story of Ms. B's generational access to power via the English language depicts the very real inequality that exists in Indonesia, the story of Iwan, the main character in *9 Summers*, *10 Autumns*, complicates this picture.

Indonesian bilinguals manipulate the symbolic power of English, potentially posing a challenge to the dominance of Indonesian. This is illustrated by the character Iwan, who challenges the power of the Indonesian language by emphasizing the power of English and explores the different language attitudes and layers of identities held by bilinguals. He did not receive a quality formal English language education as a child, but Iwan's situation shows the benefits of being multilingual, even (perhaps especially) for someone from a lower class background. Unlike Ms. B, whose English has helped her maintain the socio-economic power passed to her by her parents, Iwan needs English to climb the social ladder and escape from poverty. Indeed, Iwan attributes his family's poverty to his father's lack of English skills (9S, 10A, 24). Bapak began work as a *kenek* (an assistant to a public transportation driver), and now is a minicab driver, a profession that does not pay well and is considered second-class. His father's limited opportunities have created apprehension in Iwan: he fears he will end up like Bapak. Failing to master English may mean failing to gain a competitive advantage in an increasingly globalized economy.

Example 2. (9S, 10A, 24, translated by Maggie Tiojakin)

Bapak bekerja sebagai *kenek* mobil angkutan umum bersama suami Bu Agik, Pak Ucup. Tidak ada les bahasa Inggris, tidak ada tidur siang. Ia menelusuri jalanan di kota Batu. Cerita ini kerap menghantuiku, bagaimana kalau sejarah itu terulang, bagaimana kalau aku harus meluangkan masa mudaku di atas angkot? Mampukah diriku melalui jalanan yang ditempuh oleh Bapak?

Bapak worked as a *kenek* together with Pak Ucup, Bu Agik's husband. Bapak had never taken any English course nor could he afford to take a nap. What he did was roam around the city of Batu all day. I used to wonder if history would repeat itself and I would end up living the same life my father had led, spending my youth on public transportation collecting pennies after pennies. Could I survive that kind of life as he did?

Iwan, comprehending his family's financial situation, understands that both a good English education and taking a nap were luxuries for his family. One requires funds and the other requires leisure time; individuals from low-income families like his are deprived of both. It is common knowledge in Indonesia that minicab drivers and *keneks* work more than eight hours a day but barely make ends meet. Iwan's father's daily income did not provide enough to enjoy anything beyond his family's primary needs: meals and a place to live. Realizing the resemblance between his life and his father's, Iwan is anxious about his future. While Iwan believed that having better English skills was necessary to escape poverty, he remained financially limited; there was a gap between his life and his aspirations. Mastering English, for Iwan, was an aspiration which at that time did not match his financial circumstances. Iwan creates a strong link between economic background and access to English education, and by extension, English skills with social stratification.

A good English education, which usually is synonymous with attending an English cram school, requires money. Taking an English course was beyond Iwan and his sisters' means: "For us, as the young children of poor parents, living in modesty was not easy. It was painful, at times. We didn't have dolls and toy cars to play with. We couldn't afford to pay the English

lessons at a language course. At that time, almost everyone in our neighborhood had a BMX bicycle, but we could only watch. More than everything else, we had to be very selective in choosing the school textbooks that we needed to get, otherwise, we couldn't afford to buy them" (9S, 10A, 34). Attending English cram school was a tertiary need for Iwan's family, equated with having various luxury goods. Readers are invited to witness the economic gap between Iwan and his neighbors, shown by their relative access to English language education, exclusively reserved for middle and upper class families. Like Ms. B, Iwan believes that such access is rooted in social class; and that this inequity will be perpetuated from generation to generation. While his fears do not come to pass, we still see the robust interdependence between socio-economic benefits and English skills.

Iwan believed that his family's poverty derived in part from his parents' lack of education; they were elementary and middle school drop-outs who were financially unable to attend English cram schools (9S, 10A, 24). Moreover, as he claims in the following example, growing up in a small town prevented him from accessing opportunities available to Indonesians living in major cities like Jakarta and Surabaya. However, he hoped that learning English would allow him to avoid reproducing his family's lower-class status. In this light, Iwan sees education as a remedy for his family hardship.

Example 3. (9S, 10A, 90, translated by Maggie Tiojakin)

Mataku masih buta, aku belum pernah melihat dunia lain. Aku hanya melihat Nico sebagai bule dan tidak tahu bagaimana gaya hidupnya di Kanada. Bagiku, Kota Malang sudah jauh sekali. Aku belum pernah menginjakkan kaki ke Surabaya ataupun Jakarta. Aku selalu berusaha mendekati Nico untuk mengetahui dia lebih jauh. Aku ingin mengupas budaya, gaya hidupnya, dan

I was then blind: I had never seen any other part of the world other than my own. All I saw was Nico the foreigner and I kept wondering what life was like for him back in Canada. For me, the journey to a neighboring bigger town, Malang, was already a far journey from home. I had never set my feet in Surabaya or Jakarta. I would always try to be close with and befriend Nico to

mempraktikkan bahasa Inggris.

know him better. I wanted to know more about his culture, his lifestyle, while also practicing my English.

As a graduate of a public senior high school and a public university, where English is part of the national curriculum, Iwan had a certain level of proficiency. But because he lived in a small town, associated with an inferior quality of education and fewer opportunities to practice English, Iwan lacked full access to conventional channels of power such as quality language education in school or private lessons at an English cram school.

Later on in Example 3, Iwan reveals that negotiating these unequal opportunities is necessary for individuals who wish to better their English skills and eventually obtain a higher quality of life. Realizing his own limited resources, Iwan takes advantage of any opportunity to enhance his English skills—developing friendships with bilingual people with whom he can eventually practice his English. His conversations with Nico, an exchange student in Iwan’s senior high school, are a site of sociolinguistic interaction in which he can enhance his oral skills. In other words, because Iwan believes that English will play an important role in his future success, he does everything possible to improve his English skills.

Example 3 highlights Iwan’s belief that English is a language of opportunity that can open up the world. Initially, his poverty prevented Iwan from traveling even to neighboring cities, like Surabaya, or the capital city, Jakarta. However, mastering English opens the world, and ultimately he is able to go beyond these two cities and visit other countries. His efforts to enhance his English created the first opportunity to improve his and his family’s life: getting a job in multinational company, as we see in Example 4.

Example 4. (9S, 10A, 175)

Di perusahaan multinasional ini, aku mulai melihat dunia luar. Aku mulai berinteraksi dengan rekan-rekan kerja Nielsen di luar negeri, seperti Malaysia, Hong Kong, dan Singapura. Aku mulai menyegarkan bahasa Inggrisku kembali, mempelajari bagaimana menulis e-mail yang cerdas dan bagaimana berkomunikasi lewat telepon. *"This is Iwan! How are you doing today?"* Selain banyak belajar dari e-mail-e-mail yang dikirim Mbak Yanti, aku juga belajar dari e-mail anak-anak *Client Service* yang sering menyisipkan bahasa Inggris gaul di e-mail mereka. *"Whazzup, bro!"* Minggu demi minggu, bahasa Inggrisku pun mulai membaik.

At the multinational company, I began to see the outside world. I started to interact with colleagues from overseas, such as Malaysia, Hong Kong, and Singapore. I would start refreshing my English skill speaking to them in English, while practicing my fluency, and I would learn how to write good emails and how to communicate by phone. *"This is Iwan! How are you doing today?"* I learned from the emails that Mbak Yanti sent out, and I also learned from the emails that were sent out by staff in the Client Service department who would sometimes insert a slang language in their emails. *"Whazzup, bro!"* Every week, my proficiency in English got better and better.

In this example, Iwan treats English not only as linguistic capital, but also as an economic and cultural currency. As linguistic capital, his English proficiency increased his chances of being shortlisted and eventually securing the job at the multinational—and multilingual—company. This position leads to financial stability, particularly when compared with his parents' humble, rural life; in this light, Iwan's English skill has tacitly functioned as economic capital.

English also functions as cultural currency, creating opportunities for Iwan to become acquainted with foreigners with whom he does not share a first language or cultural background. At this point, he also acknowledges a desire to learn other people's views and about their ways of life. Partially because of his English proficiency, Iwan is given the chance to travel abroad. As his English speaking skills improve, he begins to widen his networks and his horizons. Iwan never loses his certainty that English is a currency for purchasing success. In fact, he looks for more avenues to improve his English, especially as his network gets broader and he works with

people who use English as their *lingua franca*. The process of acquiring and mastering English for Iwan is “like going through a linguistic reincarnation,” one that has allowed him to mobilize and navigate his social power and ladder (Kachru, 1990, p. 176).

This linguistic reincarnation allows Iwan to cross previously untraversable borders. After growing up in a simple family with no opportunity to go overseas, Iwan is now very excited to possess a passport, a symbol of his broadening world. English functions like the “fabled Aladdin’s lamp,” which opens the linguistic gates to travel abroad (Kachru, 1990, p. 167), as we see in Example 5.

Example 5. (9S, 10A, 176)

Pengalaman ke luar negeri pertamaku!
Paspur pertamaku, hotel pertamaku,
pesawat terbang pertamaku! Perjalanan
yang tak pernah aku impikan di ranjang
bambuku. Aku begitu “kikuk” melalui
pengalaman baru itu. Dari bandara
Soekarno-Hatta sampai dengan *check-out*
di Kuala Lumpur. Aku melangkah pelan-
pelan dan mencoba mengerti semua
profesi ini. Aku melihat, mendengar, dan
menikmati pengalaman yang berbeda itu.
Sepulang dari Malaysia, tak hanya
mendalami bahasa pemograman dan
membawa pulang beberapa souvenir, aku
membawa lukisan besar tentang sebuah
negara tetangga, tentang “luar negeri.”
Ada gairah baru, “laki-laki” dalam diriku
semakin dewasa, langkah kakinya
semakin kuat.

That would be the first time I had ever
been abroad! My first passport, my first
hotel, my first flight! It was a journey I
had never dreamed of on my bamboo
bed. I was so “clumsy” when I
experienced my first overseas journey.
From Soekarno-Hatta airport until I
checked out from the hotel in Kuala
Lumpur. I took one step at a time and
tried to understand the entire process of
my current profession from which I saw,
listened, and enjoyed the whole different
experience. When I got home from
Malaysia, I was not only good at the
programming language, or bringing a few
souvenirs home, but I also brought home
a great painting about the neighboring
country, the “foreign country.” There
was some new passion instilled in me,
the “man” inside me had got more
mature, and his steps got more firm.

Iwan’s first experience going overseas awakens his passion for travel. His first flight is unforgettable, one of the moments transforming him from a provincial person to a cosmopolitan one. Tacitly, Iwan continuously shows the connection between his English skills and his sense of

self, as an individual who gradually grows and transforms. He initially defines himself as uninformed person when he refers to himself as *kikuk*. The word *kikuk*, which cannot be easily translated into English, contains some pragmatic meaning referring to a clumsy state of mind, confusion from a lack of information. Iwan, overwhelmed, called himself *kikuk* because it was his first time in an airport, let alone on an international flight. However, despite being a first-time flyer, he enjoyed every moment of the experience. Iwan believes that traveling to a “foreign country” has transformed him into a “new man.” It has broadened his knowledge, shaping him into a more confident and mature person with broader boundaries. And once again, the ability to communicate in English has given him an edge, securing him social and cultural power. English is a symbolic passport for Iwan; it is the linguistic capital that has converted into cultural capital and later on into social and financial capital when he eventually becomes the director of Nielsen Consumer Research in New York City.

In addition to functioning as a socio-cultural passport, English also serves as a gatekeeping device: without his English skills, Iwan would not have been offered the position in New York. It is his English skills, together with his statistics ability and other competitive values, that have qualified him in the first place for the position in New York. His efforts to enhance and master English skills eventually yield fruit by landing him a job—a prestigious one—in the land of hope, New York. Iwan mentions repeatedly that New York once represented an unattainable aspiration. This repetition reminds the readers of his belief that hard work, family support, prayers, and English skills have helped him realize his long-time dream. Unlike Ms. B, who sees English as linguistic capital that has benefitted her as an individual, English for Iwan provides familial success. He sees his successful conversion of linguistic capital to social and economic goods as an achievement he shares with his family.

Example 6. (9S, 10A, 61-2, 92 & 188-192)

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>1 Setiap aku menginjakkan kaki di jalanan di New York City, aku masih belum percaya bahwa aku benar-benar menelusuri salah satu kota metropolis yang paling gemerlap, paling megah, paling kuat di dunia. Setiap aku mengangkat telepon, berbincang dengan ibuku, kami masih belum percaya akan perjalanan jauh yang “mengangkat” kami semua ini. New York City bukan impian masa kecilku, bukan keinginan gilaku. New York City bukan keinginan yang muncul dari mimpi dari rumah mungilku. New York City adalah buah kerja keras, keprihatinan, dan kejujuran. New York City adalah buah “kehangatan” rumah kecil kami. Dan, dari jalanan di New York City ini, aku berani menelusuri masa kecilku kembali.</p> | <p>Every time I take a step on the streets of New York City, I still can’t believe that I am in one of the most metropolitan and luxurious, exhilarating cities in the world. Every time I call my mom, we both still cannot believe that this journey will “escalate” and save our lives. New York City is neither my childhood dream, nor my wildest dream. New York City is never a dream that I could imagine I could afford owing to the fact that I was growing up from a very simple family in a very simple and tiny house. New York is the fruit of hardwork, endurance, sympathy, and honesty. New York City is the “warmth” of our little tiny house. And from every street in this city, I dare to explore and reunite with my childhood memory.</p> |
| <p>2 Saat itu aku belum tahu, berapa jauhkah jarak antara Jakarta-New York? Di belahan dunia manakah New York? Seperti apakah kehidupan di sana? Bagaimana perpisahan ini akan mengubah hidupku, mengubah hidup kami semua? Dengan nasihatnya yang sederhana, Ibu tidak menanyakan berapa besar gajiku, atau kapan aku akan pindah ke New York. “Kamu pikir dulu, kamu kan yang tahu apa yang terbaik untuk hidup kamu. Ibu hanya berdoa untuk yang terbaik.”</p> | <p>We didn’t know, at that time, the distance that stretched between Jakarta and New York. Where is New York, anyway? What is life like over there? How would my journey be in New York? How was the journey to New York going to change my life, our life? My mother did not even ask me about how much I would get paid in New York, she only thought about simpler things, such as, “Why don’t you think about it first; you know what’s best for your life. I can only pray for the best.”</p> |
| <p>3 Aku kembali ke tempat kos, kembali mendengar Pavarotti. Kontemplasi kembali melambung di udara bersama impian tentang New York.</p> | <p>I got back to my room and listened to Pavarotti’s in my rented room. I started to contemplate and was lost in the moment. I was lost in thought about New York.</p> |
| <p>4 Malam itu, aku langsung pergi ke wartel di dekat kos dan ingin membagi cerita besar ini dengan orang-orang tercinta di Batu.</p> | <p>That night, I went to the phone booth near the house where I was renting a room and called home to share the news with my beloved family in Batu.</p> |
| <p>5 “Bu, percaya nggak? Aku ditawari kerja di Amerika, di New York!” Ibu</p> | <p>“Buk, can you believe it? I got a job offer in the US, in New York!” My mother</p> |

sempat terdiam beberapa saat. “Kamu sudah yakin? Kan baru beberapa bulan saja di Danareksa.”

- 6 Ketika dayung kecilku berhasil membawa perjalanan ini jauh ke New York, aku masih sering terpikir teman bule pertamaku itu. Jarak kami semakin dekat sekarang. New York city dan Quebec bisa ditempuh kurang dari satu jam perjalanan pesawat terbang.

was silent for a minute. “Are you sure? You’ve just started working in Danareksa [a multi-national company that Iwan first gets hired upon graduation, based in Jakarta] a few months ago.”

When my little oars had taken me across the world and brought me straight to New York, I still thought of my first white friend. Distance is no longer a problem now. We are closer now. New York and Quebec can be reached by only an hour of flight.

New York is a symbol of Iwan’s hard work, persistence, and family support. And since he has accessed it via his English skills, it also symbolizes struggle and unequal distribution of opportunity. Iwan explicitly connects his ability to elevate himself and his family to his linguistic skills, correlating English with socio-economic success and advantage. He uses the term “escalate” to describe this social climb from low to middle class.

In this extract, Iwan discusses the “warmth” of New York, as a metaphor for his—and by extension, his family’s—success. I read the scare quotes in “warmth” as a changed meaning from having the “warmth” in their tiny home despite the financial struggle to the new “warmth” after he relocates and works in New York. The new “warmth” in his parents’ house is now with a financial success for him and his family members. His financial growth to some extent is attributable to his English skills, because his first job is at an Indonesian-based, international company with clients worldwide. Danareksa requires potential employees to have a certain degree of English proficiency and at least a 550 TOEFL score (Danareksa, 2017). Later, Iwan successfully lands a challenging job at an even bigger company in New York. Moreover, being in New York, a center of the world, enables him to go to Quebec, Nico’s hometown, and later to travel the world. New York represents Iwan’s emotional, social, financial, and cultural transformation. It embodies a dream he had never dared to imagine: his and his family’s

aspirations, struggles, efforts, and success. And it has been achieved in large part because of English.

The above examples (1-6) highlight how English has become an indispensable asset for Iwan and Ms. B. It has enabled Ms. B to maintain her social class, and it has enabled Iwan to improve his. English is the language of status and prestige; it is the language of inequality and opportunity. Language is never a neutral entity.

Moreover, in the case of both characters, it is apparent that their bilingualism confers an economic advantage. Bourdieu (1991), in his study of cultural capital, suggests that the ability of bilingual characters to shift between languages can convert symbolic capital to cultural capital (such as social status and reputation) and/or economic capital (such as higher-ranking positions, better-paid work). This is exemplified when Iwan invests in improving his language skills, expecting that this will give him a wide range of socio-economic and cultural capital (Pierce, 1995). Like Ms. B, who believes that her high social status is partially due to her English mastery, Iwan believes that English is a significant tool for achieving success. While power is not always and necessarily associated with English, in both texts English plays a vital role in procuring economic benefits.

Like Ms. B and Iwan, Mei in “Madre” also emphasizes the commodification of English skills. Although her store is located in Jakarta, Mei chooses English instead of Indonesian when naming it; she believes this conveys a modern, sophisticated feel that will attract high-end and expatriate customers (I will return to this example in Chapter Five). For Mei, Ms. B, and Iwan, English is more than a linguistic entity; it is a powerful device facilitating socio-economic and cultural advantages, security, and success—and, in the process, widening the socio-economic gap. These examples emphasize the positive aspects of bilingualism. The ability to shift between

style and languages signifies the ability to meet the language market (Bourdieu, 1991). Their bilingual skill grants them socio-cultural and financial security, while simultaneously highlighting their bilingual identity. Their bilingual skill grants them pride and profit (Heller & Duchêne, 2012).

Although English is not the only language that could confer such advantages, and that other resources play important roles as well, popular texts demonstrate that bilingual characters like Iwan and Ms. B are socially and financially advantaged compared to other Indonesians, and that they attribute their advantage to mastery of English. In fact, English-Indonesian bilinguals have been obtaining high-ranking positions in government offices and multinational companies since the 1970s (Sneddon, 2003). Thus, English is not only “an instrument of communication or even of knowledge, but also an instrument of power” (Bourdieu, 1977, p. 648). Language can be a symbol of domination, submission, and authority. English is the language that carries power to gain economic advantage (Kachru, 1990).

Furthermore, using English terms instead of Indonesian ones has symbolic value and interpretive consequences. In this light, the characters use English that retains its image as an international, prestigious, and cosmopolitan language, while they are still maintaining their Indonesianness. On the other hand, the examples from the texts also convey the characters’ complex and differing personal relationships to English. In *9 Summers, 10 Autumns*, we learn that Iwan feels less confident with English in certain contexts. In contrast with Ms. B, who is consistently very secure in her linguistic capital, Iwan is more humble when describing his English ability. Despite his high position he feels inferior to his Indonesian colleagues who come from a higher social class: “I am actually less confident to hang out with these Jakartans who are now New Yorkers. As you may already know by now about my past, it is not easy for me, a son

of a minicab driver to hang out with these elites, the high class people, and I need to climb, so high” (9S, 10A, 106). Iwan is a director at Nielsen Consumer Research in New York, suggesting he navigates an abundance of cultural and linguistic boundaries and complex interactions on a daily basis; yet, he is still self-disparaging. Accordingly, while English may have helped Iwan become a social climber, mastering English per se is still insufficient to bridge the socioeconomic gap that exists between him, a person coming from a low-income family background, and his Indonesian co-workers, second- and third-generation Indonesian elites. The linguistic capital granted him through his mastery of English has not fully translated into cultural capital. Iwan sees himself as socially and culturally incompatible with the Indonesian elite— notwithstanding that he is, in fact, a privileged transnational Indonesian elite himself. He, indeed, beats the odds given the fact that he is coming from a low social class in Indonesia.

While it is obvious that English has played a vital role in the lives of both of these characters, we need to turn a critical eye to their stories, as their experiences are not representative. Ms. B, as a member of the economic elite, has had access to quality English education from childhood. Iwan, like the majority of Indonesians, comes from a lower-class family and has had limited access to good English education; his English skills improve because of opportunities he receives from his company, rather than because of his schooling. Iwan is an anomaly. It is rare for someone like him to gain economic privilege: the majority of Indonesians still are deprived, and since English language education is necessary to be nationally and globally competitive, this has led to unequal access to socio-economic mobility. Iwan points out that socio-economic stratification impacts the quality of English education; the limited resources in public schools has encouraged the establishment of English private institutions catering to the middle and upper class. Thus, English is not only a linguistic matter but also a social problem.

English is both a language of fear and a language of opportunity: it empowers only a handful of people, while concurrently marginalizing many other Indonesians. In this light, Iwan, Fifin, Ms.B—who are privileged due to their English ability—have a great deal of cultural capital and other material capital that many others do not (Bourdieu, 1991). As a linguistic resource that is limited to certain groups of people, English both reflects and reinforces social inequalities: it grants prestige, financial security, and a rung up on the social ladder (Heller & Duchêne, 2012)—but only to a few.

Moreover, both texts acknowledge, at least implicitly, that the quality of English instruction in public schools remains subpar. Like Iwan, the majority of Indonesians cannot afford to send their children to private schools. When he describes pursuing other avenues, like speaking with Nico and his international colleagues to enhance his English skills, or attending an informal English course that he could not afford, he is implicitly suggesting that the English education taught in public school is substandard. Moreover, Iwan recognizes the gulf between himself and other Indonesians who grew up in Jakarta. He tells the reader, “I am actually less confident to hang out with these Jakartans who are now New Yorkers.” Socio-politically speaking, this gap is the result of the Jakarta’s preferential treatment, in comparison to the rest of Indonesia, since the New Order Era. Iwan is from a small town of western Indonesia, Batu, East Java, which is far from Jakarta; his experience resonates with that of much of under-resourced Indonesia, which has lower quality public schools and poorer English instruction (cf. Zein, 2017). A low-income family like Iwan’s is left with few choices; these may include learning subpar English or struggling to find other resources to master the language. Iwan was able to befriend a native speaker with whom he could practice his English without paying. However, it

is important to note that Iwan's is one of the few schools in Indonesia that have hosted students from the United States, Canada, or Australia via the student-exchange program.

The experiences of Ms. B's colleagues and Iwan also implicitly suggest that there is a quality discrepancy between the English instruction offered in public and private schools, particularly those applying the international curriculums. In *9 Summers, 10 Autumns*, Iwan talks about the low quality of the language education in his public school. Likewise, Ms. B's English is much better when she comes back from the United States, and she implies that her Indonesian colleagues are not up to her standard. This statement reveals much about the English education phenomenon in Indonesia. English, as the most sought-after foreign language, is part of the national curriculum at public junior and senior high schools, and in a number of public elementary schools in urban areas (Renandya, 2004). The junior high school graduate is expected to have studied English for approximately 405 contact hours; senior high schools require 808 contact hours, with each contact hour lasting 45 minutes, as regulated by the Ministry of National Education. After these many contact hours, students are expected to be able to communicate in fairly proficient English.

However, this has not proven to be the case; English language education is still far from successful. Both linguistic and non-linguistic factors have contributed to the poor instruction of English in public schools (Darjowidjojo, 2000). The complex and multilayered failures include low teacher salaries, a lack of English mastery among local teachers, the constantly changing curriculum, the lack of language laboratory facilities and textbooks, and the large number of students (up to 50) in one class (Dardjowidjojo, 2000; Renandya, 2004, Lie, 2007, Zein, 2017). The low quality of education in public schools has resulted in a mushrooming number of private language schools. These schools claim to offer better and more efficient English instruction, as

well as small classes. They charge between USD 60 and 100 per month to segment the middle- and upper-class families (Dardjowidjojo, 2000; Lie, 2007; Lamb & Coleman, 2008). In his narrative, Iwan stated he had been willing to attend this school, but his financial struggles prevented him from doing so (9S, 10A, 54-5). The same was true for his father, who could not get a better job and improve his life because he could not afford an English language course (9S, 10A, 24, 34). Iwan indicates that his father's failure to secure a new job and his inability to speak proficient English were related to the inferior standard of formal English language education in the public schools in their hometown in Batu, Malang, East Java. On the other hand, in cities like Jakarta, Bandung, and Surabaya, some primary schools can offer quality English instruction, because they have more resources than remote schools do (Renandya, 2004). There is a quality discrepancy among schools in big cities, small towns (particularly in Java), and remote areas (particularly Eastern parts of Indonesia). Even though Iwan's public school is still in Java, it is located in a small town, as opposed to the big cities that are generally well-facilitated. As we saw in Chapter One, this is one of the impacts of the New Order government centralization that paid most of its attention to Jakarta and other big cities, leaving remote areas in Java, Sumatra, and eastern parts of Indonesia underdeveloped.

Some students even attend international schools or national private schools, which adopt curricula from the UK, the US, Singapore, New Zealand, and other Inner Circle countries. These schools offer their students direct language exposure via English-speaking teachers, which are the primary selling points for the parents, as well as other resources, such as summer schools or summer camps in English-speaking countries. Such programs are available only to middle- and upper-class families, because their tuition ranges from IDR 34 billion (USD 25,968) to IDR 39 billion (USD 29,342) ("The Jakarta Intercultural School", 2016). In 2014, the average income

per capita in Indonesia was USD 1854 (World Bank, 2015). The payment alone determines the accessibility and effectively reinforces the inequity of language distribution.

English private schools and international schools are flourishing due to parents' loss of faith in English language education in public schools (Lie, 2007; Lamb & Coleman, 2008). Iwan reflected this loss of faith when he negotiated an opportunity to practice English with Nico, whom he considered a prime English speaker, in order to compensate for Iwan's inability to attend an informal language course. Parents believe that their children's English mastery can determine what kinds of jobs they will be able to have, due to the English proficiency requirement for white-collar or managerial jobs and for wider employment opportunities (Lie, 2007; Zein, 2017). Thus, English in Indonesia has become an invisible boundary between people from urban areas and those in the remote area, between the privileged and the marginalized, between the haves and the have-nots (cf. Thompson, 2012). The same belief is also shared by Iwan, who once envisioned his life would play out just like his father's due to his financial incapability to afford a quality English education. Iwan and his father are among the unprivileged, only with a different outcome.

Having said that, I consider English or the mastery of English a commodified element, an example of "the Starbucks phenomenon," a concept introduced by George Ritzer (2004). Many Indonesians consume Starbucks coffee for its prestige (it looks cool to hold a Starbucks cup), rather than for the coffee per se. This holds true for English as well. Despite being too expensive for many Indonesians, both goods—Starbucks coffee and English—are commodified "objects" bought for their prestige, their symbolic value. In Examples 3-6, Iwan does not merely treat English as a linguistic capital, but rather as an economic capital which later grants him symbolic power. On the other hand, Ms. B's ability to afford this symbolic capital becomes the invisible

boundary between herself, one of the haves, and her colleagues, the have-nots. Likewise, Mei in “Madre” capitalizes on the image of English to leverage her bakery’s prestige, despite being located in Jakarta. She clearly states that she needs to change the name of her bakery “Bogor Bakery,” which is already in English, to a more modern one, “Fairy Bread,” because she wants to attract high-class consumers and expatriates, or those with more financial security (“Madre,” 26-7). In all these cases, the characters show that this commodification of English has created two polarized social classes based on the ability or inability of individuals to pursue a quality English education. Furthermore, Iwan, Ms. B, and Mei portray English as a commodified asset one needs to have in order to gain social, cultural, and economic benefits, beyond its function as a linguistic device.

The mastery of English concomitantly is one of the indicators of social entrenchments: those who are English-Indonesian bilinguals, thus privileged, and the others who are not, thus unfortunate. The popular texts portray Ms. B, Meimei, Sakti, Andien, Iwan, and Mei as cosmopolitan bilinguals. They also show those who are not English speakers as socially and financially disadvantaged, i.e., Ms. B’s office colleagues and Iwan’s father and other family members. Although the texts do not explicitly address marginalized groups, Iwan makes connections between his poor background and his lack of opportunities to achieve English fluency as a child. Throughout the texts, the characters project how English functions to differentiate between these two groups: those who are socially and economically advantaged and disadvantaged. For this reason, the linguistic value of English is overpowered by its socially, culturally, and economically perceived use-value.

The characters clearly believe that English plays a central role in their communities, signifying access to socio-economic and cultural power. The texts demonstrate the social gap

between people like Ms. B and people like Iwan. However, Iwan's English skills help bridge this gap, illustrating that economic success is still bound to language. The unequal distribution of English simultaneously causes and indexes social entrenchments in Indonesia. By describing her distinctive position at the office (Example 1), Ms. B claims that English creates social boundaries between herself and her colleagues. Clearly, mastering English is not only a matter of linguistic skill, but rather is a readily commodified good believed to grant financial success (Heller, 2003). It is important, however, to note that although it plays a vital role in the materialized world economy or materialized economic world, English is not the only element in the commodification process (Park & Wee, 2012). The narratives of Ms. B and Iwan reinforce the predominant belief that not only mastering English but also living in America, neither of which are accessible to most Indonesians, guarantees success in employment (Lamb and Coleman, 2008; Lie, 2007). In other words, the door of opportunity opens for those who are English speakers.

Metalinguistic discourse in Indonesian popular texts

In addition to shedding light on how English stratifies socio-economic power, I also find that popular texts also reinforce the fallacies perpetuated in English language education. The first fallacy refers to second language speakers' tendency to idealize white middle-class Americans as *the* legitimate English speakers. This fallacy concomitantly relegates variants of English from the non-Inner Circle countries as deviant, inferior, and interlanguage Englishes (Kachru, 2005). The second fallacy is the Outer and Expanding Circle language learners' belief that they should speak English to communicate with Inner Circle speakers. Other fallacies include the equation of learning English with learning American culture. Ms. B's and Iwan's attitudes, perceptions, fears,

challenges, goals, struggles, desperation, and frustrations, as well as their sense of achievement and empowerment, all reflect a wider Indonesian sensibility and sociolinguistic reality in an era of globalization. Their struggles and efforts encapsulate how the characters experience English education.

In order to unpack Ms. B's and Iwan's struggles with and attitudes towards their English education, I draw from Lee's analysis of the metadiscourse of English in popular culture (2012) and Kachru's identification of the fallacies of English language education (2005). Basuki and Setyawan portray realistic characters and situations; their readers can easily relate to these texts that reflect the struggles they encounter in their daily lives (Lee, 2012). I show how these texts reveal the characters' perception of English, which mirrors—and perhaps helps create—the wider societal attitude in Indonesia.

Many Indonesians are under the impression that the purpose of learning English is to communicate with native English speakers, particularly Americans. English teachers in Indonesia still privilege British and American English (Dardjowidijoyo, 2000). In *Ms. B: Panggil Aku B!* (PAB), Ms. B expresses her preference for Standard English, as spoken in the Inner Circle, and for a monocultural model of learning English. In particular, she prefers American English to other variants. Furthermore, she boasts that Columbia School of Journalism “require[d] us to speak a good and standard English at all times... and require[d] a higher TOEFL score” than other universities. Ms. B emphasizes her TOEFL scores not only to prove her English proficiency, but also to signify her preference for American English, as opposed to British English. (Universities in the UK, Australia, and New Zealand require international students to take the International English Language Testing System (IELTS), rather than the TOEFL [IELTS, 2017]). While it is logical for Ms. B to bring up the TOEFL when she talks

about being a United States university graduate, I interpret this as signaling a tacit preference for American English. When she refers to her work in the United States and her graduate studies at Columbia University, Ms. B indicates that she is learning English to speak with English speakers from the Inner Circle—the United States—and to fully function at work and attend college.

Ms. B has a habit of using American slang, saying things like “Holy Cow!” and “Red Neck” She demonstrates her pride in her distinctively American English skills, saying, “Sekarang aku tidak heran, mengapa beberapa orang kadang terheran-heran dengan beberapa celetukan spontanku yang khas prokem Amerika” [I am no longer surprised to see how my fellow Indonesians are amazed with my spontaneous American slang] (WYMM, 26). Clearly, Ms. B values her American-centric English skill. In fact, the author devotes two and a half pages to describing Ms. B’s attitude toward Singlish and Indonesian-English variants and her Indonesian colleagues’ *bahasa gado-gado*, which she considers to be inferior, unclear, and deviant variants of English (WYMM, 25-7).

By the time they return to Indonesia from the United States, both Iwan and Ms. B equate English with US culture. Ms. B repeatedly praises American music, food, and ways of living (PAB, 12, 97); Iwan reminisces about weekend brunches and Broadway shows (9S, 10A, 95). These attachments are an organic product of living in the United States and associating with American culture. Iwan’s preference for American life and English-speaking individuals was established even before he moved to the United States, but grew even stronger after he lived in New York and then moved back to Indonesia.

The second fallacy, that speaking English is primarily for communicating with people from the Inner Circle, has turned English into a language of assessment, and thus fear. Iwan believes that a good English education means learning the language from an English speaker

coming from an Inner Circle country. He learned English from his Canadian friend Nico, whose instruction compensated for the inferior quality of education in Iwan's public school and Iwan's inability to afford alternatives.

For Iwan, English is a source of anxiety and despair when he tries to cross the boundaries separating him from a linguistically superior individual. Despite his position in his Jakarta company and his travel experience, Iwan is still nervous when speaking to Rickie, an American recruiter and interviewer at Nielsen's New York office:

Example 7. (9S, 19A, 188-192, translated by Maggie Tiojakin)

Aku masih belum bisa menanggapi serius "*Ati is looking for you!*" sampai mendapatkan e-mail kedua dari Mbak Ati yang menjadwalkan sebuah telepon *interview* dengan *senior manager* DP di sana. Ini telepon *interview* pertama yang pernah kulakukan. Karena perbedaan waktu 12 jam antara New York dan Jakarta, kami memutuskan untuk melakukannya di pagi hari waktu Jakarta. Pada hari Selasa itu, sekitar jam 7 pagi, sebelum AC diaktifkan, aku sudah menunggu telepon dari New York di meja kerjaku yang terbuka. Detik demi detik, detak jantungku berpacu semakin cepat, keringat mulai membasahi baju kerjaku. Bagaimana jika aku tak mengerti bahasa Inggris mereka? Bagaimana aku harus memperkenalkan diri dan menjawab semua pertanyaan? Bagaimana pula jika Bapak Raden Pardede datang melewatiku saat telepon *interview* berlangsung? Kegundahan itu pun terpecah ketika teleponku berdering!

I still had not taken the statement seriously, "*Ati is looking for you!*" until she sent an email to me herself, to arrange for a telephone *interview* with a *senior manager of Data Processing* in New York. It was the first telephone interview I had ever done. Due to the 12-hour difference between New York and Jakarta, we decided to do the interview in the morning Jakarta time. On Tuesday, at 7 am, before the air conditioning was switched on, I was already at my desk in the office waiting for the phone call. Each second, my heart skipped a beat, and I began to sweat. What if they didn't understand my English? What if I couldn't answer the questions? And how did I do the introduction of myself? How about if Bapak Raden Pardede passed me by while I was being *interviewed*? All the worries were broken when the phone finally rang.

Iwan positions the American interviewer as a legitimate English speaker, while simultaneously denigrating his own English skills with his self-deprecation. From this extract, we can also see

that the interview functions as a gatekeeping device, an assessment of Iwan's linguistic skill. His English is subject to a native speaker's assessment, highlighting the power imbalance between Iwan and the interviewer. This inequality creates anxiety, and the stakes are high: Iwan's English skills are on trial, and he could fail the interview if his English is incomprehensible. Iwan studied English for at least six years during middle and senior high school, and he is working in a multinational company in which English is the language of communication. Nevertheless, he remains unsure of his language ability. Many Indonesian learners can identify with his moment of terror.

But Iwan struggles through his fear and moves to a triumphant moment: he passes his interview and is offered the job. His linguistic capital, which in this context is his skill in English, has been converted into economic, cultural, and financial capital, enabling him to enjoy Broadway shows in New York and to buy Gucci shoes in Venice, Italy (9S, 10A, 54-5). This is in stark contrast to his childhood, when his family could not afford to buy him a BMX bike or send him and his sisters to an informal English school. Iwan believes that English has been crucial for his financial success and his ability to improve his family's life. Accordingly, while English is a language of anxiety, it also is a language of opportunity.

Although this opportunity is not available to all Indonesians, both texts present a metalinguistic discourse in which bilingual characters strive for and eventually gain success. In this metadiscourse, English functions as a language indexing socio-cultural opportunities and inquiry. This discourse resonates strongly in Indonesia. Accordingly, many bilinguals hold positive towards English, although there are less proficient bilinguals and monolinguals who are socially, culturally, and economically marginalized due to their low English proficiency.

Conclusion

Popular texts demonstrate that English language education is, for many Indonesians, linked to socio-economic status. In this light, the texts show that language is not a neutral entity. In a multilingual country, language distribution is imbalanced (Blommaert, 2005; 2012). The texts illustrate how English produces and reproduces symbolic power that concurrently highlights the socio-economic and political struggles of Indonesians. Thus, in a country like Indonesia where English distribution is unequal, English becomes a language of both opportunity and fear.

In popular texts, we see that English permeates Indonesians' lives in various forms. It is a commodity that helps build economic and cultural capital. It empowers and marginalizes different groups of people. It is the language of symbolic power. Many Indonesians initially treat English as linguistic capital but later consider it as a commodity that can empower them. Unfortunately, if some are empowered, others are marginalized. The texts present bilingual characters struggling to master English, the language of symbolic power. In their efforts to acquire English, they experience struggle and anxiety. Some embrace it; some suffer. In the process of gaining the symbolic value and power of English, the ability and inability to access it become important social class indicators.

Popular texts also reflect dominant language attitudes and language ideologies. Both the fear and the triumph the characters feel illustrate how English language education exists and influences lives. The language policy of the Indonesian government—which encourages the study of English—impacts the characters; they feel they must learn English if they want to improve their lives. In turn, it is not only language policies but also popular texts that affect societal discourse, by encouraging people to pursue English learning. Those with access to

English will stay in power, while those without access remain without it. For those without power, mastering English is perceived as one of the significant ways Indonesians may achieve upward mobility, as shown by Iwan. English is vital to power reproduction, as demonstrated by Ms. B. On the other hand, Ms. B and Iwan believe that those who do not speak English cannot keep up with the English-Indonesian bilinguals. For these characters, English is not only a linguistic matter but also a socio-economic commodity. Popular texts demonstrate that the unequal distribution and accessibility of English divides Indonesians.

Because it is unevenly distributed, English has created social entrenchment for many Indonesians. Understanding the position of English will help us to better understand its crucial textual role as the main source of Indonesian *bahasa gado-gado* practices. Despite the stigma of *bahasa gado-gado*, English indexes power dynamics, social gaps, and cultural inequalities.

CHAPTER FOUR

BAHASA GADO-GADO IN DISCUSSIONS OF SEXUALITY, GAY IDENTITIES, AND LOVE

In 1998, at the beginning of the *Reformasi* era, an economic crisis hit Indonesia and people finally realized the failure of the New Order era. This moment of crisis gave space for the nation to redefine itself politically, socially, culturally, and to some extent, linguistically. Such social and cultural change is partly indicated by a linguistic shift from Standard Indonesian to *bahasa gado-gado*, becoming more visible in public spaces like cinemas and bookstores, as we saw in the Introduction. Yet many Indonesians have raised criticisms of *bahasa gado-gado* because it involves English. While I read *bahasa gado-gado* as an expression of freedom, many Indonesians condemn it because people often use it to discuss “un-Indonesian” topics. In that regard, *bahasa gado-gado* is not only a challenge to the monolingual usage of Indonesian, but also a challenge to normative Indonesianness, a sense of essentialized Indonesian identity, culture, and norms. Although many Indonesians may see such a challenge as a threat to the dominant construction of being Indonesian, the popular texts that I examine portray the deconstruction of essentialized Indonesianness as a positive development, an opening up of what being an Indonesian may mean.

As we have already seen, the Reformasi era marks a significant period for Indonesia, giving space for people to express new forms of Indonesianness, new ways of being Indonesians. Indonesia has seen a dramatic change from a semi-military nation to a democratic government that has significantly influenced the society at large (Hellwig, 2007). The political change of climate has inevitably influenced the socio-cultural atmosphere, giving way to more freedom in various facets of life, including greater openness in expressing taboo and non-normative values,

identities, and expressions which include verbally unrestrained affection and sexual discourse. Among the many non-normative topics and values frequently mediated by *bahasa gado-gado*, the most striking ones in popular texts are related to verbal expressions of love and sexuality. These new values include the freedom to express love and non-normative sexualities in a liberating and positive manner.

Such freedom, often seen as *kebablasan* (uncontrollable) by many Indonesians, includes sexual freedom. Since 1998, Indonesia has seen more freedom to express sexuality, as evidenced by the 2003 publication of Moammar Emka's controversial yet best-selling book *Jakarta Under Cover: Sex in the City*, which detailed luxurious prostitution in Jakarta. Indonesians' ambivalence about such sexual freedom is exemplified in the popular novel *Ms. B: "Panggil Aku, B,"* where the narrator critiques Emka's sexual freedom of expression, even while celebrating similar types of freedom throughout the *Ms. B series*. Moreover, it is interesting to learn that even a graduate from an American university, like Ms. B, the main character in the *Ms. B. series*, perceives a new wave of freedom in a rather negative lens. We can imagine how other Indonesians, most whom are neither overseas-educated nor highly educated at home, may perceive this wave of freedom as the negative influence of the essentialized *budaya Amerika* 'American culture'.

Thus, we see a correlation between the political change post-1998 and a social, cultural, and linguistic shift partly indexed by *bahasa gado-gado*. In this chapter, I analyze four popular texts to show how code-switching between Standard Indonesian, CJI and English plays a strategic role in preventing social embarrassment in conversations about sexuality and love that many Indonesians would otherwise regard as taboo or controversial. I argue that the shifting discourse that occurs in the practice of *bahasa gado-gado* is indicative of broader social and

cultural changes occurring during the transition from the New Order to life under the current government.

While dominant Indonesian views of *bahasa gado-gado* would suggest that it makes popular texts “un-Indonesian,” I demonstrate that in fact they consistently uphold Indonesianness, albeit in diverse and expansive ways that I read as a proposal to view Indonesianness in an inclusive manner. Prior to my analysis, I provide some necessary background on Indonesians’ perceptions of and attitudes towards *bahasa gado-gado* in discussions of emotionality and extramarital sexuality and gay identities. I also discuss various aspects of Indonesian identities evidenced in the texts, as background for understanding how the characters may adopt *bahasa gado-gado* to converse about taboo and ostensibly vulgar topics, while still maintaining their identities as Indonesians.

Background

Indonesians define certain topics as taboo and vulgar, especially if their discussion is seen as influenced by Western or otherwise “un-Indonesian” values. These topics include verbal love expression, extramarital or premarital sexuality, and gay identities, all of which are prevalent in the popular texts examined here—and often discussed using *bahasa gado-gado*.

The noticeable absence of Standard Indonesian when sex is discussed in these texts related to its status as the language of national identity, and the normative values it carries. As the official language of the nation, Standard Indonesian is closely related to the government’s nation-building propaganda and the project of national identity construction; therefore, it is a language of ideology and formal law for Indonesia.

The relation between non-normative acts and language use provides important

background information for my analysis. I divide this background into three parts corresponding to three taboo subjects: love, women's sexuality, and homosexuality.

Love expression

The socio-cultural environment plays an important role in shaping the socially-constructed activity of expressing love in one's first language (Deawale, 2008). In Thompson's (2013) study of how Zanzibari Muslim women talk about love in Swahili, she shows that love is often conveyed non-verbally. For these women, love is conveyed through other linguistic and semiotic sources, or "strategic actions," that include the tone and pitch of their voices, the way they serve food, or the brief conversations they have with their husbands while eating their meals. They represent love as not a matter of a woman's emotions, but rather a means of eliciting a desired response from a husband.

For many Indonesians, expressing love is often a matter of physical gestures rather than overt verbal expression. A handful of people may use Indonesian to express love, but it can feel cliché and banal. To cross-check my insider intuition, I asked for input from other Indonesians on several online forums, both an English-mediated site, *Living in Indonesia Expat Forum*, and an Indonesian-mediated forum, *Kompasiana*. The former is an online forum for both Indonesians and expatriates living in Indonesia; I selected the opinions of only those who self-identified as bilingual Indonesians. From the second forum, I selected Indonesian online opinion written by Indonesians writing about their opinion about love expressions in Indonesian. In those two forums, I asked how participants felt about conveying love with Indonesian love expressions such as *cinta* (love), *sayang* (to care for) or *rindu* (to miss). Most of those who responded, self-identifying themselves as Indonesians, said that they prefer using English when expressing love,

because English sounds “classier,” while expressing love in Indonesian is “tacky,” “tawdry,” “puke-inducing,” and “weird.” The reluctance to express love verbally in Indonesian suggests that such expressions are not part of Indonesian speech acts. By extension, the verbal expression of love is not considered part of “Indonesian identity.” As we will see below, switching into English allows Indonesians to express love verbally in ways that would be considered “un-Indonesian” if done in monolingual Indonesian.

Women’s sexuality

As we saw in Chapter Two, many Indonesians, particularly women, are subject to social surveillance of their sexual autonomy, not only from their immediate family members, but also from the community (Bennet, 2005). People often label any Indonesian woman who is believed to be sexually active outside of marriage an “easy woman” (Bennet, 2005; Davies, 2015). Indonesian Muslims learn, through religious doctrine and government propaganda, that sexual encounters must be mediated by marriage (Bennet, 2005, 2015; Boellstrof, 2005). A “good” Indonesian woman should live by normative values, which are in large part influenced by religious values. By extension, women’s sexuality is a taboo topic of discussion. Yet, as we will see below, *bahasa gado-gado* allows Indonesians to bring this topic out into the open.

Homosexuality

Because many Indonesians and the government consider homosexuality to be deviant, and a social disease that needs to be cured, most Indonesian gay men are still in the closet. Also, coming out in an open manner is not considered normal. In Indonesian discourse, the term *LGBT* is often contrasted with the term *normal* suggesting Otherness; and an LGBT individuals may be

considered *anak tiri* (step children), as opposed to birth children of Indonesia as the motherland (Boellstorff, 2005a).

For example, a scene in *Arisan 2!* (2011) illustrates how LGBT issues are still foreign to some Indonesians. When Nino is being interviewed by a reporter, both characters pronounce “LGBT” using English, as opposed to Indonesian, pronunciation. The same is true for other characters who consistently use *bahasa gado-gado*.

Many Indonesians, especially Jakartans, use *homoseksual* or *homo* as derogatory terms to insult gay men (Constantine, 2004). When an Indonesian heterosexual mocks an Indonesian homosexual as *homo*, it is comparable with the English term, *faggot*, an offensive term when used by a presumptive heterosexual to refer to a homosexual man. When Indonesians use *homoseksual* or *homo*, they usually refer them as someone who has a disease he needs to be cured from. Unlike the term *gay*, which is not yet acknowledged in the Great Dictionary, *homoseksual* has entered the KBBI or the Great Dictionary, suggesting the government’s official acknowledgment of the term. In the KBBI, *homoseksual* is defined as describing same-sex sexual interest and attraction. We will see in the discussion below that *bahasa gado-gado* allows Indonesians to discuss homosexuality in a positive manner.

Indexing Indonesianness

Popular texts feature characters who transgressions the above norms in various ways. Despite these transgression, in many ways they also index their Indonesianness.

In the *Ms. B series*, the main character is a sojourner who has been away from Indonesia and residing for many years in the United States. Yet she still calls Indonesia home (PAB, 15). Both she and her friend Fifin explicitly express their attachment towards Islam, the majority

religion. Furthermore, Ms. B and her family express attachment to Javanese culture and Ms. B's Javanese identity is referenced throughout the texts.

Ms. B's Indonesianness is visible throughout the texts, even in sections that some might interpret as undermining local values. Contrary to normative Indonesian expectations, Basuki, via the aid of Ms. B's *bahasa gado-gado* in the three books, brings together extramarital sexual encounters and religion. In Example 1 (and elsewhere in the series), Ms. B uses *bahasa gado-gado* to juxtapose a reference to the Islamic daily prayer with a conversation about pre-marital intercourse. Ms. B departs from Indonesian expectations: she can talk openly about pre-marital sex but also show some religious affiliation.

Example 1. (MBJM, 39)

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1 Biasanya aku harus bangun pagi (subuh <i>time!</i>) | I usually wake up very early (subuh <i>time!</i>) |
| 2 Sekarang, semua itu bisa dijadikan satu. Misalnya, aku bangun kesiangan (yang tidak subuhhan, <i>ouch</i>), nah habis mandi aku bisa langsung berangkat dengan membawa bekal. Perjalanan dari Lebak Bulus ke Sudirman membutuhkan waktu satu setengah hingga dua jam perjalanan. Selama itu, aku menyisir rambutku (<i>thanks God</i> , sejak di- <i>smoothing</i> jadi lebih mudah diatur), berdandan lengkap. | Now, all can be one. For example, I wake up later (and I didn't perform Subuh prayer, <i>ouch</i>), then take a shower and leave for office with some lunch box. The trip from Lebak Bulus to Sudirman takes about one hour and a half to two hours. During the trip, I usually comb my hair (<i>thanks God</i> , after the <i>smoothing</i> , it's easy to be taken care of), and do [my] makeup. |

While Ms. B's failure to pray may put her identity as a "good Muslim" in question, especially when coupled with her listening to her friend's pleasure in premarital sex (discussed further below), it would be a mistake to assume that she is not religious or not concerned with observing Islamic norms. Basuki reveals Ms. B's Muslimness by delivering the message that she needs to pray *subuh*, the early morning prayer that most Muslims observe before starting a day.

Throughout the series, religious faith is also shown through Fifin, who expresses a desire to pray after a long time neglecting this daily religious activity. Throughout the series, Basuki presents Islam as a ritual activity (prayer) that her characters engage in, while also embracing other (Western) values. In this sense, Basuki rejects the notion that religion should regulate one's morality or is incongruous with new values.

Complications, however, arise in the intersection of traditional views, modernness, and westernization. In Example 1, we see Ms. B assigns an additional role to English, here used to discuss not sex, but religious rituals. Because religion is an important means used to measure one's Indonesianness, it is important for many to abide by socially prescribed religious obligations, as evidenced in this example by *subuh* prayer. Ms. B's use of English juxtaposes religious traditions with modernness—a combination which for many would appear to threaten authentic Indonesianness due to an assumed relationship between modernness and westernization.

Moreover, Ms. B challenges the link between English and a set of morals (including vulgarity and pre-marital intercourse) by utilizing *bahasa gado-gado* in the discourse while emphasizing Islamic values regarding prayer. Ms. B manages to reconcile her identity as a graduate of a US university (therefore someone who has been exposed to foreign values that many Indonesians see as destructive to Indonesianness), a Muslim, and an Indonesian. By doing so she challenges the perception of English as a Western language that can threaten one's authenticity as an Indonesian by placing it within an acceptable moral system in Indonesia. Ms. B proposes a new way of being an Indonesian: she sustains her pride in being an Indonesian, yet simultaneously uses English, CJI, and Standard Indonesian in her daily life. Therefore, in this light, the writer invites Indonesian Muslim readers not to judge Ms. B and Fifin, as we can see

that both of them show some affiliation towards Islam, despite their open talk about sex.

Throughout the *Ms. B series*, Ms. B and Fifin, both American-educated, emphasize the role of Islam in measuring and building one's Indonesianness. In this light, it is intriguing to see how Basuki constructs the image of a religious Indonesian woman throughout the *Ms. B series*, while openly discussing Indonesian women's sexual autonomy in such a bold manner that we will see in the section to follow. On the one hand, Ms. B, as a female character has full autonomy by explicitly stating that she lives together with boyfriend during her stay in New York (PAB, 124). On the other hand, Ms. B still has a religious identity, a significant attachment towards Indonesianness. This hybrid identity is also indicated using *bahasa gado-gado*, as we will see in the upcoming section.

The same is true for Iwan who sees himself as a Javanese Indonesian, regardless of his attachment towards New York and the United States. Iwan's embracement of his Indonesianness is also expressed via his family's discourse.

In hindsight, he indicates that verbally expressing love is not part of his family's culture, suggesting that he has adopted this "new lifestyle" while away from Indonesia. Love in the context of the emotion is conceptualized as a physical action and gesture rather than a verbal expression. Growing up, while verbal manifestations of love were not part of his family's linguistic repertoire, love was shown in other ways:

Sering juga pada malam hari, aku terbangung, terbatuk-batuk karena dinginnya udara Kota Batu. Ibu selalu bangun membuatkan kopi panas untukku. Semuanya pun nyaman kembali. Tak ada obat batuk, hanya kopi panas, hanya kehangatan dari Ibu. (9S, 10A, 9)

Sometimes I would wake in the middle of the night, coughing, because it was so cold at night in Batu. Ibu would make me a cup of hot coffee when that happened and afterward I felt safe and comfortable again. We didn't have the money to buy medicines, so we used hot coffee. Yet Ibu's love was enough to get me through the night.

His mother (to whom he refers as Ibu) shows her love through the hot coffee she often prepares for him in his bad days, while his father (Bapak) shows his love through the bamboo bed he builds for Iwan. Neither expressed their love verbally, but Iwan felt it nonetheless.

In a similar manner, Iwan's father shows his love to Iwan nonverbally:

Karena aku sering batuk-batuk pada malam hari, Bapak membuatkan ranjang dari bamboo. Ranjang ini ditempatkan di sudut ruang tamu kami, di dekat pintu dapur, di depan kamar orangtuaku. Ranjang bamboo berukuran kira-kira 0,5 X 1,5 meter itu adalah ranjang pertamaku. Aku bisa merasakan hati Bapak di atas ranjang itu, kehangatan hatinya yang tak pernah diucapkan lewat kata-kata atau pelukan.
(9S, 10A, 9)

Because of my coughing fit, Bapak built me a bamboo bed to lie on at night. He placed it in a corner of the living room, near the kitchen door, in front of my parents' bedroom. That bamboo bed—0.5 x 1.5 meters—was my first bed. I could feel Bapak's heartfelt effort on that bed and the warmth of his love which he could never articulate in words or with an embrace.

Having grown up in a family who is not used to conveying love in such a verbal and expressive manner, Iwan has embraced a new way of expressing love while being a sojourn in New York, which I will discuss in the section to follow.

Despite the fact Iwan embraces a new culture via speech acts after living for many years overseas, he demonstrates that picking up the "new foreign habit" does not necessarily make him less Indonesian.

The two illustrations above show that love is a matter of covert and implicit deliverance, especially for Iwan's parents, member of the older generation and are English illiterate. As we will see in the discussion of verbal love expressions below, this background is essential to understand how Iwan, a younger generation and English literate, prefers *bahasa gado-gado* when it comes to expressively deliver his affection.

Popular texts also construct their Indonesianness through reference to well-known Indonesian traditions. In a similar fashion, the consistent maintenance of Indonesianness is also

apparent in the *Arisan!* films, in which the filmmaker settles with *arisan*, a traditional cultural gathering, as a central theme of the films. In this light, the filmmaker sustains an attachment to her Indonesianness by portraying *arisan*, a cultural event, as a central theme of the films. For most Indonesians, *arisan* is *Indonesia banget* (truly Indonesian), part of the state's construction of a homogenized national identity. Furthermore, she consistently shows the integration of the modern and traditional, Western and local concepts in one discourse, for instance, by depicting dollars as the currency, instead of rupiahs, the Indonesian currency, during the *arisan*. Along with that, the audience are presented with the characters' involvement in their visible concern towards social and political issues in Indonesia, and their attachment towards Indonesian songs (some of which are part of the original soundtracks of the films). The films also portray the maintenance of some traditional and Indonesian values via the characters' predominant usage of Indonesian, their use of Batakese, one of the regional languages in Indonesia, and a positive representation of Indonesian traditional massage.

Moreover, *Arisan* projects an attachment toward Indonesianness via Nino, one of the characters in the films (also a filmmaker). Nino often receives criticism about his films because they portray homosexuality positively, thus violating hegemonic Indonesian understandings of morality. In responding to the criticism, Nino argues that his film is also portraying Indonesia, because in his view, Indonesia is heterogeneous and inclusive. Via this response together with his language selection throughout the films, we see Nino proposing a wider and broader notion of national values. Nino's view is line with his sexual orientation and his freedom expression, partly represented by his language selection, which I will further elaborate in the section discussing *bahasa gado-gado* and homosexuality.

Finally, one of the most important ways that these texts are marked as Indonesian is through their use of Standard Indonesian. Despite that my own focus is on *bahasa gado-gado*, and it is a significant feature in these texts, Standard Indonesian is still the dominant language throughout the texts. While the characters select *bahasa gado-gado* in their discourse, they still function most of the time in Indonesian, suggesting they are not detaching themselves from the national identities.

In all these ways, popular texts construct and/or defend the Indonesianness of their characters. While both *bahasa gado-gado* and the treatment of taboo topics might be used by some readers to contest these texts' Indonesianness, there is a sustained effort from the authors and filmmaker to claim Indonesianness.

Given the paradoxes that the authors and filmmaker project between *bahasa gado-gado* and Indonesianness or Indonesian identities in the texts, I will demonstrate that *bahasa gado-gado* in the popular texts acts as an effective means for the authors and filmmaker to propose their new, more expansive, non-judgmental, and inclusive meaning of what contemporary Indonesianness can look like.

In the analysis that follows, I examine how love, women's sexuality, and homosexuality are discussed in both monolingual Indonesian and *bahasa gado-gado*. The majority of references to verbal love expression, women's extramarital sexuality, and homosexuality are delivered via *bahasa gado-gado* and conveyed in a liberating manner and a positive tone. Contrastively, when addressing these topics more implicitly or in a negative tone, the characters use monolingual Indonesian.

In this chapter, I show how *bahasa gado-gado* is used in popular texts to expand Indonesianness to include those who transgress the taboos discussed above. I begin with the use

of *bahasa gado-gado* to express affection in an overt manner; and subsequently analyze how the texts use *bahasa gado-gado* in discussions of women's extramarital sexuality and homosexuality. I argue that *bahasa gado-gado* allows writers and their characters to reconcile their Indonesianness with non-normative language use and behaviors, by integrating English as a global language into Indonesian; in this way, they produce expanded meanings of what Indonesianness looks like.

Throughout the chapter, I display excerpts from the written works verbatim, with italics and other typography intact, in both the original and the translation. Excerpts from the *Arisan!* films are my own transcription, and I italicize any English occurrences only in the translation because they are unmarked in the film itself. For ease of reference, I number paragraphs for the printed texts and turns for the film dialogs and narration. The conversations in all texts are predominantly held in Indonesian—a mix between Standard Indonesian and CJI—but feature English switches or *bahasa gado-gado*.

Code-switching to mediate verbal expressions of love

As we saw above, expressing love is not usually done in Indonesian. Yet one important use of *bahasa gado-gado* now, especially among younger people, is to verbally express love.

While the *feeling* of love may be universal, the pragmatics of *expressing* love may differ from one culture to another (Lutz, 1998; Wilkins & Gareis, 2006; Deawele, 2008). Second language acquisition research has shown that many second language speakers find it easier to express love overtly in an L2 as opposed to their L1. Many second language speakers claim that a second language is more appropriate than their first language for such expressions, due to a

different emotional weight attached to love expression in the first and second languages (Wilkins & Gareis, 2006; Deawale, 2008).

Similarly, Indonesian popular novels, such as *9 Summers*, *10 Autumns*, provide examples of love as a socio-cultural and emotional act without distinguishing the types of love, such as passionate love or other types (cf. Wilkins & Gareis, 2006). Accordingly, “I love you” or other explicit love expression allows an exploration of why Indonesian writers prefer saying or expressing it in English, as opposed to their first language, be it the regional or Indonesian, in the otherwise Indonesian discourse.

In the seven texts that I analyzed, I found that the majority of expressions of love, whether verbal or explicit, are conveyed in *bahasa gado-gado*. I found only one instance in which monolingual Indonesian is used: by Ms. B’s former boyfriend in *Ms. B series*, to ask himself whether he still deserves to love Ms. B (MBJM, 20). Aside from being too formal and awkward to my taste as an Indonesian, and thus confirming the other Indonesians’ opinions regarding *cinta*, *rindu*, or *sayang* as discussed earlier in this chapter, this love expression is a self-assurance, not a verbal confession to another person.

I have chosen the love expressions displayed in Setyawan’s novel *9 Summers*, *10 Autumns* as representative of the seven texts, because it contains the most examples. The credit for some of the English translations of *9 Summers*, *10 Autumns* in this chapter belongs to Maggie Tiojakin, the translator of the published English version. I present my analysis of excerpts from *9 Summers*, *10 Autumns* to show that the frequent switching from Standard Indonesian or CJI to English during displays of affection is a strategic mechanism used to integrate newly adopted socio-cultural values into one’s speech act.

Iwan, the main character in *9 Summers, 10 Autumns*, consistently uses English in his letters and emails to his family when expressing love. Although he uses monolingual Indonesian in many other parts of the novel, he never does so when expressing love. Example 2 is an email addressed to Iwan's mother but sent to his sister's email address due to his mother's technological illiteracy. While the dominant language of his emails is Indonesian, he deliberately switches to English when it comes to love expression.

Example 2. (9S, 10A, 164)

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1 Setelah 8 tahun di New York, Buk, setelah ingin pulang tiap tahunnya, promosi ini lebih dari mimpiku, mungkin lebih dari kita semua digabung jadi satu. Doakan biar lancar yah, Buk. Kalo sempat, bikin nasi kuning buat syukuran. | After 8 years living in New York, I always want to go home. Every year. This job promotion is more than I ever dreamt. It is more than our dreams. Please pray for me, Buk. If you have time, please invite our neighbors to pray together at our house and cook them the traditional rice for the prayers' event. |
| 2 Yowis, gitu aja yah. Salam buat semua. | That's all from me. Send my regards to everyone. |
| 3 <i>With all my heart,</i>
Anakmu (yang dulu sering kau bilang durhaka)
<i>New York, January 2008</i> | <i>With all my heart,</i>
Your son (the one your used to call your long-lost son)
<i>New York, January 2008</i> |

Bahasa gado-gado with a deliberate switch from Indonesian to English functions as a space to express verbal and overt love. The love expression here is indicated by the shift of the language, from Indonesian to English. Example 2 shows that the writer adopts Indonesian when discussing the traditional family and community habit to pray together and cook traditional rice for symbol of success. However, a noticeable switch occurs when the character expresses his love.

Despite his parents' inability to speak or read English, Iwan keeps switching from Indonesian to English when expressing his love verbally. His mother has little to no knowledge of English. She is a housewife and comes from a very poor background. *With all my heart* is an

expression of love and the only English phrase that he uses in this email. While it is a logical choice for Iwan to speak English due to his environment, we can imagine that the use of *with all my heart* may appear peculiar to his mother, given her low English proficiency. As we saw earlier, the older generation tends to show love via gestures rather than verbal expressions. By explicitly verbally expressing his love to his parents, in English, Iwan introduces a “new culture” to his family, but one which they may not even be aware of since they may not understand it. In this case, Iwan, as a representative of a younger, more commonly bilingual generation, is English-literate and presumably familiar with verbal love expression, as opposed to his parents, who are part of an older generation. By expressing love verbally in a language that is still foreign for his parents and maybe also for his siblings, Iwan appears to be introducing a new element to his family culture. He is trying to instill a new culture in his family; while he uses Indonesian out of habit, a brief switch into English enables him to express love verbally. In this way, code-switching functions as an evocative tool, in which one language is understood as a better tool to express particular emotions than another (Mahootian, 2005). And yet, because the English phrase may not be understood by his mother, it protects him from the charge of transgressing the taboo.

For Iwan, who has been living in New York for eight years, English is the most available linguistic resource to communicate. Expressing love verbally may also be a new behavior that he picks up while living in New York, as shown in the above excerpts, in which Iwan explicitly observes that both his parents tend to express their love in non-verbal manners, and that verbal love expression was non-existent when he was growing up. Accordingly, for Iwan, languages play a significant role in maintaining both his Indonesianness and his cosmopolitan self.

Bahasa gado-gado serves as an effective outlet to deliver undisguised love expression in a family where expressing love is accomplished through physical gestures and is often left

unspoken. Iwan utilizes *bahasa gado-gado* to express unconcealed love not only for his family members, but also to his younger self to whom he refers as “his friend” and “his brother.”

Example 3. (9S, 10A, 54)

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>1 <i>My dear friend, my love,</i></p> <p>2 <i>I miss you, dan semoga tulisan ini bisa memanggilmu, karena aku tahu, kau tak akan pernah jauh diriku. Ini tulisan terakhir tentang saudara-saudaraku, tentang seseorang yang hatinya putih, adik bungsu Mira.</i></p> | <p><i>My dear friend, my love,</i></p> <p><i>I miss you, and I hope this writing can summon you, because I know you have never been apart from me. This is my last writing about my siblings, about my sister with a good heart, my youngest sister, Mira.</i></p> |
|---|--|

The letter is written mostly in Indonesian, but with a noticeable occurrence of English when expressing love. In his predominantly Indonesian email, Iwan’s language selection invites further scrutiny due to the use of two languages that carry two different functions in one discourse. He starts his email in English to demonstrate his affection toward his younger self without any restriction; that is, he conveys it in a non-pragmatic manner. He switches to Standard Indonesian to display his feeling about his sibling, yet this is delivered implicitly. There is a division of labor between English and Indonesian in the expression of emotions. Iwan employs English when he needs to verbally express his affection (par.1), but Standard Indonesian when conveying it implicitly and pragmatically (par. 2). Iwan cannot stay loyal to monolingual Indonesian, but needs *bahasa gado-gado* to express his love in an overt fashion.

In a similar light, Iwan utilizes *bahasa gado-gado* to narrate a childhood experience, but switches to English to reflect, show gratitude, and express love, as demonstrated in Example 13. In his reflection, as a bilingual adult who has picked up new American values, Iwan revisits his childhood memory and deliberately expresses his affection towards his mother in *bahasa gado-gado*.

Example 4. (9S, 10A, 210-211)

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>1 Melihat airmata Ibu jatuh saat itu, <i>I told myself, I will not let this happen again. I want to make her a happy mother, a very happy mother. I want to do something for my family. I love them so much. This past memory, though painful, has saved my life.</i> Di sinilah aku mulai melihat hidup ini tak hijau lagi.</p> <p>2 Kenangan ini, meskipun perih, telah menyelamatkan hidupku.</p> <p>3 Aku tak bisa memilih masa kecilku.</p> | <p>When I saw my mother's tears falling that night, <i>I told myself, I will not let this happen again. I want to make her a happy mother, a very happy mother. I want to do something for my family. I love them so much. This past memory, though painful, has saved my life.</i> And from here I learned that life is not so green after all.</p> <p>The memory, though painful, has saved my life.</p> <p>I can't choose my childhood.</p> |
|---|--|

After *bahasa gado-gado* and two-full sentences in Indonesian, he then continues in a monolingual English to express his emotion:

4 *Dearest,*

With tears, from both my eyes and my heart, right now, while remembering that story, I want to thank you for being so good to me, for always listening patient to me and guarding me. You have saved me!

If you want to go and rest, I will respect your decision, the way you have been understanding me. Pure and deep. You know, you are always in my heart. Wherever you are.

*Live. Let's live. Tomorrow is here, now.
I love you, very much.
Your brother*

A consistent departure from Indonesian to English conveys Iwan's affectionate expression towards his mother. Indonesian acts as a language to elaborate about this childhood experience. This reflects the traditional Indonesian that shifts towards the modern and new Indonesian.

Moreover, the division of labor between the languages is also associated with English literacy and illiteracy, reflecting the experiences of Iwan's younger self and his family members, particularly his parents. His childhood self and his family members share their illiteracy in English and their attachment to Javanese and Indonesian cultures. These two elements are

important points of reference that help explain why Iwan in the time frame of the novel can express his feeling in an open manner via his language selection, as he is now a bilingual with a hybrid identity. Saying “I love you,” “I miss you,” and other verbal love expressions appears to reflect his individual trajectory, newly adopted habits, and speech acts—that is, the range of sociocultural and linguistic experiences to which he has been exposed (Deawale, 2008). In this light, Iwan, who has learned English as a second language later in his life, may have picked up the new habit of expressing love verbally while living in New York. In incorporating it into his existing linguistic habits and literacy, he has created a hybrid self.

Taken together, Examples 2-4 show that *bahasa gado-gado* grants a space for Iwan to explicitly express his affection in a verbal manner, suggesting the relationship between *bahasa gado-gado* and love expression is inescapable, and that maintaining monolingual Indonesian in this context is not possible.

The frequent presence of phrases like *with all my heart, I love you, I love you very much, dearest*, and *my love* in the otherwise Indonesian novel, is striking. Switching from Indonesian to English may “avoid the affective loaded meaning” that is present in the Indonesian equivalents (Li & Tse 2002, p. 168). The equivalence in Indonesian may sound too direct, so using English may save Iwan from embarrassment or being clichéd or too awkward as it is not the “cultural value” shared with his parents within their Indonesianness. In other words, English as a foreign language comes as a neutral language that represents his newly adopted habit, probably a foreign notion for his parents. Here English plays an emotive function that conveys an affective purpose (Li & Tse, 2002). “I love you” or other English overt expressions can convey the emotionally-loaded statements in an open manner. Code-switching from Indonesian to English allows Iwan to express his emotions with relative ease. As Iwan learns English later in life, he has done so “in

less affectively arousing circumstances” than he did Indonesian (Bond & Lai, 2001, p. 185). In other words, for Iwan, a second language speaker who learns English as a young adult, his attachment towards English is probably less intense than his attachment to Javanese or Indonesian, his childhood languages. The English expressions employed by Iwan in these examples convey love in a register that is less embarrassing than it would be in his native language. Iwan, an active English user himself, finds English useful to express his love toward his sister and his mother. This expression is not intended to create a gap between him and his mother, or him and his readers in the case of Example 3, but rather to bridge his need to verbally express his feeling. He may not be accustomed to saying it in Indonesian, as he may have never done and said that all his life. English can carry such a task. Switching from his primary language to his second language suggests that he has adopted the new lifestyle and mixed it together with his old self to create a “new” form of identity.

Love expression as a tool has a fluid capacity to cross the imaginary border between traditional social values and new cultural values. In this case, English, with its love expressions *I love you*, *I need you*, and *I miss you*, is much preferred over Indonesian, due to the “newly adopted culture” from the West in which English plays an important role. These cultural and social attributes may thwart many speakers from using Indonesian as a vehicle for expressing affection. Here, switching to English allows Iwan to express his feeling without embarrassment or awkwardness. This kind of switch from Indonesian to English is encouraged by social inhibition and cultural taboo. While values have changed, language has not caught up with those changes, so speakers like Iwan seek a new language to express new values.

Moreover, switching from Indonesian to English when verbally expressing love contributes to expanding meanings of Indonesianness by juxtaposing Indonesian with the

language of Iwan's newly adopted lifestyle. Unfortunately, the Indonesian language has not yet caught up with this new culture, which results in code-switching in which English plays an important role. In this case, English is the language that carries a cultural notion that contributes to the development of a third or new culture (Kachru, 1986).

Code-switching to discuss sexuality

Just as Indonesians in the Reformasi era have found new ways of expressing love verbally and openly via code-switching, *bahasa gado-gado* allows more open discussions extramarital sexuality, especially for women.

As we have already seen, Indonesian women, especially those who are Muslim, are subject to cultural expectations imposed by society and the state, such as living nobly and, more importantly, practicing sexual abstinence until their wedding nights (Bennet 2005). Long-standing propaganda has taught many Indonesians to act and speak as a *Manusia Indonesian Seutuhnya* (an authentic Indonesian), who possesses *kepribadian Indonesian* (the Indonesian identity), which means to speak “good” and “correct” Indonesian, to act as a person who holds up the values stated in Pancasila, the 1945 Constitution, and the GBHN, and to avoid the threat of foreign influence by rejecting Western values.

Because of taboos about sexuality, the characters cannot discuss these topics in monolingual Standard Indonesian. On the one hand, throughout the seven texts I examined, I did not find a single instance of sexuality discussed explicitly using Standard Indonesian. Instead, all the instances of monolingual Indonesian occur in discussions of less taboo topics, or in implicit discussions of taboo topics. For example, when Andien's husband informs her that he has slept with someone else, he uses monolingual Indonesian; however, he communicates this information

via implicit cues. This piece of information will be useful to contrast to the scene, discussed below, in which Andien informs Meimei explicitly about her husband's affair.

On the other hand, taboo topics that are discussed openly always involve *bahasa gado-gado*. I found hundreds of examples that illustrate characters across my seven texts exploiting *bahasa gado-gado* in this way; here I will discuss five representative examples from the *Ms. B series* and the *Arisan!* films. The four extracts show how the characters use *bahasa gado-gado* to openly discuss their extramarital sexuality.

Bahasa gado-gado provides a space for the bilingual characters to boldly discuss sex, as shown in Example 5. The example starts in Indonesian with Ms. B's private thoughts about her best friend Fifin's breasts, followed by her conversation with Fifin about sexual activity.

Example 5. (PAB, 36)

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>1 Aku sering melirik payudara Fifin yang besar. Ukurannya 36D. Luar biasa, bandingkan dengan milikku yang 34B... oops. Ah, tapi badan Fifin kan memang gemuk, perutnya saja berlipat, juga paha dan pantatnya besar. Wajar jika payudara juga besar kan?</p> <p>2 "What else?" tanyaku.</p> <p>3 "Hahaha...B, <i>I really don't know</i>. Oh, seks. Mungkin karena aku <i>good in bed</i>.</p> | <p>I often took a glance at Fifin's breasts. Hers are 36D. Hers are extraordinary, compared to mine, which are 34B... oops. However, she is chubby, with her fat stomach, thigh, and huge buttocks. So, it's very logical for her to have them, right?</p> <p>"What else?" I asked.</p> <p>"Hahaha, B, <i>I really don't know</i>. Oh, sex. I may be <i>good in bed</i>.</p> |
|---|--|

The sociolinguistic distance between Standard Indonesian and English provides a mechanism for the characters to openly discuss sex, as shown in paragraph 3. The shift from a neutral discourse to a sexual one is indexed by *bahasa gado-gado* when the use of Standard Indonesian in paragraph 1, which carries no vulgar or obscene implication, shifts to a sexually-charged discourse in paragraph 3, accompanied by *bahasa gado-gado*. A sexual conversation that would have had vulgar connotations if it were in monolingual Standard Indonesian starts in paragraph 3, which exhibits code-switching among Standard Indonesian, CJI, and English. The vulgar

connotation of the final sentences is sidestepped by a switch from Standard Indonesian to English and a dialect shift from Standard Indonesian to CJI. With the aid of *bahasa gado-gado*, Ms. B can openly ask about Fifin's premarital activity and Fifin can openly talk about her sexual independence and autonomy. Their use of a language that mixes English and Indonesian is a clear transgression of the government's monolingual mandate stated in the language law No. 24/2009. Paragraph 3 also presents us with Fifin's responses in *bahasa gado-gado*, instead of monolingual English, while being questioned in English. Her use of the Standard Indonesian forms *seks* 'sex' and *mungkin karena aku...* 'maybe because I am good at...' shows she does not reject Indonesianness. Yet the topic of the conversation transgresses Indonesian norms, values, and culture and, therefore, may be seen as "un-Indonesian." While many Indonesians would find both the characters' open discussion of a "vulgar" sexual topic and their use of *bahasa gado-gado* "un-Indonesian" acts, I read the narrator's and characters' consistent use of *bahasa gado-gado* more positively. By avoiding discussing extramarital activities in Standard Indonesian, in a sense they are respecting Indonesian norms. Yet they make good use of a readily available linguistic resource to discuss topics of importance to them. Moreover, the fact that Standard Indonesian for sex, *seks*, is clearly borrowed from English suggests that Standard Indonesian is not as "tidy," as non-Western, as its proponents would have it. Even Standard Indonesian often relies on English when it comes to discourse about sex.

Both Ms. B and Fifin use CJI and English when discussing their dating style in a sexually-charged conversation. The example to follow presents Fifin's personal thoughts about Ms. B's dating style, which is different from her own. Her thoughts are conveyed in Colloquial Jakartan Indonesian (CJI) with a switch to English when discussing sexual activity. I underline

CJI switches in both the original and my translation to highlight their occurrence; they are unmarked in the original.

Example 6. (MBJM, 6)

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>1 <u>Lu</u> emang hebat, B. Bukan cuma sebagai sahabat, tapi juga manusia. <u>Gue</u> kagum <u>sama</u> kegigihan <u>lu</u> memperjuangkan eh mempertahankan status perawan <u>lu</u>. <u>Hari gini</u>, B? <u>Ngebayangin aja</u> susahnya minta ampun. <u>Gue</u> jadi penasaran, <u>lu</u> tuh kalau pacaran <u>ngapain</u> aja? <u>Ngelakuin petting</u> <u>nggak</u>? Hehehe, gila ya <u>gue</u>.</p> <p>2 Pasti susah banget buat <u>lu</u>. <u>Gue</u> yakin pasti banyak <u>cowok</u> yang <u>coba-coba ngajak</u> <u>lu</u> “tidur.” Soalnya <u>gue</u> yang <u>begini aja</u> sering banget diisengin <u>cowok</u>, yang <u>buntut-buntutnya ngajak</u> <i>check-in</i> ke hotel. Apalagi <u>lu</u>, B.</p> | <p><u>You</u>’re super, B. Not only as a best friend, but as a human being. <u>I</u> admire <u>you</u> for keeping <u>your</u> virginity. <u>It’s hard</u>, right? I can’t <u>even imagine</u>. <u>I</u> am curious <u>if you</u> are <u>also petting</u> with your boyfriend. Hahaha, <u>I</u> know my curiosity sounds so crazy.</p> <p>It must be hard for <u>you</u>, right? <u>I</u> am pretty sure there must be many <u>men</u> who <u>wanted to “sleep”</u> with you. A woman <u>like me</u> who is not as pretty as <u>you had slept with many men</u> and had <u>eventually asked me to check in</u> at hotels. <u>You (must have experienced) being asked (like I did)</u>.</p> |
|--|--|

Example 6 is more sexually explicit than Example 5, a difference that is indexed by the shift from Standard Indonesian to CJI. Because Fifin is a Jakartan, it is not surprising that she would communicate in CJI with Ms. B, another cosmopolitan Jakartan. However, the appearance of CJI and English is notable when discussing sexual activities in both Examples 5 and 6. While the intimacy between characters plays a significant factor for the switch, the topic of conversation also contributes.

Moreover, in Example 6 we also see that English terms *check-in* and *petting* are used with sexual connotations. In this context, both refer to the activity of two people engaged in (or about to engage in) extramarital sexual activity. In ordinary conversations on the topic of hotels, Indonesians who don’t speak English would likely use the CJI term *ngamar*, since there is no Standard Indonesian term with the meaning of “registering at a hotel.” Many younger and urban Jakartans understand *check-in* as an activity that precedes sexual intercourse. While *ngamar* has

the same meaning as *check-in*, it is not used in popular texts intended for young adult readers because it may sound vulgar to Indonesians who speak and understand CJI, English, and Standard Indonesian. Conversely, *check-in*, being a foreign term, has fewer associations for many Indonesians and so acts a neutral code (Kachru, 1986). The next term, *petting*, has no available equivalence in either Standard Indonesian or CJI, perhaps because it is a taboo activity for unmarried individuals, especially unmarried women. In addition to functioning as a strategic mechanism to be less vulgar or offensive, the *bahasa gado-gado* in this example is a linguistic necessity. Essentially, code-switching here highlights “cultural non-equivalence” (Callahan, 2004, p. 92).

Aside from functioning as a device to sidestep potentially cultural-sensitive offenses, *bahasa gado-gado* in the Example 6 also avoids a sexually-charged conversation in Indonesian. Fifin refers to sexual intercourse implicitly, noticeably avoiding any of the Indonesian terms for intercourse, such as *bercinta* or *bersenggama* ‘to have sexual intercourse’; instead, she uses the euphemistic *tidur* ‘to sleep’. Thus, there is a clear avoidance of Standard Indonesian for the topic of sex in Example 6. Code-switching between English and CJI is a response to the hegemonic ideology that conflates sexuality and pornography. The switch is strategically used to euphemize conversations that some readers would otherwise find vulgar and pornographic. In other words, shuttling between Indonesian, CJI, and English is a playful strategy that allows Ms. B and Fifin to avoid vulgarity. This is especially true when it comes to taboo sexuality, such as extramarital female sexuality. While Ms. B, and Fifin, both as Jakartans and as fictional characters, may not be particularly subject to social surveillance regarding their lifestyles, the norm for readers may still be premarital abstinence, and many may hold the perception that “the entire female body is considered a site of sexual purity” (Bennet, 2005, p. 132). The conversation

between Ms. B and Fifi that we see in Examples 5 and 6 transgresses this social norm. Through *bahasa gado-gado*, Ms. B can freely discuss a sensitive matter that many consider less-than-Indonesian.

Bahasa gado-gado grants a space for characters to explicitly discuss non-normative sexual contact, as evident in Example 7, from the film *Arisan!*, where Andien shifts between CJI and English when she mentions sex in turn 10. In this conversation, Meimei and Andien, both female, are discussing a conflict. The underlined words, phrases, and sentences highlight the use of CJI in this example.

Example 7. (Arisan!)

- | | | | |
|----|---------|---|---|
| 1 | Meimei: | Tapi sekarang satu Jakarta <u>udah</u> pada <u>tau</u> bahwa <u>lo</u> sedang ada affair. | But now the whole city <u>has known</u> that <u>you</u> are having <i>an affair</i> . |
| 2 | Andien: | So what? <u>Gue pengen seneng-seneng</u> kok. Dan Rama <u>bikin gue seneng</u> , dan <u>gue</u> merasa lebih muda lagi. | <i>So what?</i> <u>I</u> just <u>wanted to have fun</u> . And Rama <u>makes me happy</u> , and made <u>me</u> feel <u>younger</u> . |
| 3 | Meimei: | <u>Lo lagi</u> ada problem ya? | Do <u>you</u> have any <i>problems</i> ? |
| 4 | Andien: | Problem sih dari dulu juga ada. Kecuali <u>elu</u> . | Everybody has <i>problems</i> . Except <u>you</u> . |
| 5 | Meimei: | Kenapa <u>gue</u> ? | Why <u>me</u> ? |
| 6 | Andien: | <u>Lo</u> dari kecil <u>ga</u> pernah berjuang untuk <u>dapetin</u> apa yang <u>elo</u> mau. <u>Lo</u> cantik, orang <u>tualo</u> kaya, semuanya serba perfect! | Since <u>you</u> were young you have <u>never</u> fought <u>for anything</u> <u>you</u> <u>wanted</u> to enjoy. <u>You</u> are beautiful, <u>your</u> parents are rich, all is <i>perfect</i> ! |
| 7 | Meimei: | <u>Gue</u> perfect? <u>Elo</u> gak tau aja, Ndien. | Am <u>I</u> <i>perfect</i> ? <u>You</u> <u>just didn't know</u> , Ndien. |
| 8 | Andien: | <u>Gue</u> harus kawin dengan bos <u>gue</u> yang 20 tahun lebih tua daripada <u>gue</u> , hanya untuk <u>ngerasain</u> apa yang <u>elo</u> <u>rasain</u> dari kecil. | <u>I</u> had to get married to <u>my</u> boss who is 20 years older than <u>I</u> am, just <u>to feel</u> and have anything <u>you</u> have <u>enjoyed</u> since you were a kid. |
| 9 | Meimei: | Tega ya, <u>lo</u> <u>ngomong kayak gitu</u> ? Bob itu kan baik, dia sayang <u>ama</u> <u>elo</u> , Ndien. | <u>How could you say that?</u> Bob is a good guy, he loves <u>you</u> , Ndien. |
| 10 | Andien: | He slept with someone else. <u>Gak tau kan lo</u> ? | <i>He slept with someone else</i> . You <u>did not</u> know, did <u>you</u> ? |
| 11 | Meimei: | Kapan Ndien? | When (did he do it), Ndien? |

- | | |
|--|--|
| 12 Andien: Tahun lalu <u>kek</u> , kemarin <u>kek</u> , apa bedanya? Dia udah mengkhianati <u>gue</u> , Mei. | It <u>doesn't matter</u> , <u>whether it was</u> last year, yesterday, what's the difference? He has already betrayed <u>me</u> , Mei. |
|--|--|

The occurrence of CJI and English when discussing sex suggests that there is a clear avoidance of Standard Indonesian for doing so, particularly demonstrated in turns 1 and 10. The first use of *bahasa gado-gado* occurs when Meimei points out Andien's affair in turn 1. The most prominent English switches occur in turn 10, when Andien informs Meimei that her husband has slept with someone else and where *affair* is the only English word amid a CJI and Standard Indonesian sentence. Both *affair* and *he slept with someone else* could have been written in Standard Indonesian. *Selingkuh* is the Standard Indonesian term for having an affair, while *he slept with someone else* could have been rendered as *dia sudah tidur dengan orang lain*. Thus, the *bahasa gado-gado* in this example does not function as a lexical filler. The use of these Standard Indonesian terms, however, would have shifted the register of the conversation from colloquial to formal, so the switch from Standard Indonesian to English here functions as a mechanism to maintain stylistic register. Aside from the fact that the interlocutors are friends, the informality is necessary due to the topic of the whole conversation, Andien's affair. Standard Indonesian, as the official language comprising normative social-cultural values, would attach an overly formal flavor to turns 1 and 10.

Moreover, since Andien's husband's confession referred to his affair as simply "a mistake" and an "an accident," we see the contrast with Andien's *bahasa gado-gado* in turn 10 reporting the same incident. In the former, there are no Indonesian terms used to refer to his sexual contact, while in the latter, Andien utilizes *bahasa gado-gado* to name his act overtly. As I mentioned earlier in the chapter, Bob, Andien's husband, uses a pragmatic strategy and implicit cues to admit that he has an extramarital affair, avoiding discussing sex openly in monolingual

Indonesian. In contrast, the code-switching between CJI and English in Andien's speech functions as a device to discuss "non-normative" values in a liberating and explicit manner.

In a similar manner, the role of *bahasa gado-gado* to moderate a sexually-charged topic is demonstrated in Example 8. This example is an exchange between Andien and her female friend that discusses having an affair, which for Andien's friend is a distinctive activity from *flirting*. In making such a distinction, Andien's friend switches from Indonesian to English.

Example 8. (Arisan!)

- | | | |
|--------------------|--|--|
| 1 Andien's friend: | Dulu sebelum cerai dengan suamiku, aku juga sering flirting. | Before getting divorced with my husband, I often <i>flirted</i> . |
| 2 Andien: | Flirting apa selingkuh? | <i>Flirting</i> or having an affair? |
| 3 Andien's friend: | Andien, selingkuh itu kalau kita make love dengan orang lain pakai perasaan. Kalau <u>enggga</u> , itu namanya flirting. | Andien, having affairs is when you <i>make love</i> with feeling. If <u>not</u> , we call it <i>flirting</i> . |

Like the previous example, Example 8 contains sexual overtones which are expressed using English switches. In this exchange, Andien's friend suggests Andien have an affair, which she sees as different from *flirting*. The notable switch occurs when Andien's friend delivers her suggestion to Andien to flirt, have an affair, and make love (para.3).

The English switch in Example 8 (para.3), "make love," is used instead of *bercinta*, *bersenggama*, or *berhubungan intim*, the Standard Indonesian terms for discussing sexual intercourse politely and in formal contexts and situations. If the CJI term *ngentot* or *ngewe* were used, it would create an entirely different connotation, as many Indonesian readers would find the conversation extreme, vulgar, and offensive. In ordinary and relaxed conversation among friends, many Jakartans use *ngentot* and *ngewe* to discuss sexual intercourse in a colloquial manner, but here Andien and her friend carry the conversation in an intimate yet formal tone which would make the appearance of CJI term appears not only vulgar, but also

sociolinguistically unfit. Moreover, these words are largely considered too vulgar for a published text, even a film. In this light, *bahasa gado-gado* in Example 8 functions as a sociolinguistic tool that moderates the formality or vulgarity that Standard Indonesian or CJI, respectively, would have invoked if used.

Throughout these examples, the characters in popular texts show a clear avoidance of Standard Indonesian when discussing sexual intercourse. In the examples above, switching to English grants a space for the writers to discuss sex, albeit still euphemistically, as evidenced by the use of *petting*, *good in bed*, *make love*, and *slept with*. As I have discussed, Standard Indonesian, as the national and official language, has been defined through linguistic description, through which it is identified, limited, constructed, interpreted, and mapped by government ideologies, national identity, and political, social, historical, and religious sources (Gal & Irvine, 2000). This process has created social tensions that have encouraged people in Indonesia who have been formally taught Standard Indonesian to develop a meta-discursive knowledge of Indonesian that guides negotiations of when and when not to use it. English carries liberating connotations that Standard Indonesian would not. The sociolinguistic and metapragmatic values attached to Standard Indonesian helps explain the use of *bahasa gado-gado*. *Bahasa gado-gado* enables the characters to discuss sexuality in an unrestrained manner. Standard Indonesian carries a set of national values that can simultaneously create a “too stiff” and “too formal” effect, not allowing the discussion of non-normative, “un- Indonesian,” or sociolinguistically “inappropriate” values. With Standard Indonesian carrying such a heavy task in its role as the national language, switching to another language, English or CJI, provides a linguistic resource for Indonesians when discussing taboo topics that can disrupt expectations of Indonesianness.

All the conversations presented above address taboo topics in a liberating manner. *Bahasa gado-gado* serves as a linguistic resource that can side-step the social norms that construct “Indonesianness” via state ideology and law. The noticeable shift to English when sex is the topic indexes the necessity of softening sexual connotations that might appear offensive or vulgar to their audience. *Bahasa gado-gado* enables bilingual Indonesians to discuss taboo topics that can mitigate embarrassment or shame through a second language that offers an emotional distance (Bond & Lai, 2001).

Accordingly, throughout the texts, none of the characters expresses shame when discussing sexual activities. In *Ms. B series*, Fifin, when contrasting her lifestyle with Ms.B’s, demonstrates her awareness that premarital intercourse is not part of “Indonesian culture” and admires Ms. B’s “good” moral decision to remain a virgin despite living abroad in the United States; but Fifin’s openness is conveyed by *bahasa gado-gado*. In a similar manner, Andien’s and her friend’s straightforward attitudes towards taboo topics, when discussing Andien’s friend’s personal definition of, and attitude towards, affairs, is expressed in *bahasa gado-gado*. Via *bahasa gado-gado*, both resist normative expectations of how Indonesians, particularly Indonesian women, should act—with shame—when talking about sexuality.

Homosexuality in the *Arisan!* films: The roles of code-switching

Just as *bahasa gado-gado* has provided a space for Indonesian women to openly discuss sexuality and subsequently renegotiate and expand their identities, so too has it provided space for more open, neutral or even positive, discussions of homosexuality, which for many Indonesians is another taboo, abnormal, negative, culturally sensitive and “un-Indonesian” topic.

Because of the stigma that surrounds homosexuality, it cannot be discussed in monolingual Standard Indonesian in a positive manner. Throughout the seven texts, I did not find a single instance of homosexuality discussed in Standard Indonesian as a neutral or non-stigmatized sexual orientation or in a non-judgmental manner. Across the texts, when the characters use monolingual Indonesian to discuss homosexuality in a negative tone, they use the derogatory terms *homo* or *homoseksual*, discussed above. On the other hand, they typically switch to the term *gay*, using *bahasa gado-gado* when projecting homosexuality in a positive manner or a non-judgmental fashion. There is one exception that I will discuss below.

Of the seven texts, I will focus on the *Arisan!* films to represent the elaboration of homosexuality because these films center on the issue of homosexuality. The films feature two gay Indonesian characters, Sakti and Nino portrayed as members of the Jakartan elite who travel overseas and are highly educated English-Indonesian bilinguals, unlike most gay men in Indonesia who are working class, do not speak English, and have never traveled abroad (Boellstorff, 2000).

In both films, the characters primarily use *bahasa gado-gado* when discussing homosexuality, except for one instance when Sakti uses *homoseksual* during a session with his psychotherapist. Excepting this moment, the characters overwhelmingly employ *bahasa gado-gado* to discuss homosexuality, and do so in a neutral and non-stigmatizing manner. In this light, *bahasa gado-gado* is an effective mechanism used by the writers to present homosexuality in a positive light, as a direct challenge to the established cultural discourse.

There are six examples that I present in this section: The first two extracts provide background on how the Reformasi era government has granted freedom of speech to its citizens but the Islamic extremists manipulate and exploit it by taking over the government's task to

“discipline” the “infidels” (Examples 9 and 10); the other four include the discussion of homosexuality executed via *bahasa gado-gado* (Examples 11-14).

Examples 9 and 10 shed light on shifting Indonesian attitudes towards homosexuality. Example 9 is a dialog between a reporter and Nino, a movie producer whose movies often depict the life of Indonesian gay men who are already out of the closet. The interview occurs during an LGBT festival held in Jakarta, while there has been a protest by the Islamic Defenders Front (*Forum Pembela Islam*, FPI) for a couple of days. The conversation starts with the reporter asking Nino a question about his movie that is being protested.

Example 9. (*Arisan! 2*)

- | | | | |
|---|-----------|---|--|
| 1 | Reporter: | Apakah mas Nino akan terus melaksanakan festival film ini? Setelah didemo berhari-hari. | Are you sure you want to keep doing this (gay and lesbian) movie festival? People have been on strike for days now. |
| 2 | Nino: | Aaah, harus! Ini namanya demokrasi. Saya akan tetap lanjut bikin film yang bertemakan LGBT dan buat mereka yang gak suka dan mau demo ya silakan aja! | Ah, I have to! This is what we call democracy. I will keep filming the movies about <i>LGBT</i> themes. If they disagree with my ideas, it's their right. |
| 3 | Reporter: | Tapi Mas Nino sudah melakukan ini sebanyak 7 kali ya, Mas? Tapi kenapa baru didemo sekarang, Mas? | But Mas Nino has been filming an LGBT movie for seven times, Mas? And why did they go on strike now? |
| 4 | Nino: | Ah, that's a good question! Saya masih harus mencari tahu jawabannya, but I think this country may be going to different direction now. Gitu. | <i>Ah, that's a good question!</i> I need to find the answer for that, <i>but I think this country may be going to a different direction now.</i> That's it. |

Indonesian Muslims are a heterogeneous group, with divergent reactions towards lesbian, gay bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) people and issues. In Example 9 we learn that there is a split of opinion among Indonesian Muslims, with conservatives against LGBT people and issues, as demonstrated in turns 1 and 2. Turns 1 and 2 implicitly position LGBT people as foreign and

abnormal. Accordingly, the characters utilize *bahasa gado-gado* to discuss the “non-normative” gender identity. In his response, Nino whose LGBT film festival is the object of protest, uses *bahasa gado-gado* to discuss his prediction that Indonesia is going in a different direction, with more people open to this “non-normative” sexual orientation. Nino’s remark about Indonesian going in a different direction is conveyed in English, suggesting a point of departure from the traditional and hegemonic national identity to a more liberating, accepting attitude towards the “foreign” ideas and “non-normative” values.

In a similar vein, the characters in *Arisan* still employ *bahasa gado-gado* when having an LGBT-themed conversation, as demonstrated by Example 10, where we learn that there is a strike held by a number of FPI members towards Nino’s LGBT film festival. The exchange is a phone conversation in which Andien tells Meimei about the strike. Meimei, who is in Bali, expresses how Jakarta’s social climate change due to the conservatives has frightened her. The underlined phrases in both original and translation mark CJI to draw readers’ attention towards *bahasa gado-gado* (Standard Indonesian, CJI, and English) utilized in the text. While the *Arisan* films do not explicitly state the religious affiliation of Sakti, the homosexual character, most of their audience is Muslim. Because the majority of viewers are also Indonesians, the film’s presentation of *keindonesian* (Indonesianness) and *manusia Indonesia seutuhnya* (“true Indonesianness” or “the Indonesian identity”) is also important to consider. With the position of Indonesian as the key language for homogenized national identity construction, the discussion of gay relationships is mediated by the aid of *bahasa gado-gado*. *Bahasa gado-gado* juxtaposing both English and Indonesian enables the characters to candidly discuss the gay-themed conversation.

Example 10. (*Arisan!* 2)

- | | | | |
|---|---------|---|--|
| 1 | Andien: | Absurd di sini, Mei. Kamu liat kan foto yang aku twit tadi? | It is really <i>absurd</i> here, Mei. Did you see the pictures I just <i>tweeted</i> ? |
|---|---------|---|--|

- | | | | |
|---|---------|---|--|
| 2 | Meimei: | Oya? Polisi pada kemana Ndin? Ih males deh <u>gue</u> pulang ke Jakarta. | Oh, really? How about the police officers? <u>I'm</u> just too hesitant to go back to Jakarta. |
| 3 | Andien: | Eh, ini kan intrik-intrik kecil biasa lagi. <u>Buruan deh</u> kamu pulang. You are the city girl who used to hate the... remember? Come back her soon, deh! | Eh, these are only small intrigues. It's fine. <u>Go home soon</u> . <i>You are a city girl who used to hate</i> (unintelligible), <i>remember? Come back here soon, <u>deh!</u></i> |

Example 10 suggests that for Andien and Meimei, Jakartan natives, the Indonesian government does not do enough to ensure Indonesians' freedom of expression, particularly for anything "non-normative" or deemed un-Indonesian. To fully understand the nuances in Example 10, it is important to understand the government's role in interdicting events deemed "un-Indonesian" from taking place. Many Indonesian Muslims see the government's role as prohibiting "non-normative" activities in public, such as prostitution, LGBT events, and alcohol consumption. Accordingly, they anticipate the government banning LGBT activities but in the film, it is FPI who tries to prevent the LGBT film festival from taking place. In this manner, we learn that some members of Islam Defender Fronts (FPI) take over the government's role in controlling Indonesian gay men in expressing their sexual orientations. While for many viewers, FPI may appear to be the "hero" taking over the government's failed mission, for those who are averse to FPI, this action is indicative of the noticeable absence of a governmental role in securing the radical organization that often threatens diversity and plurality in Indonesia. FPI, a conservative and radical organization, has been notorious in orchestrating raids of any organization or event deemed un-Islamic and, by extension, "un-Indonesian." Because the strikes in the film are executed by FPI it is safe to conclude that religion is the lens that has motivated them. Andien comments about the strike in *bahasa gado-gado* as shown in turns 1 and 3, implying her support towards the LGBT-theme film produced by Nino. Andien and Mei's support toward the LGBT

movement carried out in such an unfavored language use can be taken as an act of transgressing the normative and dominant component of being Indonesian, yet we can also read it as the writer's proposal to resist the pre-given and top-down national identity prescribed by the government.

As we saw in Chapter One, many Indonesians link the growing LGBT movement with the encroachment of Western culture. Indeed, Dinata and many other filmmakers are highly influenced by Western culture (Tatyzo, 2011). Given that the *Arisan!* films would be subject to censorship if the New Order regime were still in reign, their use of both CJI and English appears to celebrate freedom and resist state ideology. In this vein, *bahasa gado-gado* is a way to present sexuality—specifically, homosexuality represented by the cosmopolitan figures—as the product of the intersections of national values and imported ones. Due to the function of Standard Indonesian as a language that is vital for national identity building, Indonesian carries sociocultural values that might be perceived to misalign with conversations about homosexuality. It is perhaps unsurprising, then, that the supposed Otherness or foreignness of homosexuality in these two films is mediated through switching to English.

Unlike the first two examples that illustrate a link between Indonesia's social and political situation and discourses of homosexuality, a link partially indexed by language use, the example to follow shows how the character uses *bahasa gado-gado* to come out as a gay Indonesian in a non-restrictive manner. Example 11 depicts an exchange between Nino and Sakti, who meet for the first time at an upscale café and start to get to know each other. Nino initiates the conversation by having a small chat about where they work out.

Example 11. (*Arisan!*)

- | | | |
|---|--|---|
| 1 | Sakti: Anda kayaknya ikutan fitnes di Grande Bodylife ya? Saya kayak | Do you usually exercise at <i>the Grande Bodylife</i> ? I think we have met before. |
|---|--|---|

- pernah liat Anda.
- 2 Nino: Oya? Saya kok gak pernah liat kamu ya. Oh, really? I don't think so.
- 3 Sakti: Jadi Anda produser film? So, are you a film producer?
- 4 Nino: Hampir layak dibilang begitu. Yeah, you can say that.
- 5 Sakti: Kok gitu? Why?
- 6 Nino: Ya, soalnya film pertama saya flopped. Gagal dari segi bisnis dan dicacimaki kritikus. Yeah, my first movie *flopped*. It did not sell and was heavily criticized by the film critics.
- 7 Sakti: Tentang apa? About what?
- 8 Nino: Tentang seorang laki-laki yang udah berumah tangga. Tapi kemudian dia sadar bahwa dirinya itu gay. About a man who was married, but then he realized that he was *gay*.
- 9 Sakti: Kenapa kok kayanya Anda seriiing membikin film yang bertemakan gay gitu? Why do you like creating a film with a *gay* theme?
- 10 Nino: Karena tema itu yang paling saya kuasai. I'm gay. Because that's the theme that I know best. *I'm gay*.
- [Sakti nods.]
- 11 Nino: Kamu gak ada masalah kan dengan gay? You don't have any problem with *gay*, right?
- 12 Sakti: Gak masalah. Saya orangnya open-minded. I don't have any problem with it. I am *open-minded*.
- 13 Nino: But then, you are not gay? *But then, you are not gay?*
- 14 Sakti: Oh, engga. Sama-sekali engga. No, not at all.

The conversation starts in Indonesian, but there is a noticeable switch to English when Nino refers to a gay man in turn 8. In turn 10, Nino is very direct and straightforward when coming out to Sakti despite having just met him for the first time and, in turn 8, when informing Sakti that he is a film producer whose works depict Indonesian gay men. While the conversation takes place predominantly in Indonesian, he switches to English whenever he mentions being gay, including when he himself comes out to Sakti (turn 10).

Moreover, Nino's question (turn 11) shows us that homosexuality remains a condemned sexual orientation, in that he worries that his coming out will discomfit Sakti. Also, when Nino attempts to find out if Sakti is also a homosexual, he asks him directly, as seen in turn 13. In both uses of *gay*, Nino portrays homosexuality in a positive light.

It is virtually impossible to stay loyal to Standard Indonesian or CJI, when expressing one's homosexuality in a positive or non-prejudiced manner because the Indonesian equivalent of *homosexual* when used in Indonesian refers to a social disease. Thus, Nino's comments about his identity, his interests, and his work, which is related to him being gay, must take place in *bahasa gado-gado*, utilizing both Indonesian and English.

In *Arisan!*, viewers are presented with positive connotation of homosexuality with the constant usage of *gay* in a positive light. As an Indonesian gay, Nino embraces his homosexuality in an open and positive manner, and *bahasa gado-gado* plays an important role in his ability to do so. He portrays homosexuality in a positive lens, by never using *homo*. As evidenced in the text, *homo* indexes stigma; Sakti, at various points in the films before he comes out, refers to *homoseksual* as a disease that needs to be cured. Nino, on the other hand, indexes his pride in his sexual orientation by using *gay*. I read the noticeable absence of the word *homo* in his speech as a step away from the pejorative meaning that surrounds the image of Indonesian gay men. By using the codeswitched term *gay* rather than the pejorative Standard Indonesian word *homo*, Nino discusses his sexual orientation openly and without shame. His coming out makes his homosexuality (and societal homosexuality more generally) open and visible in public discourse and *bahasa gado-gado* has enabled him to do so in an unambiguous manner.

However, for some heterosexuals, the term *gay* and the very idea of homosexuality may still connote Otherness and receive stigma even in Jakarta. Example 12 is an exchange between

Sakti and a member of his staff in their office located in Jakarta. His employee delivers a phone message from Nino to Sakti. The staff member, while utilizing *bahasa gado-gado*, informs Sakti about the phone caller, Nino, whom he identifies as a gay man. The employee reminds Sakti to be careful with the caller because he is gay, and later we learn that the caller is Nino. The staff member's comment indicates implicit discrimination against homosexuality, as we can see in turns 1 and 3. However, the term *gay*, as used here, is less stigmatized than the word *homo*.

Example 12. (*Arisan!*)

- | | | | |
|---|--------|--|---|
| 1 | Staff: | Orangnya asik, tapi elo kudu hati-hati ya! | He is nice, but you needed to be careful! |
| 2 | Sakti: | Kenapa? | Why? |
| 3 | Staff: | Soalnya die <i>gay</i> (/gei:/). | Well, because he is <i>gay</i> (/gei:/). |

When this conversation occurs, Sakti is still in denial about his sexuality and not out to anyone. The comment made by his employee about Nino being “nice, but ... gay” indicates that his employee perceives his being gay and having a pleasant personality as contradictory. His employee's comment stigmatizes Nino's sexual orientation, conveyed through *bahasa gado-gado*, which is demonstrated in turn 3. While the staff uses *gay* instead of the derogatory *homo*, he still passes judgment towards homosexuality. In this light, *bahasa gado-gado* is still an effective outlet when it comes to talk about homosexuality.

Whether negatively or positively, *bahasa gado-gado* has provided a space to converse about “non-normative” sexuality. *Bahasa gado-gado* utilized by Nino in Example 11 and by Sakti's staff member in Example 12 indicates two different attitudes towards Indonesian gay men. In Example 11, Nino uses *bahasa gado-gado* to proudly claim his sexual orientation. On the other hand, Sakti's staff member, also utilizing *bahasa gado-gado*, makes a (mildly) negative remark about an Indonesian gay man. These two examples suggest that *bahasa gado-gado* works differently for Indonesian queer men (and/or their allies), represented by Nino, and normative

Indonesian individuals, represented by the staff member. While presenting a divergent attitude towards homosexuality, in both cases *bahasa gado-gado* effectively allows an open discussion of homosexuality.

The stigma surrounding homosexuality has been apparent in the last two examples. In the next example, it is also shown by Sakti, who is still closeted when the conversation takes place. He treats homosexuality as an abnormal sexual orientation. In Example 13 below, Sakti equates being an Indonesian with heterosexuality during a private consultation session with a psychotherapist.

Example 13. (Arisan!)

- | | | |
|---------------------|--|--|
| 1 Sakti: | Kayanya ini udah ke-tujuh kalinya, saya datang ke sini, Dok. Tapi saya masih belum ngerasain adanya perubahan. Malah kayanya saya makin gak bisa mengontrol diri saya sendiri, contohnya di gym, udah sebulan ini ada laki-laki yang selalu ganggu konsentrasi saya. Bayangin aja Dok, dia itu udah kayak alat pacu jantung buat saya. Setiap kali saya ngeliat dia, target denyut pacu jantung saya di hari itu, udah langsung tercapai gitu. | I'm here for the seventh time, Doc. Yet, I don't feel any changes at all. In fact, I feel like I am getting worse because I cannot control myself anymore. For example, at the gym, it's been a month since I first saw this guy who consistently disturbs my concentration. You can imagine, Doc, my heart skips a beat every time I see him. |
| 2 Psycho therapist: | Apa dia gay juga? | Is he also <i>gay</i> ? |
| 3 Sakti: | Dokter ngomong apa, sih? Siapa peduli dia gay atau engga? Yang penting kan, saya, saya harus normal, Dok, kenapa sih saya ga bisa jadi normal? | What are you talking about, Doc? Who cares whether he is <i>gay</i> or not. The most important thing is, me, I have to be normal, Doc, why can't I be normal? |
| 4 Psycho therapist: | Gay sekarang udah ga dianggap abnormal lagi loh. | <i>Gay</i> now is no longer considered abnormal, you know? |
| 5 Sakti: | Iya, saya inget kok, semua yang Dokter pernah bilang. Tapi kan, saya bayar Dokter kan, untuk buat saya normal. Saya kan pernah | Yeah, I do remember, Doctor, all that you have said. But then, I pay you to make me normal. I have told you once, right, Doctor? My |

- | | | |
|---------------------|--|--|
| | bilang ama Dokter, Papa saya udah meninggal Dok, saya anak satu-satunya, orang Batak lagi, saya kan harus bisa nerusin garis keturunan, Dok. | dad passed away, Doc, I am the only child, not to mention, I am a Bataknese, I have to pass my family name to my next generation, Doc. |
| 6 Psycho therapist: | Siapa yang mengharuskan? | Who asked you to do so? |
| 7 Sakti: | Ya, adat saya donk, Dok. Keluarga saya. Belum lagi kalau mama saya tau, anaknya gay, dia bisa gantung diri. | Yeah, of course my ethnic and family customs, Doc. Not to mention if my mom finds out that her son is <i>gay</i> , she could kill herself. |

The above example demonstrates that Sakti treats himself as an abnormal person because of his sexual orientation, as shown in turn 3. In turns 5 & 7, Sakti highlights his identity as Bataknese, an ethnic group in Indonesia that values sons over daughters due to the patriarchal system. This statement highlights Sakti's affirmation towards his identity as a Bataknese who still wants to uphold his ethnic customs, and by extension, to be an Indonesian. But he is worried that his sexual orientation is a challenge to his Indonesianness. The psychotherapist tries to convince Sakti (and viewers) that it is normal to be gay, as shown in turn 4, which is also conveyed in *bahasa gado-gado*. In this way, the *Arisan!* films give space for characters to fully accept their sexuality, which is partly aided by *bahasa gado-gado*. Also, *bahasa gado-gado* has provided a space for the characters, either homosexuals like Sakti or presumptively heterosexual individuals like the doctor to depict homosexuality as a positive or neutral sexual orientation, as opposed to a negative or "non-normative" one; this depiction is accompanied by the consistent use of *gay* throughout the conversation.

Later, after Sakti has embraced his homosexuality, he uses *bahasa gado-gado* to claim his homosexuality in a celebratory manner. The use of *bahasa gado-gado* to come out is evident in Example 14, a conversation between Sakti and Dr. Joy at Dr. Joy's clinic.

Example 14. (*Arisan!* 2)

- | | | | |
|---|----------|---|---|
| 1 | Dr. Joy: | Ini kulitnya okeee banget untuk orang seusia kamu. Amazing! Tutup matanya yang rapat ya. It's okay sstttt, dikit aja. Sakti masih single? | Your skin is really great for somebody your age. <i>Amazing!</i> Please close your eyes. <i>It's okay</i> sstttt, just a little. Sakti, are you still <i>single</i> ? |
| 2 | Sakti: | He eh. | Yeah. |
| 3 | Dr. Joy: | Umur sudah cukup, kenapa Sakti belum menikah? | You're old enough to get married. Why haven't you got married yet? |
| 4 | Sakti: | I'm gay, dok. | <i>I'm gay, doc.</i> |
| 5 | Dr. Joy: | Oh, I'm sorry, I mean I'm not sorry, but you're so open and honest, it's like you're happy to be gay. | <i>Oh, I'm sorry, I mean I'm not sorry, but you're so open and honest, it's like you're happy to be gay.</i> |

Sakti's statement when coming out is full of pride and delivered in a liberating manner. He comes out proudly and without any hesitation to Dr. Joy, a stranger, in turn 4, and with a noticeable shift from Indonesian in turn 3. The switch from Indonesian to English is initiated by Sakti when he confesses that he is gay. Sakti's coming out in *bahasa gado-gado* earns Dr. Joy's surprise because most Indonesian gay men do not declare their homosexuality in such a celebratory manner. To respond to Sakti's coming out, Dr. Joy responds in English as well. Their exchange demonstrates that one can be an Indonesian, speak Indonesian and English, and be gay—facts that contradict Indonesia's dominant ideologies about both homosexuality and language use. Both Sakti's declaration and Dr. Joy's response are facilitated by *bahasa gado-gado*. Again, *bahasa gado-gado* has sidestepped and circumvented shame and acted as a powerful aid for discussing homosexuality. Moreover, I read the noticeable switching from Indonesian to English when coming out as the creation of new ways of, and an expansion of the meaning of, being Indonesian.

Nevertheless, the exchange in Example 14 suggests that homosexuality is still a stigmatized sexual orientation. Dr. Joy makes a somewhat negative remark about Sakti's

homosexuality in turn 5, although the plot eventually reveals that she is a lesbian. Notably, the (mildly) negative judgments from Sakti's employee (Example 12) and Dr. Joy (Example 14) or even self-awareness from Nino (Example 11) regarding the discourse of homosexuality in his surroundings are expressed in English or *bahasa gado-gado*. Because being gay is an unfavorable sexual orientation for many Indonesians, Sakti's openness in coming out has invited Dr. Joy to pass such a brusque response. There is more than one way to interpret Dr. Joy's comment in turn 5 expressing her apology: It may be that she is sorry that Sakti is gay, implicitly suggesting the negative value of being gay in the heteronormative nation. Or it may be that Dr. Joy manipulates her apology in a playful manner, canceling her first expression of regret, spotlighting Sakti's coming out, which appears unusually open; she may be sorry that she initially assumed he was straight. Nevertheless, her surprise that he would be happy to be gay suggests she sees homosexuality as something negative, or at least recognizes that many Indonesians see it that way.

There is one consistency in the films when discussing homosexuality: the characters switch to English. On the one hand, *bahasa gado-gado* may act as a shelter for Sakti, a gay man whose sexual orientation would be considered un-Indonesian by many Indonesians and the current government. In these two films, the stigma is demonstrated by a political party figure who criticizes Nino for making a film that steps outside of traditional "Indonesian culture" and locally normative morality. In this way, he suggests that homosexuality is not part of "Indonesian culture." On the other hand, Sakti still functions in monolingual Indonesian most of the time, suggesting that he does not reject his Indonesianness. In this light, by using *bahasa gado-gado* when coming out, the gay characters show that they can be gay and Indonesian. There is an

ongoing and fluid relationship between language and identity as language users continuously negotiate their handling of available linguistic resources (Park, 2012).

Furthermore, coming out and using *bahasa gado-gado* are a combination of two culturally unfavored acts. For many viewers who still consider homosexuality as foreign and abnormal, Nino's and Sakti's confessions of homosexuality might be deemed non-Indonesian speech acts, which by extension would make these characters less Indonesian than the heterosexual characters in the films. Indeed, in these two films, Sakti and Nino are atypical. Yet, given that many Indonesians tend to highly regard other Indonesians who are well-traveled, and English-Indonesian bilinguals, the fact that Sakti and Nino are members of the Jakartan elite may mitigate the stigmatized aspects of their identities as Indonesian gay men.

The film's supportive portrayal of homosexuality is reinforced at the end of *Arisan!*, when Sakti is already out to Andien and Meimei. Andien comments on homosexuality by utilizing *bahasa gado-gado*, when she says "Sekarang gue percaya kalau *diamond is not a girl's best friend*, tapi *gay guy is a girl's best friend!*" [So, I believe that *diamond is not a girl's best friend*, but, *gay guy is a girl's best friend!*]. This moment offers another example of characters using *bahasa gado-gado* when discussing homosexuality in a liberating and positive manner.

While homosexuality is still seen as Other in the context of Indonesian speech acts and the dominant culture, gay characters and their friends discuss it openly and positively. While it is easy to dismiss discussions of extramarital sexuality and homosexuality as un-Indonesian, the narratives of these two films suggest, rather, that we should see both as part of Indonesian discourse. Throughout the narratives, Sakti, Andien, Nino, Mei, and the psychologist suggest that homosexuality is normal, contrary to the government and many Indonesians' attitudes and treatment towards it.

Via *bahasa gado-gado*, the characters put homosexuality and Indonesianness side by side and view it positively. While still Other for many, *bahasa gado-gado* has provided a space for gay Indonesians to come out and, in this light, “to decipher, to recognize, and acknowledge themselves as subjects of desire, bringing into play between themselves as a certain relationship that allows them to discover, in desire, the truth of their being” (Foucault, 1985, p. 5). By doing so, the characters offer a new point of view and reconcile their self-conceptions as Indonesians.

The Indonesian government presents true Indonesianness as tied to a heteronormative sexual orientation, living in harmonious, modern, and heterosexual family; therefore, the notion of homosexual Indonesian together with *bahasa gado-gado* represents an affront of this notion. While homosexuality is not fully accepted by many Indonesians, there is an attempt demonstrated by popular writers and filmmakers to present homosexual characters as Indonesians. Both *bahasa gado-gado* and the treatment of homosexuality projects their resistance to dominant understandings of Indonesianness.

As a liberating use of language, *bahasa gado-gado* empowers Nino and Sakit to openly discuss being gay and to come out as gay men. The *bahasa gado-gado* that occurs in addressing homosexuality does not attempt to reconcile Indonesian identity with the use of English as a foreign language; instead this mechanism operates to transgress and disrupt the inflexibility and stiffness of “good and proper” Indonesian. The use of *bahasa gado-gado* here shows us the filmmaker’s resistance to heterosexual norms and offers us an alternative language that affirms homosexuality. *Arisan!*, the first Indonesian film to depict homosexuality in a positive light (Munir, 2007), manages to expand understandings of Indonesianness both through its topic and language choices. Thus, coming out via the help of *bahasa gado-gado* may also be a way to re-

imagine a new Indonesian culture. It is a way to resist hegemonic power, insisting that the hegemony can be tweaked, twisted, and appropriated to meet the national culture.

If the filmmakers and the authors were completely rejecting Indonesianness, they could have made the films entirely in English, with totally Westernized characters, without any cultural, social, and political attachment towards Indonesia and Standard Indonesian. The fact that they did not thus suggests a new lens for viewing themselves and their characters as Indonesians. Both *Arisan!* films portray and project the paradoxes of being an Indonesian: being an Indonesian but speaking *bahasa gado-gado*, discussing sex without shame, and being openly gay, all acts that challenge an essentialized national identity. However, by juxtaposing two distinctive ideologies and sets of values, the characters and filmmaker show that there is more than one way to be an Indonesian. Popular texts suggest that homosexuality *is* Indonesian, and so is *bahasa gado-gado*.

The *Arisan!* films use *bahasa gado-gado* to symbolize a departure from an essentialized view of Indonesian culture. These popular texts use *bahasa gado-gado* to provide a space for bilingual characters to talk about sexuality in a celebratory and open manner and without shame. Correspondingly, the above sections have shed light on how popular texts have expanded our understanding of Indonesianness both through language selection, and topics not normatively associated with being Indonesian. The unruly combination of two different languages produces an untidiness that is in defiance of governmental top-down policies regulating the use of Standard Indonesian in education, mass media, broadcasts, and other domains. Because of educational norms during the New Order era, many members of the generation who grew up in that era perceive “good and proper” Indonesian as appropriate only for formal situations and contexts, such as in the classroom. On the other hand, non-standard dialects of Indonesian are

more commonly used in daily conversation or relaxed situations, where juxtaposition of other languages may receive less correction and surveillance. In this case, there are assumed gaps among “good and proper” Indonesian, the non-standard Indonesian dialect (CJI), and English. For many Indonesians, “good and proper” Indonesian sounds stiff and formal, while other languages, such as CJI and English, sound less formal, and mixing the two does not transgress any norms. English as the main ingredient in this code-switching is strategically used in informal interaction as a substitute for formal Indonesian expressions (Li, 2000).

Conclusion

In this chapter, I have argued that *bahasa gado-gado* transgresses the dominant components of the hegemonic definition of Indonesianness: *Bahasa gado-gado* in popular texts functions as a linguistic resource that is designed to moderate taboo, otherwise pornographic conversations and also to express love.

The use of English as a non-standard language in otherwise Indonesian texts has provided characters the capacity to resist monolithic ideas of “Indonesian culture.” The discourse of “Indonesian culture” and normative acts are linked to the construction of Indonesianness, in which religion is the dominant lens through which Indonesianness is measured. By openly discussing sexuality, the characters show that they can use *bahasa gado-gado* as a device to sidestep normative values, i.e., the state ideology Pancasila, the 1945 Constitution (UUD 1945), the pornography law, and other social-cultural norms (*adat istiadat*). *Bahasa gado-gado* also expands hegemonic constructions of normative Indonesian identity which are mediated by the interpretation of an Islamic shame culture that has been adopted and adapted to Indonesian norms (Bennet, 2005; 2015; Davies, 2015). Thus, in popular texts code-switching with English

acts as neutralization, “a linguistic strategy to unload a linguistic item from its traditional, cultural, and emotional connotations by avoiding its use and choosing an item from another code” (Kachru, 1991, p. 186). The switching from Indonesian to English offers a space for writers to express “non-normative” topics and ideas apart from their specific social and cultural overtones and connotations.

Popular texts also suggest that a speaker’s switch from Indonesian (Standard or CJI) to English conveys a weakening attachment to moral and cultural norms. English as a language of the Other is taken as an index of inauthentic Indonesianness by many Indonesians, as it is often perceived as language of the West (Gunarwan, 1993). On the other hand, the authors and characters clearly *don’t* see it as divorced from Indonesian identity. While it would be easy for traditionalists to dismiss these popular texts as advocating the Westernization of Indonesian culture, I read the characters and narrators of the texts rather as preserving their Indonesianness via linguistic and other semiotic resources while they also show an expansive understanding of Indonesian identities. They are presenting *new* ways of being Indonesian: ways of being that allow for traditional values, in which regional language plays a role, as well as the embrace of local, national, foreign, and international matters where English and Indonesian both play a role. In this light, codeswitching gives Indonesians a method of rejecting a homogenized national identity, where English may be seen a useful linguistic resource rather than a deviant one. Accordingly, via *bahasa gado-gado* practice, there is a sense that Indonesian and English represent two different sets of symbolic values derived from stereotypes of the Indonesian culture and the Western culture respectively. On the one hand, the Indonesian language seems to symbolize the traditional, local culture and moral standards. On the other hand, English, in

contrast, is a tool that can carry the freedom of expressing personal desires and critical attitudes toward mainstream beliefs.

Using Indonesian as the dominant language for creative expression juxtaposed with English to discuss certain themes creates an interesting dynamic in the literary works. The examples I have presented of *bahasa gado-gado* show how language practice mediates the construction of gender, sexuality, and identity issues, suggesting that switching into English is not merely to perform some exhibitionism, as some scholars have claimed (e.g., Buchori, 1994; Muslich, 2010; Rosidi, 2010), to perform broken English (Lie, 2007), or to display an inferiority complex (e.g., Buchori, 1994; Muslich, 2012; Rosidi, 2010). As well, popular texts demonstrate a strategic rejection of the view that Western culture is inherently negative. *Bahasa gado-gado* can function to resist, redefine, renegotiate, and challenge the national identity imposed by the state ideology. For sexuality and love, English provides a linguistic resource that enables freer and more positive discussions of taboo and controversial matters.

CHAPTER FIVE

BAHASA GADO-GADO: LANGUAGE SELECTION AND HYBRID IDENTITIES

The aim of this chapter is to unpack the relationship between language selection and the decentering and destabilizing of Indonesian's position as the only appropriate language for unity among Indonesians. First, I show how bilingual characters manipulate *bahasa gado-gado* to construct, reinforce, and articulate their characters' linguistic prowess to reconstruct a modern and cosmopolitan Indonesian. *Bahasa gado-gado* constructs a sense of modernness and simultaneously challenges restrictions on an Indonesian identity imposed for more than three decades by the conservative government. Second, *bahasa gado-gado* conveys a hybrid identity via the attachments of two worlds and via the ownership of English mechanism. In this light, speakers celebrate their linguistic freedom via *bahasa gado-gado*, highlighting their ownership of English, a language that (re)circulates globally and has become (re)contextualized at the local level (Widdowson, 1994; Norton, 1997).

Identity

Identity is a large part of my analysis of *bahasa gado-gado* as a mechanism used to contest, re-construct, and expand dominant constructions of Indonesianness, as mandated either explicitly or implicitly by the law, the 1945 Constitution, Pancasila, GBHN, and other elements of government propaganda. I see identity as not only a social construct but also a space where individuals can exercise who they are in relation to the world (Pierce-Norton, 1992; Bucholtz and Hall, 2004). Identity can be interpreted within the context it is formed: that is, among social, political, and economic relations.

Since language is used not only to communicate but also to mark group identity (Wright, 2004), language choice in popular texts can challenge the dominant understanding of Indonesian group identities. While language is not the only means of identity construction, it is the most pervasive and robust, significant at both individual and societal levels (Mahootian, 2012). The connections between language and identity are complex and take many forms, as language works as a signifier for personal, community, and even national identities. Identity manifests in many kinds of linguistic evidence, such as ordinary conversation, life stories, narratives, interviews, humor, and other verbal arts (Bucholtz & Hal, 2004). Language selection thus is a means to assert one's identity (Rampton, 2005).

Given these complex connections between identity and language, *bahasa gado-gado* in written texts can construct certain identities that project, promote, or implicitly communicate information about the speaker (Mahootian, 2005, 2012; Sebba & Wotton, 1998). Bilinguals employ *bahasa gado-gado* for multifarious reasons, for example, to index their social status (Myer-Scotton, 1993), flaunt their modern symbols (Haarmann, 1989; Martin, 2001), exhibit a "multilingual fetish" (Kelley-Holmes, 2005), or create an in-group or secret language (Gumperz, 1982). A language may carry symbolic power that encourages language users to perceive one language as superior to others. The literature analyzing code-switching in written texts positions English as the main ingredient in the mix. Building on these studies, I argue that code-switching into English may be used to expand the meaning of collective and national identities by posing a threat towards Indonesian as the language significant for the construction of a homogenous national identity and the language in the mainstream Indonesian popular texts. In other words, *bahasa gado-gado* destabilizes Standard Indonesian from its dominant position as the only desirable language in Indonesian discourse. It does so in two ways: by contributing to Indonesian

understanding of modernness, and by constructing hybrid identities. It thus challenges a monolithic definition of national identity.

In all the texts that I analyzed, English-Indonesian *bahasa gado-gado* plays an essential role in constructing the sense of modernness and hybrid identity. Characters constantly use English in the mix of *bahasa gado-gado*, portraying their affinity for both the East and the West, the hybrid identity. I offer a textual analysis of thirteen representative excerpts. Two of these excerpts show the construction of a sense of modernness, and twelve excerpts demonstrate the characters' hybrid identities. In my analysis of how *bahasa gado-gado* projects hybrid identities, I give seven examples of how characters show affinity for the two worlds, and five examples of how they claim ownership of English. My final example demonstrates how *bahasa gado-gado* marginalizes the monolingual, presumably older generation, readership, and simultaneously decenters Indonesian.

Modernness

Multilingualism provides resources for the characters of popular texts. Such texts construct Indonesian modernness using both linguistic and non-linguistic resources. The linguistic resources include Colloquial Jakartan Indonesian (CJI) and English—for example, the names of American foods or the name of the restaurants. Popular texts build the sense of cosmopolitanism using both linguistic and non-linguistic resources. Non-linguistic resources include things like foreign-imported luxury cars, luxurious gatherings, art gallery attendance, branded fashion items, the lifestyles of young executives, and overseas education, particularly in United States universities. Location can also serve as a non-linguistic resource that symbolizes modernness. The *Ms. B series* and the *Arisan!* films are set in Jakarta; *9 Summers*, *10 Autumns* is

set in New York, but frequently references Jakarta. In both the *Ms. B series* and *9 Summers, 10 Autumns*, Jakarta and New York are metropolises symbolizing dreams, and, most importantly, modernness. Alongside the non-linguistic aspects, the sense of modernness in contemporary Indonesia is built upon and presented in the juxtaposition of two languages, in which English plays a significant role.

I build on William Liddle's definition of being a modern Indonesian: "the aspiration for material prosperity and an urban life style: a Western-type, white collar job, and an income level sufficient to purchase the manufactured goods produced by an industrializing economy" (Liddle 1988, p. 7). In this regard, I adopt an understanding of modernness as being superior, "international, progressive, futuristic, and fun-loving"—characteristics that English indexes (Lee, 2006, p. 63). While all of these traits are not necessarily present at the same time, the combination of two or more should suffice to fulfil the sense of modernness (Lee, 2006). For this study, I use the term "modernness" to capture how the Indonesian characters appropriate the sense of modernity into their hybrid identity.

Many young Indonesians equate modernness with being fashionable and up-to-date, and imbue English with these characteristics. For example, Ms. B discusses how using a Western or American word (in this case, a name) connotes a modern, "cool" identity: "Nama sebenarnya Ahmad. Terus supaya keren, dia selalu mengenalkan dirinya sebagai Mat. Lama-lama temannya memanggilnya gaya bule, Matt. Jadilah dia bernama keren" (PAB, 86). [His real name is Ahmad. But to make it cool, he always introduces himself as Mat. After a while his friends call him like *bule* [a Caucasian], Matt. So now he has a cool name.] Here, modernness is constructed through foreign culture, an American name, Westernization, English, and other cosmopolitan semiotic resources. In a similar way, Fifin associates American English with being cool and modern, and

ascribes a “hillbilly” connotation to Sundanese, a regional language (PAB, 35). Ms. B’s driver describes his wife as more knowledgeable, modern, and smart than he, due to her bilingual English and Mandarin skills (p.48). People need access to resources to project a modern identity, and among the most important resources are status-bearing language(s). English is a symbol of modernization, a key to constructing a cosmopolitan cache and thereby gaining cultural and social success (Kachru, 1990).

Being bilingual is one way to showcase one’s modernness and cosmopolitanism. Characters in popular texts construct modernness and cosmopolitanism by relying partly on language selection. *Bahasa gado-gado* is as a device for portraying oneself as educated, elite, and urbane. The characters use code-switching, manipulating the way they say things, as a way of indexing group membership and constructing social identity (Heller, 1982). Code-switching into English signifies American lifestyles, cross-cultural values, and modernness. For example, in the following excerpt Ms. B uses *bahasa gado-gado* to articulate her self-identity in opposition to mainstream values and the imposition of a restrictive national identity.

Example 1. (PAB, 27)

Dua hari lagi aku diundang wawancara kedua dengan majalah <i>Bold</i>, majalah mode Amerika yang akan terbit dalam edisi Bahasa Indonesia. Jabatanku nanti adalah <i>managing editor</i>, sebuah jabatan yang lumayan bergengsi di majalah karena mengurus jalannya penerbitan majalah itu.	In two days, I will have the second interview with <i>Bold</i>, a fashion magazine from America that will publish an Indonesian edition. I’ll be a <i>managing editor</i>, a prestigious position in a magazine because I’ll be responsible for the publishing process.
--	--

In this example, Ms. B is anticipating her interview for a job at the Indonesian franchise of an American magazine, a position requiring English fluency. Incorporating the English term *managing editor* into Ms. B’s narration and then immediately following it with an Indonesian-language explanation that the position is “prestigious” links English with prestige. The

Indonesian equivalent for “managing editor,” *redaktur pelaksana*, is available but not used, emphasizing the symbolic function of the term. Likewise, working at an American magazine, appropriately named *Bold*, rather than an Indonesian one, also conveys prestige, even if the magazine is based in Indonesia. The magazine’s English title increases its prestige. The *bahasa gado-gado* found in this excerpt reinforces English’s positive connotations, rather than its Otherness. By associating *bahasa gado-gado* with prestige, the novel balances out the tensions between modernness as a positive entity and its potentially negative Other-ness.

Code-switching into English also serves as a platform for displaying or constructing one’s modernness. Switching to English in otherwise Indonesian discourse conveys the speaker’s trendiness, luxury, modernity, and prestige, as we see in this example from “Madre.”

Example 2. (Madre, 26-27)

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>1 “Sekarang kami sudah ganti konsep, Pak. Yang di Bogor masih ada, tapi fokus kami sekarang di Jakarta. Kami sudah buka <i>outlet</i> di lima mal. Cabang keenam segera menyusul,” Mei menjelaskan dengan bangga. “Sekarang saya yang <i>in-charge</i> gantikan Papi.”</p> <p>2 Lalu dengan sigap Mei mengeluarkan dua kartu nama untukku dan Pak Hadi. Tertera namanya: Meilan Tanuwidjaja. Di atas namanya ada sebuah logo bertuliskan: “<i>Fairy Bread</i>.”</p> <p>3 “Oh sudah ganti nama toh. Dulu bukannya <i>Bogor Bakery</i>?” Kata Pak Hadi.</p> <p>4 “<u>Kalau masuk ke pasaran Jakarta kurang komersial Pak,</u>” Mei tertawa kecil.</p> <p>5 “Lha jauh-jauh kemari cari roti kenapa toh?”</p> <p>6 “Kami mau coba bikin produk roti klasik Pak. <u>Pangsa pasarnya ekspatriat dan konsumen <i>high-end</i>.</u> Beberapa hotel juga sudah ada yang tertarik kerja sama. Tapi saya pengen cari <i>starter-dough</i> yang</p> | <p>“Now, we have changed our concept, Sir. The one in Bogor is still open, yet our focus now is the store in Jakarta. We have opened five <i>outlets</i>. The sixth is coming soon,” Mei explains proudly. “Now we are <i>in charge</i> because Daddy no longer is.”</p> <p>Mei hands me and Pak Hadi her business cards. I read her name: Meilan Tanuwidjaja. On top of the card, there is a logo named: “<i>Fairy Bread</i>.”</p> <p>“The name is changed. <i>It was Bogor Bakery, right?</i>” asks Pak Hadi.</p> <p>“<u>It doesn’t sound commercial enough to compete in the market of Jakarta,</u>” Mei laughs.</p> <p>“So, why do you try to find our bread?”</p> <p>“We are trying to make some classical bread. <u>The market is coming from the expatriates and the <i>high-end</i> costumers.</u> A number of hotels have shown their interests as well and wanted to work</p> |
|--|---|

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>sudah tua karena rasanya memang berbeda.”</p> <p>7 Aku tidak yakin Pak Hadi memahami seratus persen yang dibilang Mei, tapi ia tampak mengangguk-angguk mafhum.</p> | <p>with us. But we are looking for the old and classic <i>started dough</i> because they taste differently.”</p> <p>I’m not sure if Pak Hadi fully understands what Mei is trying to say, yet he seems to nod to show he does.</p> |
|---|--|

In paragraph 1, the change from a traditional bakery to a modern one is indexed by Mei’s use of the English word *outlet*, instead of the Indonesian term *toko roti*, which describes a more traditional store. *Outlet* connotes modernness, not only because of its meaning but also because it is an English word. This change of status is also demonstrated by the change of the person in charge from Mei’s father, an older person and thus more associated with tradition and the past, to Mei herself, an urban, modern, and internationally oriented woman. These characteristics surface when she explains to Pak Hadi that she is now she is now taking over her father’s bakery and moving it from its old, rural location to Jakarta, the big capital city. When Mei explains that she has taken control of her family business, she switches from Indonesian to the English phrase *in charge*. In the same way, changing the name from “*Bogor Bakery*” to “*Fairy Bakery*” signifies a shift from a more traditional to a more modern store. “*Bogor Bakery*” is already an English name yet to Mei’s mind is not yet to capture the cosmopolitan sachet that has encouraged her to change it into another English one. The new English name connotes a modern, urban, and sophisticated store that Mei argues will attract modern, urban, high-end, and expatriate customers, and Indonesian is absent.

Mei’s *bahasa gado-gado* not only illustrates the linguistic change occurring in Indonesia, where many business now are using English names, but also the socio-cultural shift happening in Jakarta, the capital city of Indonesia (cf. Higgins 2009 and Blommaert 2005 on a similar phenomenon in Tanzania). When Mei argues that a store named *Bogor Bakery* cannot compete in the Jakarta market, but that a store named *Fairy Breads* can, she demonstrates her

understanding of the sociolinguistic (and socioeconomic) distance between Indonesian and English. She believes English grants an impression of modernness in line with a cosmopolitan identity that attracts young professionals, modern families, and expatriate customers, but that Indonesian sounds too traditional and less commercial (regional languages do not even register). Mei's codeswitching thus amplifies her privileged status as the manager of her own company, and the modernness and sophistication of the newly envisioned bakery. English switching contributes to her identity construction as a modern and sophisticated businesswoman who knows how to succeed professionally.

Bahasa gado-gado reveals a bigger societal phenomenon: a new understanding of modern identity is also indexed by a linguistic shift. The two examples above show that Indonesian is not the only language that constructs a sense of the modern, as James Sneddon claims (2003). Popular texts have demonstrated that *bahasa gado-gado* with English as a significant relevance has destabilized Indonesian as the language that constructs the sense of the modern, particularly for the younger generations.

Hybrid identities

Popular texts also reveal that *bahasa gado-gado* is being used to resist a restrictive national identity, and that it is possible to embrace aspects of Western culture while still maintaining Indonesianness. Here, I draw on Homi Bhabha's (2004) definition of the third culture: hybrid identity is a melange projecting a third space in which the new self, which is the result of global influences, meets the old self, which is locally ingrained.

There are two ways in which the characters in the *Ms. B series* and *9 Summers, 10 Autumns* claim their hybrid identity: they show their attachment to both worlds, and they use

hybrid language. Ms. B and Iwan view Western culture in a positive light, but continue to speak Indonesian and demonstrate their affiliation with Indonesia. In this manner, broadened constructions of Indonesian identity are enacted not only through culture acculturation or assimilation but also through language selection. Popular writers from the New Order-era generation resist and reject hegemonic definitions of Indonesianness via *bahasa gado-gado* that expresses affiliation with the United States in addition to Indonesia.

Below I present ten Examples: seven examples to show affinities between two worlds (Examples 3-9), and five examples to demonstrate the ownership of English (Examples 10-14).

Affinities between two-worlds

Throughout the texts, *bahasa gado-gado* is often used to show cross-cultural knowledge and understanding, demonstrating the characters' two-world affinities. In Example 3, an excerpt from a scene in which Ms. B interviews for a job at a magazine, English switches indicate her affiliation with the United States.

Example 3. (PAB, 5)

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>1 Beauty, teman-teman buleku ada yang memanggil B, seperti melafalkan huruf b dalam bahasa Inggris. Aku menyukainya. Teman-temanku memanggilku B.</p> <p>2 B?</p> <p>3 Yes.</p> <p>4 Ok. Ms. B.</p> <p>5 (Orang Amerika sering menggunakan panggilan Ms. untuk menetralkan situasi jika mereka tidak tahu orang yang dituju atau diajak berbicara masih <i>single</i> (Miss) atau sudah menikah menikah (Misses). Bisa juga ditulis di depan nama orang saat menulis surat jika tidak tahu apakah yang dituju perempuan atau pria karena dari namanya susah ditebak. Karena itu</p> | <p>Beauty, my American friends usually call me, like the way they pronounced the letter B in English. I like it. My friends call me B.</p> <p>B?</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Okay. Ms. B.</p> <p>(Americans often address someone with Ms if they are not sure if the person is <i>single</i> (Miss) or married (Misses). They usually use either term as salutation in writing if they cannot predict the gender of the recipients as it is hard to tell from their name only. Thus, they will just use Ms.or Miss may be an acronym of M(iss+Mr)s]).</p> |
|--|---|

Ms. bisa pula singkatan dari
M(iss+Mr)s].

The narrator's *bahasa gado-gado* is necessary to convey the cultural or cross-cultural information related to Ms. B's name. Elsewhere in the text, the narrator points out that even in Ms. B's very name, staying faithful to pure Indonesian is impossible: "Beauty Ayu" juxtaposes the English and Javanese words for *beautiful* (PAB, 1). Ms. B explains that not only was she given an English name by her parents but that she also self-identifies in a Western way by adopting "Ms." as a term of address. Ms. B celebrates her identity as an Americanized Javanese Indonesian. Her reference to her "American friends" also signals her status as someone who has spent enough time in the United States to acculturate and make friends there.

Moreover, Ms. B highlights her knowledge of the United States by positioning herself as the knowledgeable narrator who explains English terms and American cultural practices to her readers. The only notable typographical switch in Example 3 is the term *single*, which is italicized, as opposed to *(Miss)*, *(Misses)*, and *M(iss+Mr)s*, which are not typographically distinguished. Throughout the rest of the series, code-switching from Standard Indonesian to English is italicized; this normally appears in dialogue and narration related to Ms. B's daily life. The difference here is that English is used to deliver cross-cultural knowledge. By displaying her "American" knowledge, she projects her bilingualism as a positive quality and implicitly constructs monolingual Indonesians as deficient in understanding.

While the parenthetical passage in Example 3 delivers cross-cultural knowledge, Example 4 illustrates the need to code-switch to name products that are culturally-specific to the United States.

Example 4. (PAB, 12)

1 "Sudah makan belum Mbak B?" Tanya "Did you eat yet?" asked the maid.

- Mbok Nah.
- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>2 Aku mengangguk. Wuih, entah kapan terakhir aku makan sarapan seperti ini. Di Amerika, sarapan paling-paling, <i>corn flakes</i> dengan susu, atau roti bakar, <i>pancake</i>, telur, <i>bacon</i> atau sosis untuk daging.</p> <p>3 Tetapi tidak pernah ada nasi goreng, mie goreng, atau bubur ayam dan cuci mulut dengan pisang goreng. Kenyang!</p> | <p>I nodded. Wow, I didn't remember the last time I had this kind of breakfast. In the States, I normally had <i>cornflakes</i> with milk, or toast, <i>pancake</i>, eggs, <i>bacon</i> or meat sausage.</p> <p>But there was not any fried rice, fried noodle, or chicken porridge, let alone some fried banana for the dessert. So full!</p> |
|---|--|

Ms. B uses English phrases to describe her American-style breakfast, using the English words for those food items not available in Indonesia. Her newly altered tastes are best expressed in this new tongue, i.e. through *bahasa gado-gado*, here a necessity because Indonesian translations would not have delivered the same meaning. Ms. B's return to her homeland does not cause her to abandon her newly adopted Westernized lifestyle and speech acts; instead, it results in the fusion of local and global views, dialogues, and languages.

Ms. B manipulates *bahasa gado-gado* in both the literal and symbolic dimensions. The passage illustrates her need to symbolically re-shift her American taste to her old Indonesian taste upon physically coming back to her hometown, Jakarta. It is fitting that this relationship to language is demonstrated through a description of food: her tongue has changed both in terms of the languages she speaks and the food she enjoys. However, in paragraph 3, she reverts to Indonesian to describe the Indonesian-style breakfast she used to eat, which I also read as a symbolic return from the new (but now old) to her former (but now renewed) tongue. The notion of old and new tongue and lifestyle occurs at a very fluid and dynamic intersection, indicating that a monocultural identity cannot apply to Ms. B. She embraces her cosmopolitan identity, which is described by *bahasa gado-gado*.

Moreover, in her *bahasa gado-gado*, Ms. B appears to strategically choose the word “bacon” instead of “pork.” She translates “bacon” as “meat for sausage,” *sosis untuk daging*, in the original text, concealing the fact that bacon is a pork product. Her strategic translation both conceals the offense towards her Muslim readers, and also shows her liberal and progressive Islamic views. These views may correlate with her immersion in American culture that has resulted in-between-ness. She simultaneously projects herself as being a more progressive person, and as becoming a less authentic Indonesian Muslim. The projection is partially enabled by *bahasa gado-gado*.

Iwan also is attached to two worlds, and his *bahasa gado-gado* is necessary to portray some aspects of his experience in New York. Iwan speaks in *bahasa gado-gado* when describing the seasons in the United States, using English terms instead of Indonesian ones.

Example 5. (9S, 10A, 15, as translated by Maggie Tiojakin)

“*It’s a beautiful day! Spring* akhirnya datang juga. *Do you know that spring is my favourite season*” bisikku sambil menatap matanya yang sejuk. “*Spring symbolizes a hope, a new beginning.* Meninggalkan melankoli musim dingin, salju, dan malam yang panjang,” lanjutku.

“*It’s a beautiful day! Spring* eventually comes. *Do you know that spring is my favourite season?*” I said to myself while feeling the calm weather. “*Spring symbolizes a hope, a new beginning.* It leaves the melancholy of winter, snow, and the long night,” I added.

Example 6. (9S, 10A, 155, as translated by Maggie Tiojakin)

Autumn.
What is this in a word? *Gorgeous.* No, it’s not. *It’s beyond gorgeous.* Pikirku melayang di tengah daun kering yang sedang berjatuhan. Sebelumnya, hanya dari buku atau film, aku membayangkan *autumn* atau yang sering disebut dengan *fall* itu.

Autumn.
What is this in a word? *Gorgeous.* No, it’s not. *It’s beyond gorgeous.* I was thinking of the fall foliage. Before this, I could only imagine how *autumn* or *fall* would be like either from the book or the movie.

Readers who have never visited a four-season country may not fully understand the excitement expressed in these passages. Indonesia only has two seasons (dry and rainy). Iwan wholeheartedly embraces Spring and Autumn, seasons non-existent in Indonesia, when he experiences them in America. Translating these words into their Indonesian equivalents, *Musim Semi* and *Musim Gugur*, would conjure up different connotations and not convey the same pragmatic meaning. Code-switching to English is an attempt to describe—and elicit—an emotional response to these concepts. English appears in the otherwise-Indonesian novel because it best carries the weight of the character's American experience. *Bahasa gado-gado* is an avenue for Iwan to add American flavor to his narrative, and a way to accurately describe the experiences he had while in the States. The character, as a bilingual, can voice his own stories using his own languages, reflecting his two-world attachments and linguistic resources. His life experiences cannot be described with only one language. *Bahasa gado-gado* thus decenters Indonesian, once the official main language in mainstream popular texts. When the characters switch to English to preserve their experiences, this poses a threat to Indonesian, the language whose authenticity is prescribed by the government.

Bahasa gado-gado also functions to challenge, expand, and redefine the meaning of home. Ms. B and Iwan exhibit attachment to two worlds: Indonesia, the place where they were born and raised, and the United States, their adopted country for several years. The following examples (7-8) show a significant difference in how Ms. B and Iwan portray Indonesia. Ms. B, while claiming her hybrid identity, still shows some ill-attachment towards Jakarta and Indonesia. In contrast, Iwan renegotiates the meaning of home while portraying both his old hometown and his new town in an equally affirmative manner.

Example 7. (PAB, 11)

“Sssst, tapi Beauty, segawat-gawatnya di dalam pesawat, di luar sana, di Jakarta, lebih gawat,” kata Fenti menakut-nakuti.

Apa? Copet, perampok, bom, orang dibunuh, dan segala bencana? Gitu? Gitu? Habis bagaimana? *Welcome (back) to Jakarta*, B.

“Sssstt, but Beauty, though it’s dangerous to be on the flight, Jakarta is much more threatening,” Fenti tried to scare me.

What? Pickpocket? Robber? Bombs? A murder? And other accidents and disasters? That’s it? That’s all? So what? *Welcome (back) to Jakarta*, B.

In Example 7, Ms. B is speaking with Fenti, a stranger who she has met on her flight back to Jakarta. Like Ms. B, Fenti has lived in both Jakarta and the United States, and has become attached to his adopted country. However, the two characters have different reactions to Jakarta. Fenti expresses cynicism about Jakarta’s crime levels, whereas Ms. B chooses to accept the city, albeit in a wry manner, and welcomes herself back home. Her *bahasa gado-gado* has a facetious tone, capturing Ms. B’s conflicted feelings about Jakarta after living in the United States, which she perceives as more organized, developed, and safer. Her *bahasa gado-gado* indicates her acceptance of Jakarta, for better or for worse, and her simultaneous attachment to the United States. The text presents no contradiction between her return to Indonesia and her use of English. Yet her assessment of Indonesian modernness and cosmopolitanism is complicated by Ms B’s unsettled feelings about her homeland. The discourse preceding “*Welcome (back) to Jakarta*, B” focuses on how difficult and frustrating she expects life to be in Jakarta. Anticipating reverse culture shock, Ms. B feels frustrated and scared to go back to her own hometown, and her flightmate worsens her paranoia. *Welcome (back) to Jakarta* is her own internal speech; it communicates her fear and worry to the readers. Because Ms. B is an Indonesian, her criticism of Jakarta may be an insider critique; however, in light of her five-year physical absence from her homeland, her words may also be understood as mocking life in Jakarta and thus constructing her own superiority.

In a similar manner, Ms. B uses *bahasa gado-gado* to define her attachment to the two worlds. In Example 8, she speaks Indonesian while reassuring herself and fighting reverse-culture shock, and switches to English when she claims Jakarta as her (renewed) home.

Example 8. (PAB, 15)

Aku mengangguk-angguk. Sejelek apa pun keadaan negeriku atau keadaan rumahku aku berusaha ingat kata mutiara klasik itu: “*There is no place like home. Home, where the heart is. Home sweet home ...*”

I nod. No matter how bad my country is or how bad my home is, I always try to remember those classic proverbs: “*There is no place like home. Home, where the heart is. Home sweet home ...*”

In this excerpt, Ms. B makes an effort to re-adapt to life in Jakarta after a few years living in the United States. She acknowledges her resistance to Jakarta, but she still calls it home. She muses on her mixed feelings about Indonesia, a country that often treats its citizens unfairly.

Throughout the series, Ms. B frequently compares the United States and Indonesia, particularly Jakarta, and her private reflections reveal her awareness of Indonesia’s shortcomings. She tries to console herself by remembering classic proverbs. Ironically, these proverbs are in English; and she does not translate into Indonesian. Paradoxically, however, this code-switching into English indexes Ms. B’s affinity for her country, signalling her acceptance of, love for, and re-adaptation to Jakarta and to Indonesia.

For some Indonesian readers, Ms. B’s strong attachment to foreign culture and values may represent a threat to Indonesianness. Both Examples 7 and 8 show her two-world attachment, and portray Indonesia in a rather negative light. In other parts of the series, this negative attitude is displayed by her mother, who believes “American culture” is interfering with Ms. B’s Javanese-ness and Indonesianness (PAB, 49). When Ms. B returns to Jakarta from the United States, her mother constantly reminds her that she is the Javanese child of her mother, and

that she is an Indonesian. Her mother tells her not to adopt American ways of life or an American identity that may disrupt her Indonesianness (PAB, 49). She does not approve of Ms. B's affiliation with various aspects of American culture, such as living independently so that her parents cannot monitor her private life, because she sees the intrusion of Western cultural elements as irrelevant and subverting her daughter's Indonesianness (Blackburn, 2004; Bennet, 2005). Ms. B finds her mother's attempt to dictate her identity exasperating, but she does make an effort to maintain her Javanese-ness and Indonesianness, and expresses admiration for Javanese values, by proudly claiming that she is the daughter of her mother and is a Javanese, throughout the series, *Ms. B: Panggil Aku, B*, and *Ms. B: Jangan Mati*. However, as we saw earlier, Ms. B also criticizes her fellow Indonesians, negatively comparing "Indonesian habits" with her newly adopted American ones. She presents English positively, and sees the fusion of Indonesian and English as a manifestation of modernness, luxury, and prestige. Basuki clearly undermines Ms. B's mother's perspective by positively describing the lifestyle that Ms. B has adopted while living in the States.

Via *bahasa gado-gado*, the author paints Ms. B as a character with hybrid identity—still maintaining her Indonesianness yet embracing various aspects of American culture. Thus, the text presents a much broader perspective than the dominant view of Indonesianness. Through this hybrid character, the text challenges the monolithic view of national identity prescribed by the government's top-down policy. With the help of *bahasa gado-gado*, the writer re-negotiates and expands the meaning of Indonesian culture, presenting it not as a fixed and homogenous entity but rather as a dynamic one, rejecting the notion of culture as "a set of discreet, homogenous, and fairly static ethnic essences" (Rampton, 2005, p. 22).

In a similar fashion, *9 Summers, 10 Autumns* also renegotiates concepts of Indonesianness by utilizing *bahasa gado-gado*. The text reconciles the traditional, narrow definition of home with Iwan's new, extended one. Unlike the United States, which recognizes (but discourages) dual citizenship, Indonesia does not allow it—in-between-ness is not recognized—but Iwan constantly attempts to expand the meaning of *home* by using the term to refer to both Batu, Malang, Indonesia and New York. Example 9 shows this expanded definition of home. Unlike Ms. B, however, Iwan portrays Indonesia in a neutral or positive light.

Example 9. (9S, 10A, 204)

Dari Puncak Rinjani, selepas kepergiannya, sejenak aku melihat *Empire State Building, Metropolitan Museum of Art, SoHo, Brooklyn Heights, 770 Broadway, 111 Sullivan Street* atau *Jivamukti Yoga School* begitu jelas, begitu dekat. Aku seperti tidak meninggalkan mereka. Sementara aku juga melihat jelas Gang Buntu, Gunung Arjuno, Gunung Panderman. Rumah besar tetanggaku atau toko kecil di depan gedung.

From Puncak Rinjani, after coming back home, I felt like I could see (the) *Empire State Building, Metropolitan Museum of Art, SoHo, Brooklyn Heights, 770 Broadway, 111 Sullivan Street* or *Jivamukti Yoga School* in my fantasy. (They were) so real, so close. I feel like I do not leave them. At the same time, I can see Gang Buntu clearly, Arjuno Mountain, Panderman mountain. The big house of my neighbour or a small shop in front of a building [in Malang].

In this example, the narrator switches back and forth between Indonesian and English, juxtaposing his new identity as an executive in a multi-national company with his old self, a poor child from a remote area. Iwan uses English place names to discuss his life in New York, but places his hometown side by side with New York City. He shuttles between Indonesian and English as he recalls the spaces in Malang and famous landmarks in New York, his new home. He constructs his cosmopolitanism by juxtaposing the two languages and the two places that function as his two homes geographically and linguistically; metaphorically, he is “at home” in both languages as well as in both places.

Coming home does not make Ms. B or Iwan abandon their newly adopted lifestyles, but rather allows them to become more cosmopolitan, incorporating aspects of both Western and Indonesian cultures. Hybrid identity is no longer perceived as a fear or a threat: it is a resource. In this context, English (along with the culture(s) of its speakers) is “a terrain that enables struggles over ownership, resources, and legitimacy to become visible” (Percio & Duchêne, 2012, p. 44). Popular texts treat multilingualism as additive and present it in a positive light. This challenges the linguistic monopoly of Standard Indonesian, which in turn challenges the notion of a fixed national identity. Indeed, the juxtaposition of languages in these texts points to an *expansion* of identities.

The Ownership of English

Bahasa gado-gado functions as an outlet to show hybrid identities and also works to claim linguistic belonging. In the discussion to follow, *bahasa gado-gado* helps its users construct identities as bilinguals and claim ownership of English. Characters in popular texts demonstrate their bilingual identities via two avenues. First, they claim ownership of English by adopting and adapting English into the Indonesian tongue, creating a discourse that integrates both local and global flavors. Second, by speaking an English-Indonesian hybrid, they challenge the notion that English is a wholly *foreign* language. This discourse is particularly evident in *Arisan!* and *Arisan! 2*, manifesting prominently in three grammatical features: the absence of an article prior to the noun (Example 10), the reduplication of the noun/adjective (Examples 11-12), and the prefixes *nge-/di-* (Examples 13-14).

Drawing on the World Englishes model, I argue that the characters claim the right of *bahasa gado-gado*, as part of World Englishes: that is, these words may sound phonologically

English, but their meaning is only understood by English-Indonesian bilinguals or those who have some knowledge of both languages. In other words, these variants take hybrid forms and require bilingual skills, Indonesian and English, to understand them. In creating the Indonesian-English variants, the characters localize English terms by imbuing them with an Indonesian flavor—the characters are not just using foreign English words but rather “claiming the ownership of English” as an Indonesian-English variant (Widdowson, 1994; Norton, 1997).

The *bahasa gado-gado* in *Arisan!* and *Arisan! 2* demonstrates that English is no longer exclusively reserved for global linguistic purposes, but that it also functions as a local identity marker. The adoption of English into Indonesian grammatical features forms a new variant. This grammatical adaptation reflects a broad linguistic adoption of both languages and shows how the characters negotiate two worlds carrying different values, here meeting in the middle.

Zero articles

There has been significant research into South Asian English variants of the World Englishes paradigm, i.e., Indian Englishes (Kachru 1985, 1991, 2005; Y. Kachru, 2006; Bhatia, 1995, 2005); however, there has not been much work on Indonesian Englishes. A distinctive feature of South Asian English is the tendency to drop or omit an article (Kachru, 2005). This tendency is also present in Indonesian English. For example, in the next excerpt, where Mei and Tom are discussing the name of Mei’s adopted son Talu, Tom drops an indefinite article:

Example 10. (*Arisan! 2*)

- | | | | |
|---|---------|---|--|
| 1 | Tom: | Tau gak kamu, Talu artinya musik pembuka adegan pertama pertunjukan wayang. | Do you know the meaning of Talu? It’s the music which is applied to the instrumental introduction to an opera. |
| 2 | Meimei: | Seperti overture gitu kan? | It’s like an <i>overture</i> , right? |
| 3 | Tom: | Exactly! <u>Special name for special boy!</u> | <i>Exactly! <u>Special name for special boy!</u></i> |

In Standard English, line 3 would read, “A special name for a special boy!” However, Indonesian grammar does not require an article prior to a noun or noun phrase, and therefore Tom does not include the indefinite article *a*. According to a generative linguistic approach, this would signal a first language interference or interlanguage that is impeding the production of the sentence. But sociolinguistically, Indonesian bilinguals can relate and understand the absence of the article in the sentence.

Reduplication

The second Indonesian grammatical feature that is commonly found in bahasa gado gado is reduplication. There are two functions of reduplication: when a noun or adjective is being reduplicated, it becomes plural, and when an adjective is reduplicated, it functions as an emphasis. With reduplicated adjectives, one need to deduce from the context whether they are meant to pluralize or to emphasize. In Example 11, the reduplication of nouns functions as a plural marker, while in Example 12 the reduplication of adjectives functions as emphasis.

Example 11 features a conversation in which Indonesian reduplication rules are applied to an English term. Here, Andien and his friend are in a restaurant where Andien is holding an *arisan* gathering.

Example 11. (*Arisan!*)

- | | | | |
|---|------------------|--|--|
| 1 | Andien's friend: | Ndien, ini semua <u>candle-</u>
<u>candlenya</u> kamu bawa sendiri dari
rumah? | Ndien, you brought all <u>the candles</u>
<i>from home</i> ? |
| 2 | Andien: | Iyalah. Biar lebih okay Abis
restaurant ini nggak punya
scented candle sih. | Of course. I wanted to make this
gathering <i>okay</i> , because this
restaurant doesn't provide the
<i>scented candles</i> . |

Although the conversation is carried out predominantly in Indonesian, the characters utilize a number of English switches. *Candle-candlenya* appropriates Indonesian rules for plurals by reduplicating the English word *candle*. It satisfies Indonesian grammatical rules while being conveyed in English lexically, thereby representing a linguistic fusion. The appearance of *candle* and the suffix *-nya* together show a blending of two different codes, forming a variant that conveys both local and cosmopolitan attachments. In this way, two linguistic sources are activated for the switch. This term indicates that a global language is being appropriated into a local linguistic context.

The reduplication of an English term also occurs in Example 12, where Sakti and Meimei are discussing the chemistry between Meimei and her husband. The bilingual characters apply the Indonesian grammar reduplication on the English adjective, as we can see in turn 3.

Example 12. (*Arisan!*)

- | | | |
|-----------|---|---|
| 1 Sakti: | Ya, tapi kan semua gak segampang itu. Semua harus ada chemistrynya, lagi. Liatin aja lo ama Ical. | But, it's not that easy. There should be some <i>chemistry</i> involved. Like you and Ical. |
| 2 Meimei: | Chemistry gue ama Ical kan udah gak seheboh dulu lagi, Ti. Kalau aja gue bisa kasih dia anak, pastinya dia akan sayang ama gue sama seperti dulu. | I don't think my <i>chemistry</i> with Ical still exists now. If only I could give him a child, I know he will still love me. |
| 3 Sakti: | Gue masih gak bisa terima ada orang yang gak cinta lagi ama pasangannya, cuma gara-gara dia gak bisa ngasih anak. Kalau misalnya bini gue entar gak bisa kasih gue anak, gue sih <u><i>fine-fine</i></u> aja. | I never understand why a man can stop loving his wife, just because they are childless. If I'm married and my wife is unable to be pregnant, I am <u><i>fine</i></u> with that. |

Sakti tries to conciliate Meimei using the double adjective *fine-fine*. Indonesian has a direct equivalent for *fine*, the reduplicated adjective *baik-baik*. Importantly, while Sakti selects the

English word here, he treats it as an Indonesian word or phrase. *Fine-fine* imitates *baik-baik*. Once adopted and adapted to meet Indonesian grammar, grammatically and semantically, *fine-fine* is no longer foreign for the bilinguals. *Fine-fine* began as an English term but has been bent to the local tongue, indexing Indonesian bilinguals' ownership of English. Here, English is not necessarily a language associated with the foreign, but rather is appropriated for local usage (Higgins, 2009; Pennycook, 2010) and may thus still index a cosmopolitan identity. However, lexically, *fine* is still a foreign word for monolingual Indonesians, and its inclusion turns any discourse into *Bahasa gado-gado*. Non-Indonesian English speakers would likely not be able to understand this lexical choice; such Indonesian-English terms are localized and nativized.

The prefixes nge-/di-

Hybrid variants made from CJI and Standard Indonesian prefixes and English terms function as a means to claim ownership of English. In Examples 13 and 14, the bilingual characters redefine English terms, pragmatically changing their meaning. Among other derivational morphemes, *nge-* and *di-* are used to form Indonesian colloquial verbs. In the following conversation, Lita and Nino comment on Andien, who is wearing sunglasses in the evening because she has just had plastic surgery near her eyes. English switches arise not only at the lexical level, but also at the levels of syntax and morphology.

Example 13. (*Arisan!* 2)

- | | | |
|-----------|--|--|
| 1 Lita: | Ngomong-ngomong Kak, sudah gelap ini, kenapa tak kau copot kacamata kau? | By the way, Sis, it's dark, why are you still wearing your sunglasses? |
| 2 Andien: | Lita, aku kan abis eyelift. Nih, liat nih masih ada bekasnya tuh. | Lita, I just did <i>eyelift</i> . Look at the scars. |
| 3 | [Nino and Lita exhibit shocked facial expressions.] | |
| 4 Andien: | Apaan sih? Kalian jangan pada nge-judge aku deh? | What's with the expression? Please, <i>don't judge me</i> . |

Additionally, *Ms. B series*, *9 Summers and 10 Autumns*, *Arisan!* films have also demonstrated the use of Indonesian-English terms, such as *handphone* (for cellphone or mobile phone), *ml* (an acronym for *make love*), *oke* (for OK), among others. These terms may appear as English terms, yet they may only be accessible for the Indonesian-English bilinguals.

Bilingual characters in popular texts capitalize on their Indonesian knowledge while concurrently harnessing their English knowledge. A negotiation between the two languages produces the Indonesian variant, and Indonesian-English terms are not necessarily comprehensible to either Inner Circle English or monolingual Indonesian speakers, because unpacking their meaning requires a certain amount of English knowledge. Therefore, the *bahasa gado-gado* in these examples demonstrates the characters' in-betweenness or hybridity, with Indonesian and English meeting in the middle.

Using the Ownership of English paradigm, I argue that the processes of appropriation, nativization, and localization of the English terms in the non-English speaking territories occur in the construction of *bahasa gado-gado*. Authors who write in a second language infuse their own norms, different stylistic and discursive conventions, and cultural paradigms into their new English variants (Kachru, 1996). The nativization of Indonesian-English takes places through pragmatic and grammatical linguistic features. The Indonesian-English bilingual speaks English with an Indonesian flavor—simultaneously crossing language boundaries and claiming ownership of English. The ongoing and fluid relationship between language and identity is in the continued negotiation between the speakers' handling of their English (Park & Wee, 2012). Accordingly, *bahasa gado-gado* as a language contact results from the amalgam of Indonesian and English.

One effect of this two-world attachment and the use of *bahasa gado-gado* is the marginalization of monolinguals, which is best illustrated in “Madre” by Dewi Lestari. Tansen, the third-generation owner of a bakery, listens to a conversation between Mei, a modern bakery owner, and Pak Hadi, the former personal assistant of Tansen’s grandmother, whose bread was well-known before she passed away and left the bakery behind. Mei is interested in Tansen’s starter dough; she tries to convince Tansen and Pak Hadi to join her business, and invites Tansen to become the bakery artisan. Tansen listens silently, concerned about whether Pak Hadi, a member of the older generation, understands Mei’s frequent English switches. “Aku tidak yakin Pak Hadi memahami seratus persen yang dibilang Mei, tapi ia tampak mengangguk-angguk mafhum” [I’m not sure if Pak Hadi fully understands what Mei is trying to say, yet he seems to nod to show he does] (Madre, 26-7). Tansen’s statement underlies his assumption of Pak Hadi’s English illiteracy and suggests that *bahasa gado-gado* is the language of the younger generation; it also demonstrates that the author, Lestari, exclusively segments her English-literate readers as younger people. Moreover, this *bahasa gado-gado* may disadvantage the monolingual readers; the author assumes that her readers are English literate, which simultaneously marginalizes non-English speakers.

These popular texts have transcended the stigma surrounding the West, English and the ideological attachments they carry. In many countries, anti-American sentiment is strong, as many people believe that “American culture” has a negative influence (Wilkins & Garies, 2006). However, the authors suggest that people may gradually submit and adapt to globalized (presumably Western) values. In showing their characters’ affinity for American culture, the authors reject the notion that all foreign influences are bad; rather, they assume that these cultural associations are natural consequences of attending American educational institutions, and are a

way to negotiate “East-ness” vs. “West-ness” (Hok-shing Chan, 2009). Their hybrid language indexes their resistance to the traditional definition of national identity. *Bahasa gado-gado* is used as a strategy for recognition: presenting an English-Indonesian bilingual character as someone who is knowledgeable, respected, and distinguished. This creates a positive connotation for English, as the language of success and recognition. From a social perspective, *bahasa gado-gado* reflects the gap between the fortunate and the underprivileged. Those who can speak foreign languages, specifically English, are elites with executive positions; they speak English to attract high-class customers and secure cultural privilege. Language, identity, and power are connected.

The characters’ language selection indicates their hybrid cultural identities; in fact, their identity seems impossible to express in just one language. They mediate and break down the invisible border between the East and the West by code-switching. At the same time, using English erects borders between urban/rural and poor/wealthy. Conflating the languages creates a space to negotiate these borders, as a local person who speaks Indonesian and as a global person who speaks English.

The popular texts have provided a notion of cosmopolitan identity as an alternative to a uniform national identity. Being bilingual has expanded Ms. B’s and Iwan’s opportunities for a wider communication. Their cosmopolitanism has allowed them to travel internationally and to build relationships with individuals in other countries that they come to see as second homes. It has also provided the space to understand the other cultures. These texts do not portray foreignness as a negative influence that needs to be denied, but as source of knowledge that should be embraced. And the texts thus provide a learning space for readers to acquire more English and/or

learn more about American culture, even though they may not have the means to travel themselves.

Code-switching is an authorial strategy for challenging the “official and national identity” laid out in the 1928 Youth Pledge, “One land, one nation, and one language.” In *Panggil Aku B*, Ms. B uses English to describe her home in Jakarta, while Iwan uses both English and Indonesian to express that both New York and Batu, Malang are his homes. Because they have lived in two countries, the boundaries between Ms. B’s and Iwan’s selves and the Other have become blurred; they are in-between, or both. They are no longer bound by the imposed definition of Indonesian language, ideology, and laws; they no longer must reject foreign influence or avoid speaking a foreign language, the language of the Other. This in-between or third space is manifested through their language choices, as they renegotiate both the physical and emotional meanings of home. Their experiences exemplify the poststructuralist understanding that identities are not pre-given or fixed, but rather fluid and subjective.

These texts also implicitly argue that being Indonesian no longer means being bound by speaking “good and proper” Indonesian. By switching between multiple languages, the authors challenge and reconfigure their readers’ understanding of what it means to be an Indonesian. Their flexible, jocular use of English signals that identity is dynamic rather than fixed, and challenges the official notion that Indonesian language and identity needs protection from foreign influences. By code-switching between Indonesian, CJI, and English, the authors portray identity as borderless. They problematize the normative categories and dominant definitions of homogenized national identity, which are confined by geographical and national borders, by engaging and communicating with worlds beyond Indonesia. English is a readily available linguistic resource to the Western-educated writers of popular texts.

Bahasa gado-gado calls “true Indonesianness” into question because of its prevalent use of English, which decenters the dominant function of Indonesian as the national language. Subsequently, mixing Indonesian, CJI, and English offers an open dialogue to expand understandings of Indonesianness: “identity is never an a priori, nor a finished product; it is only ever a problematic process of access to an image of totality” (Bhabha, 1994, p. 730). Moreover, the texts also demonstrate that in a multilingual country like Indonesia, language selection is inseparable from politics, power relations, language ideologies, and the speakers’ perceptions of their own and others’ identities (Pavlenko & Blackledge, 2004).

Conclusion

Using Indonesian as the dominant language in popular texts, while at the same time drawing on English and Colloquial Jakartan Indonesian (CJI), creates an interesting and dynamic tension. The first function of *bahasa gado-gado* decenters Indonesian’s status in its role as the language of economic success (Higgins, 2009) and functions as a marker of social identity construction (Myers-Scotton, 1993; Gumperz, 1982), conveying a competitive advantage (Heller & Duchêne, 2012), and conforming the concept of linguistic capital (Bourdieu, 1991).

Bahasa gado-gado constitutes a threat to Standard Indonesian, the official national language that constructs a sense of modernity for many Indonesians (Sneddon, 2003). Although only one of many local languages, Indonesian has enjoyed dominance since the New Order era. However, its power and status are being challenged as the influence English grows, particularly during the Reformasi era. Since English increasingly is associated with the fantasy of membership in a modern, cosmopolitan community, *bahasa gado-gado* has become a sign of resistance and a rejection of hegemonic definitions of national identity.

The characters in these popular texts challenge notions of national identity that emphasize avoiding foreignness. They abandon completely the cultural imperatives to use only “good and proper” Indonesian and limit foreign language usage. They choose to write in the national language, but mix in local dialects and English, freeing themselves from the stiff dogma of being a “proper” Indonesian. By switching back and forth between Indonesian (CJI) and English, the writers show that language no longer limits and marks their identities as Indonesians. Their discursive practices, including promoting bilingual identity and representing cosmopolitan figures who live in both local and global worlds, seem to be more important than maintaining their Indonesianness by using and speaking only Indonesian.

This language selection underscores the authors’ rejection and resistance of the national identity proposed by the New Order regime that claimed Indonesian was the language of the nation and unity. Moreover, their code-switching strategy creates intersections between their identities as Indonesians and as global citizens. Since the collapse of the New Order regime and the beginning of the Reform Era, the use of restrictive language to define Indonesian identity has been challenged. Through dialogue and narration, these writers have engaged in acting and thinking beyond the local.

Moreover, they contest and redefine the idea that true Indonesians ought to avoid foreign influence and Western culture. By including English in their writing, Basuki, Setyawan, and Lestari display their general knowledge of the global world and their affiliation with Western culture. Imbuing their characters with cosmopolitan identities is a way to display the authors’ own cultural affiliations with the West, an act of building bilingual solidarity, and a means to fully convey an original semantic connotation. However, given that English is still a language of inequality in multilingual Indonesia, the use of English in these texts can also exclude. Although

the wider readership may still understand the general picture, *bahasa gado-gado* automatically targets and segments the audience.

The impact is two-fold. First, the hegemonic status of Indonesian as the language of national identity is challenged by the appearance of CJI and English. Indonesian's status as the only language that can reflect Indonesianness is now challenged by *bahasa gado-gado*. Secondly, in the process, the notion of national identity is being liberated from normative boundaries, and is being replaced by a more equal, egalitarian, embrace of a global citizenship built on heterogeneity rather than homogeneity.

Additionally, *bahasa gado-gado* demonstrates the detachment of English from the territory of the West. Although many Indonesians view English as a Western language, codeswitching in popular texts detaches English from the West by putting it in the mouths of Indonesians, even when they are in Indonesia. In other words, these popular texts suggest that English no longer belongs only to its native speakers, but also to everyone else who wishes to speak it, creating an expanded definition of legitimate speaker (Norton, 1997; Bourdieu, 1991). *Bahasa gado-gado* challenges both the authority of English as a global and international language, and the authority of a "tidy" form of Indonesian as the national language. Moreover, *bahasa gado-gado*, in both print and cinematic popular texts, has lent a new and unconventional platform to the alternative market, making it possible for writers to tell their stories via a stigmatized language (Bourdieu, 1991). In this context, English is used as a linguistic invisible border between the East and the West, the native (presumably legitimate) and non-native/illegitimate speakers. Thus, *bahasa gado-gado* rejects the monopoly of Indonesian as the official and national language. It has created a space and channel for authors to re-construct, re-define, re-examine, and expand what it means to be an Indonesian. They celebrate the ability to

speak another language, for their characters to communicate with other nationalities. Foreignness is no longer a negative concept that needs to be feared, but rather a positive force that can lead to opportunity and upward mobility. Overall, these uses of *bahasa gado-gado* negate New Order values that view anything coming from foreign influence as a threat to top-down national identity construction.

CONCLUSION

This dissertation had two purposes. My first aim was to investigate how *bahasa gado-gado* as a result of language contact reflects socio-political and economic circumstances. At odds with negative social and governmental perceptions, *bahasa gado-gado* in Indonesian popular texts is purposeful. Language never happens in a vacuum: no language phenomenon can be analyzed without taking its social, political, cultural, and historical contexts into consideration.

Secondly, I aimed to demonstrate how *bahasa gado-gado* reinforces the symbolic power of English, in a process that simultaneously destabilizes Indonesian as the language of unity, particularly for the younger generations. As I have discussed, Indonesia has seen a language shift among some groups, particularly in urban areas. The dynamics of access to linguistic resources have shifted, affecting the status of Indonesian as the primary modernity marker in relation to English. In order to account for the popular texts that I investigate in this study, I have approached my data mainly using CALx while also adopting other theoretical paradigms from critical discourse analysis, World Englishes, post-structuralism, and, most importantly, sociolinguistic theory. These theoretical frameworks offer a broad foundation that is necessary for me to account for the multiple functions of *bahasa gado-gado* in written and popular Indonesian texts.

Visible transgression in printed texts

Bahasa gado-gado in popular texts has challenged monolithic national identity construction via a number of different forms of transgression. First, *bahasa gado-gado* transgresses the tidiness of “good and proper” Indonesian in popular text. Second, it transgresses expectations of normative Indonesianness; i.e., it suggests an interference with one’s

Indonesianness. Next, it also poses a challenge towards Indonesian as the language that is vital for constructing modern and cosmopolitan identity.

Bahasa gado-gado challenges norms of tidiness in language use. In print texts, this disorderliness is visible in the italicization of *bahasa gado-gado*. Popular texts usually italicize English to indicate its foreignness. In this way, they treat Standard Indonesia as the normative language, and *bahasa gado-gado* as non-normative. In addition to English, some non-standard Indonesian (CJI) is also italicized. I read the consistent italicization of English words as a visible boundary between Indonesian and English, in contrast to the inconsistent use of italics on CJI words, phrases, and sentences, which suggests they are (at least sometimes) viewed as part of Standard Indonesian.

The juxtaposition of Indonesian, CJI, and English through code-switching is an act of linguistic transgression that violates normative language rules. Shuttling between languages resists the norms of “tidiness” that would keep English and Indonesian, the West and Indonesia, separate. Because tidiness and appropriate language use are related to the collective identity of Indonesians, code-switching into English provokes the question of whether English is a legitimate language to use in Indonesian texts, or whether an Indonesian can be a legitimate speaker or user of English. Outside of popular texts, *bahasa gado-gado* is not yet considered legitimate language use. The authors challenge this attitude. Their language selection indexes their resistance to the power of the “legitimate” language, as vernacular languages can challenge the domination of standard languages (Woolard, 1985). Popular texts that use *bahasa gado-gado* transgress linguistic allegiance and national borders. Their use of *bahasa gado-gado*, a symbol of resistance to monolingual norms and the imperative not to mix, disrupts and decenters the use of the “legitimate” language, Indonesian.

The next transgression relates to the construction of authentic Indonesianness. As I have discussed, the characters often use *bahasa gado-gado* as a shield to mediate conversations that address non-normative sexual orientations and sexual acts, as well as to express love freely. In this way, *bahasa gado-gado* becomes a mechanism for fully expressing non-normative sexuality, while still claiming Indonesianness. *Bahasa gado-gado* thus functions as a linguistic resource for expressing non-normative speech acts, which for many Indonesians and the government constitutes a betrayal of one's Indonesianness. Switching from Indonesian to English enables the characters to embrace their true selves while challenging monolithic expectations of Indonesianness; the effect is an expanded definition of Indonesian identity.

There is a sociolinguistic ideology (or burden) embedded in the Indonesian language because it the language strongly related to homogenized national identity building. Because Indonesian is such a socio-culturally laden language, writers avoid using it in moments when characters are discussing non-normative actions, such as premarital or extramarital sexual activities, or simply sex itself. Standard Indonesian, a language that for most Indonesians is the language of the classroom, is so morally laden that characters' English switches function as a liberating strategy for honoring their non-normative lifestyles. The popular texts have demonstrated that despite being stigmatized as a vehicle of Western values, English in *bahasa gado-gado* is able to alleviate the negative stigma often attached to non-normative acts.

In using *bahasa gado-gado* instead of monolingual Standard Indonesian to discuss taboo topics, these writers, I argue, are rejecting the values and boundaries imposed by the government, which have shaped the social discourse of sexuality. Through their use of *bahasa gado-gado*, the characters they have constructed can be quite open in discussing sex, an openness that reflects their resistance towards traditional expectations of Indonesians, especially women. I read the

function of *bahasa gado-gado* in popular texts, especially when related to extramarital sexuality, as contesting the constructions of both the good Muslim and the authentic Indonesian. The switches to English convey the characters' non-traditional, liberal interpretation of Islam, the religion of the majority. The characters may be open-minded about sexually free lifestyles, but they still uphold Islamic principles; they are able to respect both dimensions of Indonesian life, though they may appear contradictory to others. In using English to express Islamic values, the authors and characters reconcile the realities of modernity with religious observance.

This is especially true for women. When switching between Indonesian and English, women transgress national, societal, and religious boundaries and demonstrate their sexual autonomy, which departs significantly from the cultural ideal of dependent and passive female sexuality. Their public discussion of female sexuality also challenges the notion that a woman's sexual activity should be under societal surveillance. *Bahasa gado-gado* is thus an essential tool for the characters to fully express themselves as Indonesian women with sexual autonomy, transgressing shame culture and prescribed norms of Indonesianness.

By expressing taboo topics in *bahasa gado-gado*, popular texts demonstrate that it is possible to discuss taboo topics via an "unfavorable" linguistic resource, while still maintaining one's identity as an Indonesian. It seems clear that *bahasa gado-gado* provides a discursive space for characters to negotiate their bilingual identities, and to resist the power imposed via government regulations, propaganda, and social discourse. In this light, *bahasa gado-gado* does not merely function as a dialect shift but also as a consistent proposal from the authors to measure one's Indonesianness in a manner more inclusive of sexual independence and homosexuality. In other words, rather than viewing *bahasa gado-gado* as an act of un-

Indonesianness, I read it as an attempt to understand and position Indonesianness within a broader context.

Additionally, *bahasa gado-gado* also challenges Standard Indonesian's function as constructing modernness and cosmopolitan. Throughout popular texts, characters use *bahasa gado-gado* as a social strategy to raise their status and demonstrate expertise (cf. Grosjean, 2010). Specifically, they use English to indicate high social standing, regardless of their actual status (cf. Higgins, 2009). This form of code-switching can be placed in the category of a language display (Eastman and Stein, 1993); in these moments, *bahasa gado-gado* is deployed to project certain social identities, such as being educated, elite, and urbane. Characters may project their identities as modern and middle-class or cosmopolitan, via the use of *bahasa gado-gado*. In so doing, they manipulate English in their *bahasa gado-gado* practice to be perceived as cool language users, projecting modernity, elegance, and luxury (cf. Kelly-Holmes, 2005; Graddol, 2006).

Additionally, these popular texts illustrate that language use is not just a matter of performing tasks. *Bahasa gado-gado* is not yet codified, nor has it acquired formal recognition, unlike its neighboring Singaporean variant, Singlish. While *bahasa gado-gado* is a hybrid form that reflects a *mélange* of local and global values, the general assumption directed at its speakers is that they have limited knowledge of English, and are probably emerging bilinguals using an interlanguage. However, the characters in these popular texts are constructed as Indonesian-English bilinguals with knowledge of two languages, who harness *bahasa gado-gado* to project their linguistic abilities and import local flavor into a global language. Because they often creatively integrate English words and phrases with local values and ideas, English speakers from the Inner and Outer Circles cannot fully comprehend these forms. Accordingly, this variant

of Indonesian-English has undergone a nativization process resulting in some morphological and semantic differences from the other circles' varieties of English. This nativization reflects acculturation into an Indonesian sociocultural context, and contact between English and other languages in the bilingual/multilinguals' linguistic repertoires.

To some degree, the force of English as a global language is inevitable. However, I have shown that English is not necessarily used as an international language, but rather as a local language carrying local values, values that only Indonesian-English bilinguals can fully understand. When these hybrid constructions are incorporated into popular texts, boundaries between local and global values are blurred, as are boundaries between foreignness and "authentic" Indonesianness. In this light, *bahasa gado-gado* challenges linguistic purism. Popular texts demonstrate how bilinguals have modified English to convey local taste, vis-a-vis their adaptation and appropriation for Indonesian tongues. When bilinguals fold English into the Indonesian grammar, they produce terms that no longer can be claimed as only Indonesian or only English; rather, they are hybrid forms. Accordingly, the new variant of English "maintains a balance between wide accessibility and cultural content." (Pennycook, 1994, p. 129).

From a national language lens, *bahasa gado-gado* compels a broader view for measuring one's Indonesianness. Including English in Indonesian popular texts might not be acceptable according to the government's project to encourage "good and proper" Indonesian. The purposeful and frequent use of *bahasa gado-gado* in mainstream print and cinematic texts has given us an opportunity to re-think its stigma as a "bad and inauthentic" language selection. As we saw, popular texts reveal that *bahasa gado-gado* is a normal component of the younger generation's speech acts. Furthermore, this linguistic expression demonstrates flexibility, bilingual solidarity with bilingual readers, and a celebration of more freedom. Additionally,

bilingualism in these texts facilitates wider communication: with other Indonesian bilinguals and with English speakers from other circles. These characters' cosmopolitanism benefits them; they can travel across the globe and communicate and build relationships with local individuals in their second home countries. It also provides a learning space to understand other cultures. In these contexts, foreignness is not seen as a negative influence but as a link to new knowledge.

The emergence of cosmopolitan identity offers an alternative to a strictly state-imposed national identity. One's Indonesianness is no longer limited by the use of good and proper Indonesian. By integrating CJI, Indonesian, and English, these popular texts constantly remind readers what it means to be an Indonesian in a global context. They emphasize that identity is dynamic rather than fixed, manifesting this in a more flexible, sometimes playful, use of English. They challenge the official notion that Indonesian as a language and Indonesian as an identity need to be protected from foreign influence. By means of code-switching among these three languages, Indonesian identity is made borderless. The normative understanding of homogenized national identity as bounded by geographical boundaries no longer makes sense in a contemporary space in which subjects consistently engage with worlds beyond their own. Popular texts are thus situated in the cross-cultural practice of "transcultural flows" (Pennycook, 2008).

Moreover, because the shuttle between languages occurs in the intersection of local and global, tidiness and untidiness, *bahasa gado-gado* offers relatively nuanced meanings of identities. At the same time as it infuses local flavor into the global arena, *bahasa gado-gado* infuses a global flavor into the local context, especially as these texts are intended for Indonesian audiences. In this manner, *bahasa gado-gado* is used to show the "in between spaces [which] provide the terrain for elaborating strategies of selfhood—singular or communal—that initiate

new signs of identity, and innovative sites of collaboration, and contestation in the act of defining the idea of society itself” (Bhabha, 1994, p. 2). The characters show their inclination towards hybrid identities by rejecting the dominant understanding of Indonesian national identity and presenting it instead as fluid, dynamic, unstable, hybrid, and overlapping (Schneider, 2003).

These popular narratives also promote the fantasy that English plays an important role in pursuing success. Illustrating that access to English is an issue of class and wealth at the same time as it may come from hard work and scrambling, these texts project aspirational beliefs that feed into popular ideas about what English may enable, even though realistically few readers will achieve what Ms. B or Iwan have. In this sense, they not only confirm Indonesians’ existing attitudes towards the power of English, but actually contribute to them. This may be one of the reasons these texts are popular: they fulfill readers’ fantasies about success that is attributable to English.

In presenting English, the United States, and American English as prestigious, modern, cool, urbane, and cosmopolitan, these texts may amplify such fantasies. This effect fits with my findings in Chapter Four connecting the sense of modernness and cosmopolitanism to the use of English via *bahasa gado-gado*. In this light, *bahasa gado-gado* has granted the writers and characters a sharing space with their audiences. In their use of *bahasa gado-gado*, these texts not only break taboos, create new identities, and depict the power of English, but also allow readers to imagine themselves doing so while picking up some cool, modern English words and knowledge of American cultures. *Bahasa gado-gado* thus may provide a space for readers to imagine themselves as part of the worlds described, even though they may not be able to travel to see the world themselves.

Suggested Further Research

Following this study, I hope to conduct a number of further empirical studies related to *bahasa gado gado*. First, I suggest an empirical study along the lines of an audience study to learn the relationship between popular texts and students' perceptions of particular variants of English. A second study may be conducted to shed a light on students' preferences towards variants of English and their Second Language Acquisition process. Next, another audience study can be conducted to examine the impact of popular texts on students who are learning English as a foreign language, simultaneously exploring whether they identify themselves as part of the imagined communities of other speakers of English in other parts of the world. As I have argued, *bahasa gado-gado* is the language of the younger generation and can be seen to marginalize the monolingual readership, I then propose another empirical audience study to investigate whether readers view these texts as disadvantaging monolingual readers while benefitting bilingual readers. Another audience study might also be conducted focusing on Muslim readers' response to characters' attachments toward both Islam and non-Islamic practices. At the same time, the frequent use of English switches in these novels may pose a problem for monolingual readers even though the writers often offer Indonesian translations after any English switches, both in the narration and the dialogue. It would be interesting to investigate whether the monolingual readers feel marginalized, or in Bourdieu's (1991) terms, subject to symbolic violence.

It would also be interesting to find out whether there are particular English terms that are frequently used in taboo topic subjects and discussion in contemporary Indonesian usage, or whether the top English-language imports and their attendant cultural imports from the Inner Circle countries are culturally and geopolitically different between Indonesian and other

languages. Through such research, we might uncover whether some words have been fully adopted and adapted to Indonesian (as indexed by official inclusion in the Great Dictionary) or retain their original typography and phonology. Such studies would not only establish a foundation for the development of *bahasa gado-gado* but also contribute to our understanding of code-switching and translanguaging.

Moreover, as I have demonstrated, Indonesian popular texts put *bahasa gado-gado* to a wide array of uses. *Bahasa gado-gado* is more than a random language act, as assumed by many Indonesians and the government; rather, it is constructive, accommodating, practical, liberating, and useful. With *bahasa gado gado* making itself more visible in the post-New-Order era, there is a need for more research in other Indonesian linguistic landscapes, such as street advertisements, banners, and other media. Moreover, further study must be conducted in those regions of Indonesia where Indonesian and CJI remain the language(s) of modernity and prestige. Finally, researching the variants of English used in educational settings would shed light on students' and teachers' use of *bahasa gado-gado* in educational settings.

In relation to its significance, this study contributes to World Englishes literature in several ways. First, it contributes to research on a non-Western country where English is used and nativized in an Expanding Circle nation. Indonesian popular texts compel us to revisit the imaginary English circles of Kachru (1986, 2005), rethinking them as dynamic and fluid boundaries in that bilingual characters treat English as part of their linguistic resources as opposed to a foreign language. More research is needed on the nature of Englishes in the Expanding Circles, particularly studies that address the boundaries between the Circles. Secondly, this study contributes to a growing body of research (e.g. Canagarajah, 2009; Higgins, 2009) demonstrating that the global spread of English results not in the wide spread of dominant

varieties of English but rather in the change and acculturation of English with local languages. This finding is important for SLA, ESL, and EFL in the Outer and Expanding Circles countries. The most pressing concern is related to the discussion of what English(es) should be taught that concomitantly addresses the issues of the ownership of English and the legitimacy of students as English speakers (Canagarajah, 1999, 2006, 2009; Jenkins, 2007, 2009). In English language education, whose culture should be taught? Many English teachers and learners still privilege the standardized Inner Circle English varieties. However, as we have seen in popular texts, English does not belong to native speakers; therefore, teaching it based on the native-speaker standard is a very problematic idea. The pedagogical model of communicative competence based on the native speaker standard disregards learners' cultural backgrounds. Popular texts demonstrate that the nativization of English not only is a matter of local and global distribution, but also reflects the identities of local English users.

In relation to the growing variants of Englishes in Other Circles, I see a mounting need to develop a standardized test that is inclusive rather than exclusive. Such a test must include non-native speakers with different accents on their listening sessions because students will eventually communicate and interact with non-native speakers in their real lives, given that English speakers from Outer and Expanding Circles outnumber those from the Inner Circle.

In an Indonesian context, it is time to rethink an educational system that highlights English native speakers as the superior speakers or the Anglicist or Americanist inspired of English-language education (Pennycook, 1994), given the fact that English teachers in Indonesian public schools are predominantly Indonesians.

The narratives in the popular texts have demonstrated that the characters in the popular texts resist the homogenous construction of Indonesianness and simultaneously challenge the top-

down and uniformed definition of national identities. In so doing, the characters demonstrate their freedom in selecting their language or “linguaging” their repertoires, lifestyles, and identities. In this context, the characters treat both language and identity as evolving, fluid, and dynamic entities, rather than as static and fixed. Via *bahasa gado-gado*, writers and characters claim their own agency as language users. Also, they demonstrate that *bahasa gado-gado* is an act of languaging that offers space to proactively choose one’s language in a number of situations and circumstances (García & Wei, 2014).

Lastly, the fact that the authors turn the power of English into significant features and themes in the popular texts informs us of compelling narratives about the significance of English in the contemporary Indonesia. English education plays a vital role in the popular imagination of success. More importantly, the narratives offer insight into how English has become a commodity in this globalized material world, privileging a few while leaving others marginalized and socio-economically disadvantaged.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ali, K. & Leaman, O. (2008). *Islam: The key concepts*. New York: Routledge.
- Alisjahbana, S. T. (1974). Language policy, language engineering and literacy in Indonesia and Malaysia. In J. Fishman (Ed.), *Advances in language planning* (pp.391-416). The Hague: Mouton Publishers.
- Alisjahbana, S. T. (1976). *Language planning for modernization: The case of Indonesian and Malaysian*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Alisjahbana, S. T. (1977). The present situation of the Indonesian language. In Bonifacio P. Sibayan and Andrew Gonzalez (Eds.), *Language planning and the building of a national language* (pp. 113-125). Manila: Language Society of the Philippines.
- Allen, P. (2007). Challenging diversity?: Indonesia's anti-pornography bill. *Asian Studies Review*, 31 (2), 101-115.
- Alwi, H. (2000). *Pedoman umum ejaan bahasa Indonesia yang disempurnakan*. Jakarta: Pusat Bahasa, Departemen Pendidikan Nasional.
- Anderson, B. R. O'G. (1966). The languages of Indonesian politics. *Indonesia*, 1, 89-116.
- Anderson, B. R. O'G. (1983). *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. New York: Verso.
- Anderson, B. R. O'G. (1990). *Language and power: Exploring political cultures in Indonesia*. Ithaca, N.Y: Cornell University Press.
- Arimasari, R. (2013). *An analysis of code-switching used in the novel Negeri Lima Menara by A. Fuadi* (Unpublished master's thesis). State Islamic College of Tulungagung (STAIN), Tulungagung, Indonesia.
- Auer, P. (1984). *Bilingual conversation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Auer, P. (1995). "The pragmatics of code-switching: A sequential approach." In L. Milroy & P. Muysken (Eds.) *One speaker, two languages: Cross-disciplinary perspectives on code switching* (pp.115-135). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Auer, P. (1998). "Introduction: Bilingual conversation revisited." In P. Auer (Ed.), *Code-switching in conversation: Language, interaction and identity* (pp.1.24). London, England: Routledge.
- Auer, P. (1999). From codeswitching via language mixing to fused lects: Toward a dynamic typology of bilingual speech. *The International Journal of Bilingualism*, 3(4), 309-332.

- Azuma, S. (1997). Lexical categories and code-switching: A study of Japanese/English code-switching in Japan. *The Journal of the Association of Teachers of Japanese*, 31(2), 1–24.
- Backus, A. (2004 [2006]). Turkish as an immigrant language in Europe. In T. K. Bhatia & W. C. Ritchie (Eds.), *The handbook of bilingualism* (pp. 689-724). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Badan Pusat Statistik. (2010). *Statistik Indonesia: Statistical yearbook of Indonesia 2010*. Jakarta: Badan Pusat Statistik.
- Basuki, F. (2004). *Ms. B: Panggil aku, B*. Jakarta: Gramedia Widiasarana Indonesia.
- Basuki, F. (2004). *Ms. B: Will you marry me?* Jakarta: Gramedia Widiasarana Indonesia.
- Basuki, F. (2006). *Ms. B: Jangan mati*. Jakarta: Gramedia Widiasarana Indonesia.
- Bentahila, A., & Davies, E. E. (1992). Code-switching and language dominance. *Advances in Psychology*, 83, 443-458.
- Bhabha, H.K. (2004). *The location of culture*. London: Routledge.
- Bhatia, T. K. (1987). English in advertising: Multiple mixing and media. *World Englishes*, 6(1), 33-48.
- Bhatia, T. K. (1992). Discourse functions and pragmatics of mixing: Advertising across cultures. *World Englishes*, 11(2-3), 195-215.
- Bhatia, T. K. (2001). Language mixing in global advertising. In E. Thumboo (Ed.), *The three circles of English* (pp. 195-215). Singapore: Unipress.
- Bhatia, T. K., & Ritchie, W. C. (1996). Bilingual Language Mixing, Universal Grammar, and Second Language Acquisition. In T. Bhatia and W. Ritchie (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 627-88). San Diego, CA: Academic Press Inc.
- Bhatia, T. K., & Ritchie, W. C. (2004 [2006]). Introduction. In T. K. Bhatia & W. C. Ritchie (Eds.), *The handbook of bilingualism* (pp. 1-2). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Bennett, L. R. (2005). *Women, Islam and modernity: Single women, sexuality and reproductive health in contemporary Indonesia*. London: Routledge.
- Bennett, L. R. (2015). Sexuality morality and the silencing of sexual health within Indonesian infertility care. In L. R. Bennett & S. G. Davies (Eds.), *Sex and sexualities in contemporary Indonesia* (pp.148-166). Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.

- Blackwood, E. (2005). Gender transgression in colonial and post-colonial Indonesia, *Journal of Asian Studies*, 64, 849-879.
- Blackwood, E. (2007). Regulation of sexuality in Indonesian discourse: Normative gender, criminal law and shifting strategies of control. *Culture, Health & Sexuality*, 9(3), 293-307.
- Blackwood, E. (2010). *Falling into the lesbi world: Desire and difference in Indonesia*. Hawaii, HI: University of Hawaii Press.
- Blommaert, J. (2003). Commentary: A sociolinguistics of globalization. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 7(4), 607-623.
- Blommaert, J. (2005). *Discourse: A critical introduction*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Blommaert, J. (2010). *The sociolinguistics of globalization*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Blommaert, J. (2012). *Complexity, accent and conviviality: Concluding comments*. Paper 26, Tilburg Papers in Culture Studies.
- Block, D. (2003). *The social turn in second language acquisition*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Boellstorff, T. (2000). *The gay archipelago: Postcolonial sexual subjectivities in Indonesia* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (Accession No. 9986442).
- Boellstorff, T. (2005a). *The gay archipelago sexuality and nation in Indonesia*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Boellstorff, T. (2005b). Between Religion and Desire: Being Muslim and Gay in Indonesia. *American Anthropologist*, 107(4), 575-585.
- Boellstorff, T. (2007). *A coincidence of desires: Anthropology, queer studies, Indonesia*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Bloomfield, L. (1933). *Language*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Bond, M. H., & Lai, T. (2001). Embarrassment and code-switching into a second language. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 126(2), 179-186.
- Bourdieu, P. (1977). The economics of linguistics exchanges. *Social Science Information*, 16, 645-668.

- Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bowen, J. R. (2000). Imputations of faith and allegiance: Islamic prayer and Indonesian politics outside the mosque. In D.J. Parkin & S. C. Headley (Eds.), *Islamic prayer across the Indian ocean: Inside and outside the mosque* (pp. 23–38). London: Routledge.
- Bucholtz, M., & Hall, K. (2004). Language and identity. In D. Alessandro (Ed.), *A companion to linguistic anthropology* (pp. 369–394). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Bucholtz, M., & Hall, K. (2005). Identity and interaction: A sociocultural linguistic approach. *Discourse Studies*, 7(4-5), 585–614.
- Buchori, M. (1994). *Sketches of Indonesian society: A look from within*. Jakarta: Jakarta Post and IKIP-Muhammadiyah Jakarta-Press.
- Bullock, B.E., & Toribio, A.J. (2009). Themes in the study of code-switching. In B.E. Bullock & A.J. Toribio (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of linguistic code-switching* (pp. 1-17). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Burhanudin, J., & van Dijk, K. (2013). Introduction. In J. Burhanudin & K. van Dijk (Eds.), *Islam in Indonesia: Constrasting images and interpretations*, (pp. 7-12). Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Butler, Y. G., & Hakuta, K. (2004 [2006]). Bilingualism and second language acquisition. In T. K. Bhatia & W. C. Ritchie (Eds.), *The handbook of bilingualism* (pp. 114-145). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Callahan, L. (2004). *Spanish/English codeswitching in a written corpus*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Pub.
- Canagarajah, A. S. (1999). *Resisting linguistic imperialism in English teaching*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Canagarajah, S. (2004). Multilingual writers and the struggle for voice in academic discourse. In A. Pavlenko & A. Blackledge (Eds.), *Negotiation of identities in multilingual contexts* (pp. 243-265). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Canagarajah, A. S. (2013). *Translingual practice: Global Englishes and cosmopolitan relations*. New York: Routledge.
- Cantone, K. F. (2007). *Code-switching in bilingual children* (Vol. 2). Dordrecht: Springer.
- Chuchu, F. H. A. (2007). *Code-switching in a multilingual environment*. Penerbit Universiti Pendidikan Sultan Idris.

- Clark, M. (2008) Indonesian cinema: exploring culture of masculinity, censorship and violence. In A. Heryanto (Ed.), *Popular culture in Indonesia: Fluid identities in post-authoritarian politics* (pp. 37-53). London: Routledge.
- Coleman, H. (2009, June). *Indonesia's 'International Standard Schools': What are they for?* Paper presented at the 8th Language and Development Conference at Dhaka.
- Conteh, J. (2007). Opening doors to success in multilingual classrooms: Bilingualism, codeswitching and the professional identities of ethnic minority primary teachers. *Language and Education*, 21(6), 457-472.
- Constantine, P. (2004). *Making out in Indonesian: Indonesian phrasebook (Revised edition)*. Tokyo, Japan: Yenbooks.
- Cook, V. (1992). Evidence for multicompetence. *Language learning*, 42(4), 557-591.
- Cook, V. (1999). Going beyond the native speaker in language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 33(2), 185-289.
- Cook, V. (2016). Where is the native speaker now? *TESOL Quarterly*, 50 (1), 186-189.
- Cribb, R. B. (1995 [2011]). *Modern Indonesia: A history since 1945*. London: Longman.
- Crystal, D. (1997). *A dictionary of linguistics and phonetics*. Fourth edition. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a global language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dabène, L., & Moore, D. (1995). Bilingual speech of migrant people. In L. Milroy & P. Muysken (Eds.), *One speaker, two languages: Cross-disciplinary perspectives on code-switching* (pp. 17-44). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Danadharta, I. (2011). *Sexual Practices among university students of Surabaya, East Java, Indonesia* (Unpublished master's thesis). International Institute of Social Studies, The Hague, The Netherlands.
- Duchene, A., & Heller, M. (2012). Pride and profit: Changing discourse of language, capital and nation state. In D. Alexandre & M. Heller (Eds.), *Language in late capitalism: pride and profit* (pp. 1-21). New York :Routledge
- Dardjowidjojo, S. (2000). English teaching in Indonesia. *EA Journal*, 18(1), 22-30.
- Day, T. (2011). *Identifying with freedom: Indonesia after Suharto*. New York: Berghahn Books.
- Davies, S. G. (2015). Surveilling sexuality in Indonesia. In L. R. Bennett & S. G. Davies (Eds.), *Sex and sexualities in contemporary Indonesia* (pp.29-50). Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.

- Davies, S. G., & Bennett, L. R. (2015). Introduction: Mapping sex and sexuality in contemporary Indonesia. In L. R. Bennett & S. G. Davies (Eds.), *Sex and sexualities in contemporary Indonesia* (pp.1-25). Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
- Davies, E. E., & Bentahila, A. (2006). Code switching and the globalisation of popular music: The case of North African rai and rap. *Multilingua-Journal of Cross-cultural and Interlanguage Communication*, 25(4), 367-392.
- Dewi, A. (2017). The English(es) to teach after study and life in Australia: a study of Indonesian English language educators. *Asian Englishes* 19, 1-20.
- Diah, M. (1982). *National language policy and the writing curriculum in Indonesia: A case study* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (Accession No. 8218455).
- Dimova, S. (2012). English in Macedonian television commercials. *World Englishes*, 31(1), 15–29.
- Dinata, N. (2004). *Arisan!* Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- Dinata, N. (Producer), & Dinata, N. (Director). (2011). *Arisan! 2* Indonesia: Kalyana Shira Film.
- Duranti, A. (2009). *Linguistic anthropology: A reader* (Vol. 1). Malden, MA: Willey-Blackwell Publishing.
- Duranti, A. (1997)[2002]. *Linguistic anthropology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Edwards, J. (2004 [2006]). Foundations of bilingualism. In T. K. Bhatia & W. C. Ritchie (Eds.), *The handbook of bilingualism* (pp. 7-31). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Edwards, J. (2009). *Language and identity: An introduction. Key topics on sociolinguistics*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Eldridge, J. (1996). Code-switching in a Turkish secondary school. *ELT journal*, 50(4), 303-311.
- Ena, T. O. (2013). *Visual analysis of e-textbooks for senior high school in Indonesia* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (Accession No. 3565990).
- Emka, M. (2003). *Jakarta undercover: Sex in the city*. Yogyakarta: Galang Press.
- Errington, J. (1998). *Shifting languages: Interaction and identity in Javanese Indonesia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Errington, J. (2000). Indonesian's authority. In P.V. Kroskrity (Ed.), *Regimes of language: Ideologies, politics, and identities* (pp.205-229). Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press.
- Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Cambridge; MA.: Polity Press.
- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. London; New York: Longman.
- Ferguson, C. A. (1959 [2000]). Diglossia. *Word*, 15, 325-40. [Reprinted in L. Wei (Ed.), *The bilingualism reader* (pp. 65- 80). London; New York: Routledge.]
- Fishman, J. A. (1972). *The sociology of language; An interdisciplinary social science approach to language in society*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House Publishers.
- Fishman, J. A. (1978). *Advances in the study of societal multilingualism*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Foucault, M. (1980). *The history of sexuality. Vol. 1: An Introduction*. New York: Vintage.
- Foucault, M. (1985). *The history of sexuality. Vol. 2: An Introduction*. New York: Vintage.
- Forshee, J. (2006). *Culture and customs of Indonesia*. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press.
- Gal, S. (1987). Code-switching and consciousness in the European periphery. *American Ethnologist*, 14(4), 637-653.
- Gardner-Chloros, P. (1987). Code-switching in relation to language contact and convergence. *Devenir bilingue*/parler bilingue Niemeyer Tubingen: 99Á/111*.
- Gardner-Chloros, P. (1997). Code-switching: language selection in three Strasbourg department stores. In N. Coupland & A. Jaworski (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics: A reader* (pp. 361-375). Macmillan Education UK.
- Gardner-Chloros, P. (2009). *Code-switching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- García, O., & Wei, L. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism, and education*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Gee, J. P. (1996). *Social linguistics and literacies: Ideology in discourses*. London: Taylor & Francis.
- Gee, J. P. (1999, [2005, 2011]). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
- Gee, J. P. (2011). *How to do discourse analysis: A toolkit*. Milton Park: Routledge.

- Gibbons, J. (1987). *Code-mixing and code choice: A Hong Kong case study*. Clevedon : Multilingual Matters.
- Graddol, L. (2000). *English as a global language*. London: The British Council.
- Grosjean, F. (1982 [2010]). *Life with two languages: an introduction to bilingualism*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Grosjean, F. (2004 [2006]). Studying bilinguals: Methodological and conceptual issues. In T. K. Bhatia & W. C. Ritchie (Eds.), *The Handbook of Bilingualism* (pp. 32-64). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Gumperz, J. J. (1982a). *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gumperz, J. J. (1982b). *Language and social identity*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Gunarwan, A. (1993, October). *Bahasa asing sebagai kendala pembinaan Bahasa Indonesia* [Foreign language as constraints in the development of the Indonesian language]. Paper presented as the Kongres Bahasa Indonesia VI, at Jakarta.
- Haarmann, H. (1989). *Symbolic values of foreign language use: From the Japanese case to a general sociolinguistic perspective* (Vol. 51). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Hanan, D. (2008) Changing social formations in Indonesian and Thai teen movies. In A. Heryanto (Ed.), *Popular culture in Indonesia: Fluid identities in post-authoritarian politics* (pp. 54-69). London: Routledge.
- Haryana, K. (2007). *Konsep Sekolah Bertaraf Internasional*. Jakarta: Direktorat Pembinaan Sekolah Menengah Pertama.
- Hatley, B. (2002). Literature, mythology and regime change: Some observations on recent Indonesian women's writing. In K. Robinson & S. Bessell (Eds.), *Women in Indonesia: Gender, equity and development* (pp. 130-143). Pasir Panjang, Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, Singapore.
- Haugen, E. (1953). *The Norwegian language in America: A study in bilingual behavior. The bilingual community* (Vol. 1). Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Heller, M. (1988). Introduction. In M. Heller (Ed.), *Codeswitching: Anthropological and sociolinguistic perspectives* (pp. 1-24). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Heller, M. (2007). Bilingualism as ideology and practice. In M. Heller (Ed.), *Bilingualism: A social approach* (pp. 1-38). New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Hellwig, T. (2007) "Nostalgia in Yogyakarta": The film *Biola Tak Berdawai* (stringless violin). In M. Leaf (Ed.), *Arts culture and social change in the new Indonesia*, (pp.101-118). Vancouver: IAR, UBC and Consulate General of the Republic of Indonesia.
- Heryanto, A. (2014). *Identity and pleasure: The politics of Indonesian screen culture*. Singapore: NUS Press.
- Heryanto, A. (1995). *Language of development and development of language: The case of Indonesia*. Pacific Linguistics, Series D: The Australian National University.
- Heryanto, A. (2008) Pop culture and competing identities. In A. Heryanto (Ed.), *Popular culture in Indonesia: Fluid identities in post-authoritarian politics* (pp. 1-36). London: Routledge.
- Higgins, C. (2003). "Ownership" of English in the Outer Circle: An Alternative to the NS-NNS Dichotomy. *TESOL Quarterly*, 37(4), 615-644.
- Higgins, C. (2009). *English as a local language: Post-colonial identities and multilingual practices* (Vol. 2). Clevedon: Channel View Books.
- Hill, J. (1999). Styling locally, styling globally: what does it mean? *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 3(4), 542-546.
- Hok-shing Chan, B. (2009). English in Hong Kong Cantopop: Language choice, code-switching and genre. *World Englishes*, 28(11), 107-129.
- Huda, N. (1994). The teaching of English in primary schools: Issues and problems. *TEFLIN Journal*, 6, 82-90.
- Idrus, N.I (2016). *Gender relations in Indonesian society*. Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill nv.
- Irvine, J.T. (1989). When talk isn't cheap: Language and political economy. *American Ethnologist* 16, 248-267.
- Irvine, J.T. & Gal, S. (2000). Language ideology and linguistic differentiation. In P.V. Kroskrity (Ed.), *Regimes of language: Ideologies, politics, and identities* (pp.35-84). Santa Fe, NM: Oxford: School of American Research Press.
- Isharyanti, N., & Cárdenas-Claros, M.S. (2009). Code-switching and code-mixing in internet chatting: between 'yes' 'ya' and 'si' a case study. *JALT CALL Journal*, 5 (3), 67-78.
- Jazadi, I. (2000). Constraints and resources for applying coomunicative approaches in Indonesia. *English Australia Journal*, 18(1), 31-40.
- Jenkins, J. (2003). *World Englishes: A resource book for students*. London: Routledge.

- Jenkins, J. (2009). English as a lingua franca: Interpretations and attitudes. *World Englishes*, 28(2), 200–207.
- Jonsson, C. (2010). Functions of code-switching in bilingual theater: An analysis of three Chicano plays. *Journal of pragmatics*, 42(5), 1296-1310.
- Jonsson, C. (2012). Making silenced voices heard: Code-switching in multilingual literary texts in Sweden. In M. Sebba, S. Mahootian & C. Jonsson (Eds.), *Language mixing and code-switching in writing* (pp. 212-232). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Jonsson, C. (2014). Power and resistance: Language mixing in three Chicano plays. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 18(2), 118-133.
- Jung, K. (2001). The genre of advertising in Korean: Strategies and “mixing.” In E. Thumboo (Ed.), *The three circles of English: Language specialists talk about the English language* (pp. 257-275). Singapore: UniPress.
- Jurriëns, E. (2008) Television dreams: simulation, for a new reality of Indonesia. In A. Heryanto (Ed.), *Popular culture in Indonesia: fluid identities in post-authoritarian politics* (pp.1-36). London: Routledge.
- Kachru, B.B. (1982). *The other tongue: English across cultures*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Kachru, B. B. (1985). Standards, codification and sociolinguistic realism: The English language in the outer circle. In R. Quirk & H. G. Widdowson (Eds.), *English in the world: Teaching and learning the language and literatures* (pp. 11–30). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Kachru, B.B. (1990). *The alchemy of English: The spread, functions, and models of non-native Englishes*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Kachru, B. B. (1991). Liberation linguistics and the Quirk concern. *English Today*, 25, 3–13.
- Kachru, B.B. (2005). *Asian Englishes: Beyond the canon*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
- Kachru, B.B. (2008). *The handbook of World Englishes*. Hoboken: Wiley.
- Kachru, Y. (1994). Sources of bias in SLA research: Monolingual bias in SLA research. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28(4), 795-800.
- Kachru, Y. & Nelson, L.C. (2006a). *World Englishes in Asian contexts*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.

- Kachru, Y. (2006b). Speaking and writing in world Englishes. In B.B. Kachru, Y. Kachru & C. Nelson (Eds.), *The handbook of world Englishes* (pp. 349–385). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Keane, W. (2003). Public speaking: On Indonesian as the language of the nation. *Public Culture* 15 (3), 503-530.
- Kitley, P. (2000). *Television, nation, and culture in Indonesia*. Athens, OH: Ohio University Center for International Studies.
- Kirkpatrick, A. (2010). *English as a lingua franca in ASEAN: a multilingual model*. Singapore: NUS Press.
- Kirkpatrick, A. (2014). English as a medium of instruction in East and Southeast Asian universities. In N. Murray & A. Scarino (Eds.), *Dynamic ecologies: A relational perspectives on languages education in the Asia-Pacific region* (pp. 15-29). Dordrecht: Springer.
- Kroskrity, P. V. (2000). Regimenting languages: Language ideological perspectives. In P.V. Kroskrity (Ed.), *Regimes of language: Ideologies, politics, and identities* (pp. 1-34). Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press.
- Kelly-Holmes, H., & Peitikäinen. (2013). Multilingualism and the periphery. In H. Kelly-Holmes & S. Peitikäinen (Eds.), *Multilingualism and the periphery* (pp.1-16). New York, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kelly-Holmes, H. (2005). *Advertising as multilingual communication*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire ; New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kusumawijaya, M. (2008). Seni (dan sastra) dalam perkembangan kota: Living together, growing Apart? hidup bersama, makin berpisah”, *SUSASTRA Jurnal Ilmu Sastra dan Budaya*,4 (1), 65-91.
- Lamb, M. & Coleman, H. (2008). Literacy in English and the transformation of self and society in post-Soeharto Indonesia. *The International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 11(2), 189-205.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (1991). Second language acquisition research: Staking out the territory. *Tesol Quarterly*, 315-350.
- Lauder, A. (2008). The status and function of English in Indonesia: A review of key factors. *Makara, Sosial Humaniora*, 12(1), 9-20.
- Labov, W. (1971). The notion of ‘system’ in creole languages. In D. Hymes (Ed.), *Pidginization and creolization of languages: Proceedings of a conference held at the University of the*

- West Indies Mona, Jamaica, April 1968* (pp. 447-472). London: Cambridge University Press.
- Labov, W. (1966). *The social stratification of English in New York City*. Washington, D.C: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Leap, W., & Boellstorff, T. (Eds.). (2004). *Speaking in queer tongues: globalization and gay language*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Le Page, R. B. & Tabouret-Keller, A. (1985). *Acts of identity: Creole-based approaches to language and ethnicity*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Lee, J.S. (2002). *Discourses of fusion and crossing: Pop culture in Korea and Japan* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (Accession No. 3200183).
- Lee, J. S. (2004). Linguistic hybridization in K-Pop: discourse of self-assertion and resistance. *World Englishes*, 23(3), 429-450.
- Lee, J. S. (2006). Linguistic constructions of modernity: English mixing in Korean television commercials. *Language in Society*, 35(01), 59-91.
- Lee, J. S. (2007). I'm the illest fucka. *English Today*, 23(2), 54-60.
- Lee, J. S. (2012). Please teach me English: English and metalinguistic discourse in South Korean film. In J.S. Lee, & A. Moody (Eds.), *English in Asian Popular Culture* (pp. 127-150). Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
- Lestari, D. (2011). *Madre*. Jakarta: Bentang Pustaka.
- Lewis, M. P., Simons, G. F., Fennig, C. D. (2015). *Ethnologue: Languages of the world* (18th ed). Dallas, TX: Sil International.
- Li, D. C. S. & Tse, E. C. Y. (2002). One day in the life of a 'purist', *International Journal of Bilingualism* 6, 147-202.
- Li, D.C.S. (2000). Cantonese-English code-switching research in Hong Kong: A Y2K review, *World Englishes* 19 (3), 305-322.
- Liddle, W. (1988). *Politics and culture in Indonesia*. Ann Arbor: U of Michigan University Press.
- Lie, A. (2007). Education policy and EFL curriculum in Indonesia: Between the commitment to competence and the quest for higher test scores. *TEFLIN Journal*, 18 (1), 1-14.

- Lindsay, J. (2011). Media and morality, pornography post Suharto. In K. Sen and D. Hill (Eds.), *Politics and the media in twenty-first century Indonesia* (pp. 172-195). New York: Routledge.
- Lim, M. (2011). *@crossroads: Democratization & corporation of media in Indonesia*. Arizona: Participatory Media Lab, ASU & Ford Foundation.
- Lipski, J. (2005). Code-switching or borrowing? No sé so no puedo decir, you know. In *Selected proceedings of the second workshop on Spanish sociolinguistics* (pp. 1-15).
- Locke, T. (2004). *Critical discourse analysis*. London: Continuum.
- Lowenberg, P. H. (1985, July). *Malay in Indonesia, Malaysia, Singapore: Three faces of a national language*. Papers presented at a Workshop of the Linguistics Society of America Institute at Washington, DC.
- Lowenberg, P. H. (1991). English as an additional language in Indonesia. *World Englishes*, 10(2), 127-138.
- Lutz, C. (1998). *Unnatural emotions: Everyday sentiments on a Micronesian atoll and their challenge to western theory*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Luvaas, B. (2012). *DIY Style: Fashion, music and global digital cultures*. London: Berg Publishers.
- Macaro, E. (2001). Analysing student teachers' codeswitching in foreign language classrooms: Theories and decision making. *The Modern Language Journal*, 85(4), 531-548.
- MacSwan, J. (2004 [2006]). Code switching and grammatical theory. In T. K. Bhatia & W. C. Ritchie (Eds.), *The Handbook of bilingualism* (pp. 283-311). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Mahootian, S. (1993). *A null theory of codeswitching* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from [ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global](#). (Accession No. 9415773).
- Mahootian, S. (2005). Linguistic change and social meaning: Codeswitching in the media. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 9(3-4), 361-375.
- Mahootian, S. (2012). Repertoires and resources: Accounting for code-mixing in the media. In M. Sebba, S. Mahootian and C. Jonsson (Eds.), *Language mixing and code-switching in writing* (pp. 192-211). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Marcellino, M. (1990). *The forms and functions of western loanwords in selected Indonesian print media* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from [ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global](#). (Accession No. 9122123).

- Martin, E. (2002a). Mixing English in French advertising. *World Englishes*, 21(3), 375-402.
- Martin, E. (2002b). Cultural images and different varieties of English in French television commercials. *English Today*, 18(04), 8-20.
- McClure, E. (1981). Formal and functional aspects of the codeswitched discourse of bilingual children. In R. Duran (Ed.), *Latino Language and Communicative Behavior* (pp. 69-92). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Meilisa. (2013). *Code-switching and code-mixing found in the novel Supernova: Ksatria, Puteri dan Bintang Jatuh by Dewi Lestari* (Unpublished master's thesis). Universitas Brawijaya, Malang, Indonesia.
- Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation: Revised and expanded from qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Mesthrie, R., & Bhatt, R. (2008). *World Englishes: The study of new linguistic varieties*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Milroy, L., & Muysken, P. (Eds.). (1995). *One speaker, two languages: cross disciplinary perspectives on code-switching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Moeliono, A. M. (1985). *Pengembangan dan pembinaan bahasa: Ancangan alternatif di dalam perencanaan bahasa*. Jakarta: Djambatan.
- Montes-Alcalà, C (2000). *Two languages, one pen: socio-pragmatic functions in written Spanish-English code-switching* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from [ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global](#). (Accession No. 3007160).
- Montes-Alcalà, C. (2012). Code-switching in US-Latino novels. In M. Sebba, S. Mahootian and C. Jonsson (Eds.), *Language mixing and code-switching in writing* (pp. 68-88). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Montes-Alcalá, C. (2015). Code-switching in US Latino literature: The role of biculturalism. *Language and Literature*, 24(3), 264-281.
- Moodley, V. (2007). Codeswitching in the multilingual English first language classroom. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 10(6), 707-722.
- Moody, A. J. (2006). English in Japanese popular culture and J-Pop music. *World Englishes*, 25(2), 209-222.
- Moody, A., & Matsumoto, Y. (2003). "Don't touch my moustache": Language blending and code ambiguation by two j-pop artists. *Asian Englishes*, 6(1), 4-33.

- Munir, M. (2011). Queering the epistemology of 'coming out': the representation of male same-sex relationship in Nia Dinata's *Arisan*. *Jati*, 6, 113-129.
- Murdiyatmoko, J. (2007). *Sosiologi: Memahami dan mngkaji masyarakat*. Bandung, Jawa Barat: Grafindo Media Pratama.
- Murata, K., & Jenkins, J. (2009). Introduction: Global Englishes from global perspectives. In E. Murata, & J. Jenkins. (Eds.), *Global Englishes in Asian contexts: Current and future deabtes* (pp. 1-13). London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Muslich, M. (2010). *Bahasa Indonesia pada era globalisasi: Kedudukan, fungsi, pembinaan, dan pengembangan*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.
- Muysken, P. (2000). *Bilingual speech: A typology of code-mixing* (Vol. 11). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Myers Scotton, C. (1983). The negotiation of identities in conversation: A theory of markedness and code choice. *International journal of the sociology of language*, 1983(44), 115-136.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (1988). *Code-switching and types of multilingual communities* (pp. 61-79). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Myers-Scotton, Carol. (1993a). *Duelling languages: grammatical structure in code- switching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Myers-Scotton, Carol. (1993b). *Social motivations for codeswitching: Evidence from Africa*. Oxford; UK: Oxford University Press.
- Nababan, P.W.J. (1985). Bilingualism in Indonesia: Ethnic language maintenance and the spread of the national language. *Southeast Asian Journal of Social Science*, 13(1), 1-18.
- Norton Peirce, B. (1995). Social identity, investment, and language learning. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29(1), 9-31.
- Norton Pierce, B. (2000). *Identity and language learning: Gender, ethnicity and educational change*. Editorial Dunken.
- Nirmolo, S., Ponsen, D., Shamara, A. (Producers), & Dinata, N. (Director). (2004). *Arisan!* Indonesia: Kalyana Shira Film.
- Oetomo, D., & Boellstorf, T. (2015). Afterword: Reflections on sexual rights, politics and sexuality studies in Indonesia. In L.R. Bennet, & S.G. Davies (Eds.), *Sex and sexualities in contemporary Indonesia* (pp. 307-317). London: Routledge.

- Omoniyi, T. (2006). Hip-hop through the world Englishes lens: A response to globalization. *World Englishes* 25, 195–208.
- O'Rourke, K. (2002). *Reformasi: The struggle for power in post-Soeharto Indonesia*. Crows Nest, N.S.W: Allen & Unwin.
- Paauw, S. (2009). One land, one nation, one language: An analysis of Indonesia's national language policy. In H. Lehnert-LeHouillier & A.B. Fine (Eds.), *University of Rochester Working Papers in the Language Sciences*, 5(1), 2-16.
- Paramadhita, I. (2014). *The Wild Child Desire's: Cinema, sexual politics, and the experimental nation in Post-authoritarian Indonesia*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (Accession No. 3635288).
- Park, J. S.Y., & Wee, L. (2012). *Markets of English: linguistic capital and language policy in a globalizing world*. New York: Routledge.
- Parker, L. (2008). Theorising adolescent sexualities in Indonesia—Where 'something different happens'. *Intersections: Gender and sexuality in Asia and the Pacific*, 18. Retrieved from <http://intersections.anu.edu.au/issue18/parker.htm>
- Pavlenko, A., & Blackledge, A. (2004). Introduction: New theoretical approaches to the study of negotiation of identities in multilingual contexts. In A. Pavlenko & A. Blackledge (Eds.), *Negotiation of identities in multilingual contexts*, (pp. 1-33). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Pennycook, A. (2010). *Language as a local practice* (1st ed). Milton Park, Abingdon: Routledge.
- Pennycook, A. (2009). *Global linguistic flows: hip hop cultures, youth identities, and the politics of language*. New York, NY : Routledge.
- Pennycook, A. (1994). *The cultural politics of English as an international language*. New York: Longman Publishing.
- Pennycook, A. (1998). *English and the discourses of colonialism*. Hoboken: Taylor and Francis.
- Pennycook, A. (2001). *Critical applied linguistics: A critical introduction*. Mahwah, N.J: L. Erlbaum.
- Pennycook, A. (2003). Global Englishes, Rip Slyme, and performativity. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 7 (4), 513-533.
- Pennycook, A. (2007). *Global Englishes and transcultural flows*. London: Routledge.
- Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Piller, I. (2003). Advertising as a site of language contact. *Annual review of applied linguistics*, 23, 170-183.
- Poplack, S. (1980). "Sometimes I'll start a sentence in Spanish y termino en español." *Linguistics*, 18, 591-618
- Pradina, F.A., Soeriasoemantri, T., & Heriyanto. (2013). Code-switching as the Positive Politeness Strategies in Indonesian Fourth Grade Students' Conversation. *Research on Humanities and Social Sciences* 3(22), 19-24.
- Raedts, M., Dupré, N., Henrickx, J. & Debrauwere, S. (2015), English in television commercials in Belgium, France, Italy, the Netherlands and Spain. *World Englishes*, 34(4), 576-599.
- Rahardjo, S. (1994). Between two worlds: Modern state and traditional society in Indonesia, *Law & Society Review*, 28 (3), 493-502.
- Rampton, B. (2005). *Crossing: language & ethnicity among adolescents* (2nd ed). Manchester, UK: St. Jerome Pub.
- Rencana Strategis Departemen Pendidikan Nasional 2005-2009. The 2005-2009 Main Policy and Strategy of Department of National Education). (2005-2009).
- Renandya, W.A. (2004). Indonesia. In H.W. Kam & R.Y.L Wong (Eds.), *Language policies and language education: The impact in East Asian countries in the next decade* (pp.115-138). Singapore: Marshall Cavendish.
- Ritzer, G. (2004). *The MacDonalization of society*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.
- Romaine, S. (1995). *Bilingualism* (2nd ed). Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.
- Robinson, K. (2015). Masculinity, sexuality, and Islam: The gender politics of regime change in Indonesia. In S.G Davies & L.R. Bennet (Eds.), *Sex and sexualities in contemporary Indonesia* (pp. 51-68) Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
- Robinson, K. (2009). *Gender, Islam and democracy in Indonesia*. London: Routledge.
- Romaine, S. (2000). *Language in society: An introduction to sociolinguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rosidi, A. (2010). *Bus bis bas: Berbagai masalah bahasa Indonesia*. Jakarta: Pustaka Jaya.
- Sarkar, M., & Low, B. (2012). Multilingualism and popular culture. In M. Martin-Jones, A. Blackledge, & A. Creese (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of multilingualism* (pp. 403-418). New York, NY: Routledge.

- Sarkar, M., Winer, L., & Sarkar, K. (2005). Multilingual code-switching in Montreal hip-hop: Mayhen meets methods, or, "Tout moune qui talk trash kiss mon black ass du nord." In J. Cohen, K. T. McAlistar, K. Rolstad, J. MacSwan (Eds.) *ISB4: Proceedings of The 4th International Symposium on Bilingualism* (pp. 2057-2074). Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.
- Sarkar, M., & Winer, L. (2006). Multilingual codeswitching in Quebec rap: Poetry, pragmatics and performativity. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 3(3), 173-192.
- Sears, L. J. (1996). Fragile identities: Deconstructing women and Indonesia. In L. J. Sears (Ed.), *Fantasizing the feminine in Indonesia* (pp.1-44). Durham North Carolina: Duke University Press.
- Sebba, M. (2012). Researching and theorising multilingual texts. In M. Sebba, S. Mahootian & C. Jonsson (Eds.), *Language mixing and code-switching in writing* (pp. 1-26). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Sebba, M., & Wootton, T. (1998). We, they and identity: Sequential versus identity-related explanation in code-switching. In P. Auer (Ed.), *Code-switching in conversation: language, interaction and identity* (pp. 262- 286). London: Routledge.
- Scheiner, E. W. (2003). The dynamics of new Englishes: From identity construction to dialect birth. *Language*, 79, 2, 233-281.
- Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 10, 209-231.
- Selinker, L. (1974). Interlanguage. In J. C. Richards (Ed.), *Error analysis: Perspectives on second language acquisition* (pp. 31-54). London: Longman.
- Selinker, L. (1992). *Rediscovering interlanguage*. New York: Longman.
- Sen, K. (1994). *Indonesian Cinema: Framing the New Order*. Atlantic Highlands, N.J: Zed Books.
- Sen, K., & Hill, T. D. (2000[2007]). *Media, culture, and politics in Indonesia*. Melbourne: Oxford University Press.
- Sert, O. (2005). The Functions of Code-Switching in ELT Classrooms. *Online Submission*, 11(8).
- Setyawan, I. (2011). *9 Summer 10 Autumns: Dari kota apel ke the big apple*. Jakarta: Gramedia.
- Skiba, R. (1997). Code switching as a countenance of language interference. *The Internet TESL Journal*, 3(10), 1-6.
- Shohamy, E., & Gorter, D. (2009). Introduction. In E. Shohamy & D. Gorter (Eds.), *Linguistic landscape: Expanding the scenery* (pp.1-10). New York: Routledge.

- Silverstein, M. (1979). Language structure and linguistic ideology. In *The elements: A parasection on linguistic units and levels*. In P. Clyne, W.F. Hanks, & C.L. Hofbauer. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.
- Smith-Hefner, N. J. (2007). Youth Language, gaul sociability, and the new Indonesian middle class. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 17(2), 184–203.
- Sneddon, J. N. (2003). *The Indonesian language: Its history and role in modern society*. Sydney, NSW: UNSW Press.
- Stanlaw, J. (2004). *Japanese English: Language and culture contact* (Vol. 1). Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
- Sumarsih., Siregar, M., Bahri, S., Sanjaya, D. (2014). Code Switching and Code Mixing in Indonesia: Study in Sociolinguistics. *English Language and Literature Studies*, 4(1), 77-92.
- Suryakusuma, J.I. (2011). *State ibuism: The social construction of womanhood in New Order Indonesia*. Depok, West Java, Indonesia: Komunitas Bambu.
- Tabouret-Keller, A. (1997). Language and identity. In F. Coulmas (Ed.), *The handbook of sociolinguistics* (pp. 315-326). Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Takashi, K. (1990). A sociolinguistic analysis of English borrowings in Japanese advertising texts. *World Englishes*, 9, 327-341.
- Takashi, K. (1992). Language and desired identity in contemporary Japan. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication*, 3(1), 133-144.
- Tatyzo, C. (2011). Nia Dinata and Indonesia's post-New Order film culture, *Flinders Asia Center Occasional Paper* 3. 1-42.
- Teeuw, A. (1984). *Sastra dan ilmu sastra: Pengantar teori sastra*. Jakarta: Pustaka Jaya.
- Thompson, K.D. (2012). *Zimbabwe's cinematic arts: Language, power, identity*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Thompson, K.D. (2013). Strategies for taming a Swahili husband: Zanzibari women's talk about love in Islamic marriage. *Agenda: Empowering women for gender equality*, 27 (2), 65-75.
- Tomlison, B. (1990). Managing change in Indonesian high schools. *ELT Journal*, 44(1), 25-37.
- Undang-undang Republik Indonesia No. 33 Tahun 2009 tentang Perfilman (The Law of the Indonesian Republic No. 33/ 2009 on Film). (2009).

- Undang-undang Republik Indonesia No. 44 Tahun 2008 tentang Pornografi (The Law of the Indonesian Republic No. 44/ 2008 on Pornography). (2008).
- Utomo, I., & Mc.Donald, P. (2008, October). *Religion, media, westernization, and sexuality among young people in urban middle-class Indonesia*. Retrieved from http://intersections.anu.edu.au/issue18/utomo_mcdonald.htm
- Valdés-Fallis, G. (1976). Code-switching in bilingual Chicano poetry. *Hispania*, 59(4), 877-886.
- Valentine, T. M. (2001). Women and the other tongue. *The three circles of English*, 143-158.
- Van Dijk, T.A (1984). *Prejudice in discourse*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Vatikiotis, M.R. J. (1993). *Indonesian politics under Suharto: Order, development and pressure for change*. London: Routledge.
- Vickers, A. (2013). *A history of modern Indonesia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Vízcaíno, J.G.M. (2011). Code-breaking/code-making: A new language approach in advertising. *Journal of Pragmatics* 43, 2095-2109.
- Wardhaugh, R. (2011). *An introduction to sociolinguistics* (Vol. 28). Malden, MA: Wiley Blackwell Publishers.
- Warburton, E. (2006). Private choice of public obligation?: Institutional and social regimes of veiling in contemporary Indonesia (Unpublished master's thesis). The University of Sydney, Sydney, Australia.
- Weedon, C. (1997). *Feminist practice & poststructuralist theory*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Wei, L. (Ed.). (2000). Dimension of bilingualism. In L.Wei (Ed.) *The bilingualism reader* (pp. 2-21). London: Routledge.
- Wei, L. (1994). Three generations, two languages, one family: Language choice and language shift in a Chinese community in Britain. *Language in Society* 25(1), 147-151.
- Weinreich, U. (1953[1968]). *Languages in contact: Findings and problems*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Widdowson, H. (1994). The ownership of English. *Tesol Quarterly* 28(2), 377-389.
- Wilkins, R., & Gareis, E. (2006). Emotion expression and the locution "I love you": A cross-cultural study. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 30, 51-75.

Wilson, I. (2014, February). *Resisting democracy: Front Pembela Islam and Indonesia's 2014 elections*. Paper presented at the Researchers at Singapore's Institute of Southeast Asian Studies share their understanding of current events, Singapore, Singapore.

Woolard, K. A. (1985). Language variation and cultural hegemony: Toward an integration of sociolinguistic and social theory. *American Ethnologist*, 12(4), 738–748.

Woolard, K., & Schieffelin, B. (1994). Language ideology. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 23, 55–82.

Wright, S. (2004). *Language policy and language planning*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Yassi, A.H. (2001). Indolish (Indonesian-English): Toward a typology of Indonesian-English code-switching. *Analisis*, 2(2), 235-252.

Zein, M. S. (2017). Elementary English education in Indonesia: Policy developments, current practices, and future prospects. *English Today*, 129(33), Vol. 1, 53-59.

Zentella, A. C. (1997). *Growing up bilingual: Puerto Rican children in New York*. Malden, MA: Wiley Blackwell Publishers.

Internet Sources:

Ahniar, N.F., & Galih, B. (2011, January 3). Ketika presiden menggunakan bahasa gado-gado. *Viva.co.id*. Retrieved from <http://nasional.news.viva.co.id/news/read/197249-ketika-presiden-menggunakan-bahasa-gado-gado>

Bahasa asing di sekolah langgar undang-undang (2010, November 8), *Kompas*. Retrieved from <http://edukasi.kompas.com/read/2010/11/08/09470730/Bahasa.Asing.di.Sekolah.Langgar.UU-4>

Benningshof, Y. (2012, April 12). Director Nia Dinata's arisan: Sex and the city with substance. *Latitudes.nu*. Retrieved from <http://latitudes.nu/director-nia-dinatas-arisan-sex-and-the-city-with-substance/>

Danareksa. (2017). *About us*. Retrieved from <http://www.danareksa.com/aboutus/aboutus.html>

Hutton, J. (2016, February 16). Anti gay actions in Indonesia threaten a fragile population *The New York Times*, Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com/2016/02/16/world/asia/indonesia-antigay-sentiment.html>

IELTS. (2017). *What is IELTS*. Retrieved from <https://www.ielts.org/>

Indonesia's Aceh introduces strict anti-gay law (2015, October 23). *BBC News*. Retrieved from <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-34612544>

- Kamal, R. (2013, February 2013). RSBI and SBI, aturannya di Pasal 50 Ayat (3) di UU Sisdiknas dibatalkan MK. *Berita 2 Bahasa*. Retrieved from <http://berita2bahasa.com/berita/01/4290901-rsbi-amp-sbi-aturannya-di-pasal-50-ayat-3-uu-sisdiknas-dibatalkan-mk>
- Karmini, N. (2016, February 12). Indonesia warns messaging apps to drop same-sex emoticons. *The Jakarta Post*. Retrieved from <http://www.thejakartapost.com/news/2016/02/12/indonesia-warns-messaging-apps-drop-same-sex-emoticons.html>
- Karundeng, N. (2012, September 24). *Mr. President SBY, are you an Indonesian and do you speak bahasa Indonesia??*. Retrieved from http://www.kompasiana.com/ninoy/mr-president-sby-are-you-an-indonesian-and-do-you-speak-bahasa-indonesia_5517e855a33311a107b6608d
- Kusno, G. (2014, August 25). *Sebuah kasus bahasa gado-gado Inggris-Indonesia*. Retrieved from http://www.kompasiana.com/gustaafkusno/sebuah-kasus-bahasa-gado-gado-inggris-indonesia_54f5f271a33311d4088b45ba
- Lamb, Katie. (2015, May). *Indonesia's priests face uncertain future*. Retrieved from <http://america.aljazeera.com/articles/2015/5/12/indonesias-transgender-priests-face-uncertain-future.html>
- Lembaga Sensor Film. (2016). Retrieved from <http://lsf.go.id/sejarahsensor>
- Mawungtyas, D. (2006, July 27). Universitas Brawihaya buka kelas internasional. *Tempo*. Retrieved from <https://m.tempo.co/read/news/2006/07/27/05880770/universitas-brawijaya-buka-kelas-internasional>
- Muliastuti, L. (2016, April 7). Pamor Bahasa Indonesia. *Koran Jakarta*. Retrieved from <http://www.koran-jakarta.com/pamor-bahasa-indonesia/>
- mongrel. (2017). In *Merriam-Webster.com*. Retrieved April 8, 2017, <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/mongrel>
- Schonhardt, S. (2013, January 28). Indonesia's Sexual Education Revolution. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com/2013/01/28/world/asia/28iht-educlede28.html>
- Simon, G. (2016, February 22). *Ethnologue*. Retrieved from <https://www.ethnologue.com/>
- Sukmawijaya, A. (2016, January 28). Berikut tiga kampus yang terapkan kuliah khusus internasional. *Tempo*. Retrieved from <https://m.tempo.co/read/news/2016/01/28/079740142/berikut-3-kampus-yang-terapkan-kuliah-khusus-internasional>

- The British International School. (2016). *About Us*. Retrieved from <http://www.bsj.sch.id/>
- The Jakarta Intercultural School. (2016). *The JIS story*. Retrieved from <https://www.jisedu.or.id/story/index.aspx>
- The sudden intensity of Indonesian's anti gay onslaught (2016, February 29). *BBC News*. Retrieved from <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-35657114>
- The World Bank. (2015, September). *Indonesia*. Retrieved from <http://data.worldbank.org/country/indonesia>
- Travel State Govt. (2017). *Dual nationality*. Retrieved from <https://travel.state.gov/content/travel/en/legal-considerations/us-citizenship-laws-policies/citizenship-and-dual-nationality/dual-nationality.html>
- Universitas Gadjah Mada. (2016). *Program internasional*. Retrieved from <https://ugm.ac.id/id/akademik/3619-program.internasional>
- Wahyuningkintarsih, V. (2016, August 17). Bahasa gado-gado *di sekitar kita*. Retrieved from <http://www.femina.co.id/trending-topic/bahasa-gado-gado-di-sekitar-kita->

Shout Outs

In this occasion, I would also take delight to thank my family and the people I have met and made friendship with. This acknowledgment functions as a token of appreciation to the people that I have met during this journey and have contributed to my life in one way or the other.

First and foremost, I would like to thank:

Bapak, the light of my life, *Terima kasih, Bapak. Semoga Bapak selalu damai dan bahagia di sisi Allah SWT. Al Fatihah* for you always, *Bapak*. Keep watching me with your loving eyes from heaven.

Ibu, the rock in the family, the one who consistently prays for me, unconditionally. *Terima kasih, Ibu, tanpa Ibu, Nelly tidak akan pernah ada dan sampai ke titik ini.*

Lesky, my best friend, soul mate, discussion partner, my journey partner, life partner, my clown, and my inspiration. The best friend one could ever have. *사랑해요*, Lesky. Thank you for being there, and thank you for being my rock, my shoulder to cry on.

Uni Dessy, Mas Iwan, trio Izzatis: Zaki Izzati, Kanaya Izzati, and Adkiya Izzati. Hopefully, this journey of mama's will be your inspiration: that dreams are for those who don't stop.

For Mama, Papa, Ika, for giving me other family members to love.

This appreciation also goes to my friends, colleagues and families for the supports and encouragement they have provided me along the way, and they are as follows:

University of Wisconsin-Madison

I thank the UW-Library systems and librarians have been a great help in my research and writing process. In particular and the UW Law Library where I worked as a graduate student librarian from Spring 2013-2015: Mary Jo, Jay Tucker, and everyone at the library.

I would like to acknowledge the friendship of Qian Wu, a friend I found in Madison: Thank you for your continued support despite the distances between College Station, PA, Madison, WI, and Seattle, WA. Hope to see you in one way or the other wherever we are pursuing our futures.

Also, I would like to thank Anthony Medrano and his wife, Adila Prasodjo. Thank you, Anth, for our uncoordinated but parallel Hawaii-Athens-Madison adventures.

Thank you to my friends who have been with me wherever and whenever, my SLA and Curriculum & Instruction colleagues (Bicho, Alice, Fatemeh, Aeree in Leiden, Sneez, Sue, Blanca, Zhijun, Jan Hagedorn, and everyone!), my seniors in SLA who have taught me many valuable lessons (Chiharu Shima and Margaret Merrill), my 2011 cohort (Kazeem, Leah, Sandrine! I still remember how we tried to conquer the preliminary exams during our weekend

and early morning study groups!), Melanie Salgado (my former statistics TA, now friend), and Cindy for our chats that kept me awake and intellectually stimulated.

I also thank Dian Mawene Lattu and Adya for their kindness helped through my first year in Madison, Wisconsin: Thank you so much.

University of Montana

My sincere gratitude goes out to the teaching squad in the Indonesian Program at the University of Montana (Mbak Arti, Emma, Fendi, and Wuri, you guys are the best!), the management teams, Shaima Khanjani, Don Loranger, Mark Schaimpoo, Mike Schoeroder, and everyone at the University of Montana and JBLM. Thank you for all the support.

Ohio University, Athens

My deepest appreciation to Professors Scott Jarvis and Peter Githinji, my professors in the Department of Linguistics at Ohio University, who have been generous with their time and support for almost a decade now, even after I graduated from Gordy.

Thanks, too, to the friends I found in Gordy, Athens, Ohio: Ryoko Oi, Jon and Genny Freeman, Barbara, Yuan, Maru, and everyone who shares Athens memories with me.

University of Hawaii at Manoa

Many, many thanks go out to Professor Uli Kozok for opening the door of opportunity, Stephen Tschudi, my mentor and the proofreader for my personal statement for the graduate studies, Mbak Yati Paseng, and Mayco. Also, very best Aloha goes out to Teteh Neneng Syahadati Rosmy, for her friendship and sisterhood. I still remember our sahoor back in 2006, in Hale Manoa, Teteh. Also, I would like to send my warmest aloha to my Hawaiian girlfriends who have become my lifetime friends: Emily Lee, Wei Wei, Gao Fan. Yoko Kusumoto, Mayco, Yoshi, and everyone I met during my year at UH-Manoa: Mahalo nui loa.

I also would like to show my gratitude to my **Northampton, Massachusetts** adventure friends: Barbara Cerise, Asako Kanoeka, Carolina Borja, Jing, and everyone I met in NoHo. Thank you for our memories in Northampton, our dinners together, our sleepovers, our laughter, our café time in one tiny yet beautiful Northampton.

I also would like to show my gratitude towards the friendship of Mbak Noor Rahmawaty, a friend I made during **the 2006 Fulbright FLTA** adventure: Thank you for our wonderful times in NYC, DC, and SF. Also I thank the friendship of the 2011 Fulbright awardees: Grace, Adies, Dwi, Tanti Sari, Fima, Irene, Sakti (Chaki), Ruri, Edo, Edwin; and all of the 2011 Indonesian Fulbrighters. Thank you!

The Netherlands

I am grateful for the beautiful memories and beautiful friends that I met and made back in the Netherlands: Desi, Sam, Widha, Amel, Wilma, Qonita, and everyone.

This journey would not have been the same without the long distance chats with my 2-4 and *hihihi* squads; Meita, Kiko, Windiana, Windi, Lisa, Inoy, Rina (my New York best memory, and soon more memories are about to be made!), Mbak Elizabeth Arti Wulandari, Stephanie Kirtiadi (ELKA), Maryam Heydari, Ball Woranon, Andrea Johannes, Ella Datsenko, Mbak Ratri, Anis, Mbak Sakti, Steve, Adeline and family (thank you so much, Del), Pak Dustin, Bu Erlin, Vanani, Grace, and the Indonesian communities in Honolulu, Hawaii; Athens, Ohio; Eindhoven, the Netherlands; and Madison, Wisconsin.

I will never forget the support and help I received from Yuseva Wardhana, Setyorukmi Anggorowati, Sri Purnamawati, Rostati, and Lewina Aguskin, from whom I have learned so much about English language education in Indonesian universities and public schools. Also, my supervisors, Bu Teriska, Bu Poppy, colleagues and good friends in PPPTK Bahasa, Depdiknas (Nunus, Suy, Jehan): thank you!

I am also deeply grateful to Megan Milks and Emily Robinson who proofread my dissertation draft expertly and attentively.

Last but not the least, I shout my sincere gratitude to my soul friend from Depok to London: Ratih, who has been very patient and supportive.

My American adventure started in the city of Honolulu and ended in the city of Seattle. I have been blessed to have experienced life in a number of states, i.e., Hawaii, Ohio, Wisconsin, and Washington state. My PhD journey began in Madison, Wisconsin, and comes to an end in Seattle, Washington. To everyone with whom I have crossed paths, thank you.

This journey, more than anything else, has been one of rediscovering myself. This is a journey that has given me a lot of space to reflect on myself, my way of thinking, my perception of life, and my surroundings. This journey has been equally painful and exciting. This has been truly one humbling, rewarding, and meaningful lifetime journey.

Alhamdulillah, yet this is not the end. This is actually the beginning. *Bismillah*.