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Abstrak

Kajian alih kode dalam peristiwa tutur digunakan penulis untuk mengungkapkan hubungan yang kompleks antara penutur dengan pendengarnya. Alih kode memperlihatkan penggunaan footing, dan ia juga bersinggungan dengan aspek-aspek identitas, seperti suku bangsa, kelas sosial, jender, dll. Kajian dilakukan baik pada tataran mikro maupun makro. Pada tingkat mikro diperlihatkan bagaimana alih kode yang merupakan bagian dari penutur (merupakan strategi komunikasinya), yang diterima oleh pendengar. Pada kajian tingkat makro, penulis mengungkapkan perilaku linguistik dan paralinguistik penutur yang dalam interaksi dapat mengungkapkan identitas.

Introduction

In this paper I analyze code-switching in the moments of speech, in terms of how it reveals the complex relationships between co-participants (i.e. speaker-hearer), how code-switching reveals the deployment of footing (Goffman 1981) and how code-switching intersects with aspects of one’s identity such as ethnicity, social class and rank, gender, etc. (Errington 1998; Goodwin 1990; Gumperz 1982; Kroskrity 1993; Zentella 1998), as these are oriented to by co-participants. My analysis will be both on the micro and macro levels. In the micro-level analysis, I study how code-switching is part of speakers’ basic communicative strategies in aligning with hearers by referring to the basic organization of talk, such as sequence organization (Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson 1974) and the orientation of speakers and hearers. In the macro-level analysis, I try to reveal some facts about speakers’ linguistic and paralinguistic (i.e. gesture) behavior that reveal their multiple social identities in the interaction.

The data were collected from spontaneous multi-party conversations in natural settings between Indonesian speakers from different ethnic backgrounds who also speak languages other than Indonesian. They are mundane conversations that take place during parties and other informal encounters. The collected and transcribed data provide significant insights into the way social relations and identities are constructed through natural interactions.

Footing and participation frameworks

In order to observe relevant and crucial phenomena of code-switching and reported speech embedded in narratives and the other aspects of narrative that would explain how code-switching and reported speech as social
phenomena are conducted in moment-by-moment interaction, I implemented the following frameworks:

Goffman’s frame analysis, participant framework and footing

Using these frameworks I analyzed the laminated entities involved in the framing of talk, the participants’ status and the roles or functions of the speakers as well as the hearers in the interactions. Participant status indicates the roles of several members of the encompassing social gathering.

The following is the functions of speakers and hearers according to Goffman (1981):

1. **The Role of Speaker**:
   - Sounding box/ animator
   - Author
   - Principal
   - Figure: protagonist, character in a described scene

2. **The Role of Hearer**: see figure 1.

Goffman’s framework makes it possible for the analysis of speakers’ as well as hearers’ roles. However, he neglects a very important aspect that is the reflexive awareness that speakers have through taking into accounts the relationship between their hearers and their hearers’ response. Although significant, hearer’s roles have been neglected in many discussions of narratives in discourse. This paper argues that this reflexive awareness also shapes the interaction.

In telling their narratives, speakers many times change their footing. When speakers change their footing, a change in participant alignment and a change in participants’ frame for events may take place. A change in footing involves code-switching, sound markers, gestures, etc. The other framework relevant to the analysis is Goffman’s Participation Framework that indicates the relationships of all the persons in the social gathering for the moment of speech.

Conversational analysis framework of sequence organization (Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson 1974)

Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson provides a detailed analysis of what is really taking place in the moment of speech. They take into account different facets of conversational organization. Concrete details of social interactions in speech are revealed through the notions of turn-taking and adjacency pairs. Using this framework, I analyze code-switching and reported speech in stories that are embedded within conversations in which multiple participants produce sequences of action.

Discussion

Language shifts

In this section I present how code-switching and footing are deployed to reveal the complex relationships between co-participants (i.e. speaker-hearer) and the characters in a described scene. I observe the basic organiza-
tion of talk, such as sequence organization and the orientation of the speaker. I also reveal some facts about the speaker’s linguistic behavior that reveal his or her identity.

The data were collected from a spontaneous multi-party conversation between four Indonesian native speakers (a brother and a sister and a couple). The siblings are originally from Jakarta. They are speakers of Indonesian and English. The couple who is originally from East Java speaks Javanese, Indonesian and English. During the conversation, the co-participants use more of the Jakartanese dialect. The couple code-switch from their Javanese Indonesian when talking to the siblings who are from Jakarta; a common practice to accommodate the siblings since they might not understand some Javanese words often used by Javanese Indonesian speakers when talking in Indonesian. The co-participants in this dialogue know each other very well, thus the conversation could be considered informal and intimate. The conversation was videotaped during lunch at the couple’s apartment in California when the siblings came to visit.

In the following excerpt, the co-participants are talking about the chili sauce served on the dining table and their reaction and opinions about having chili sauce. (Note: Yuni is the wife, Uli is the husband, and Vini is the sister).

Excerpt 1:

(Lines deleted)

174. Yuni: Sudah coba tuh
   PERF try PRT
   (Have you) already tried?

175. Vini: Ngga::k.(+)
   NEG
   No

176. Vini: Bisa sih tahan pedes kok
   can PRT endure spicy PRT
   (I) can eat spicy food, of course

177. kalau misalnya disuruh makan gitu
    if for-instance PASS-tell eat
    like_that
    if I have to eat (it), you know

178. cuman(.) kadang perutnya yang
     only sometimes stomach-TOP LK
     NEG endure
     But, sometimes my stomach cannot
     take (it).

179. Yuni: Hmm

180. Uli: Tapi kalau pedes itu
       but if spicy that
       But spiciness

181. ini ya menghilangi:: menghilangkan (.)
    this yes lose-TRANS lose-TRANS
    nauseated
    this, gets rid of the richness (of the food)

182. mblenek iku boso Jowo h.h. bahasa Indo-
     nauseated that language Javanese lan-
     guage Indonesian
     “mblenek”, that is Javanese, the Indo-
     nesian

183. Yuni: Apa nek ya.
       what nauseated yes
       What is it, “nek”, right?

184. Uli: Mblenek mblenek
       nauseated nauseated
       Nauseated
185. Vini: Oh

186. Yuni: Apa Indonesiannya apa?
    What Indonesian-DET what
    What, what is it in Indonesian?

187. Vini: Enek, nauseated

188. Yuni: Enek, kan kalau makanannya enek
    nauseated PRT if food-DET nauseated
    Nauseated, if the food is too rich, you
    know

189. kamu kasih sambel banyak-banyak gitu.
    2SG give chili_sauce much-REDPL
    you put a lot of chili (in it), you know.

    NEG far with nauseated PRT
    It's not far from "mblenek", come on.

Prior to this excerpt, Uli asked the siblings if they had tried the spicy chili sauce the couple got from their friend, which was served on the table at that moment. In line 174, Yuni repeated Uli’s question regarding whether they had tried the chili sauce or not. In her turn, Vini mentioned that she had not tried the chili sauce yet because sometimes her stomach cannot take spiciness. Then in line 180, Uli gave his opinion that spiciness helps reduce the richness of food, and the word for ‘richness (or nauseating)’ he used was ‘mblenek’, which was a Javanese word. Realizing that he code-switched from Indonesian to Javanese, in line 182 Uli said that ‘mblenek’ is a Javanese word. Interestingly, he again used a Javanese sentence ‘mblenek iku boso Jowo’. In so doing, he changed his footing. In 180–181 he addressed all the co-participants thus opening up the next turn to any ratified participants, but right after that in line 182, he closed it to just one person who knows Javanese, that is his wife Yuni. His orientation changed. His Javanese excludes the co-participants who do not understand Javanese. Thus, his utterances are oriented to his wife, Yun, who is like him, speaks Javanese as well. Yuni, as the knowing participant responded right away, but included the siblings because she used Indonesian instead of Javanese in line 183. She requested from the sibling a confirmation that the word she thought was the Indonesian version of ‘mblenek’ was correct. She asked again for a confirmation in line 186, and Vini confirmed it in line 187. Uli then in line 190 commented that the Indonesian word that he searched for was not far from the Javanese one, indicating that the word might be borrowed from Javanese.

The code-switching that Uli employed conveys some facts about the complex relationships between speakers and hearers. The code-switching shows who is included and excluded and who the utterances are oriented to, who the projected next speakers are, etc. At the same time, it also indexes the speaker’s social identity or in this case, rather the speaker’s ethnic identity. The couple, being bilinguals in Indonesian and Javanese who usually use Javanese Indonesian in their own intimate conversations code-switched to a more standard Indonesian to accommodate the siblings who are monolingual Indonesians (i.e. do not speak other languages of Indonesia) who speak with the Jakartaanese dialect. This confirms Zentella’s (1998:101) suggestion that ‘code-switching is a response to the need to accommodate interlocutors who speak different languages’. But when involvement from a knowing participant is needed in a certain activity, a speaker might code-switch to the language that is known only to the speaker and the addressed participant,
thus changing the entire activities, for instance: from giving an account of why spiciness is good to a word-search activity involving a knowing and addressed participant, thus re-aligning the speaker-hearer relationship in just one turn. Uli’s act of forgetting the word he needs at the moment of speech in this case is an interactive resource that opens up the participation framework, including and excluding his ratified hearers.

In the following excerpt, Uli told his co-participants about his experience in applying for a job at the Office of International Education and Exchange at his old university. He was accepted and he told his co-participants that his interviewer liked ‘Titanic’ (the movie) very much so she kept a poster of Titanic in her office. When he gave an account of his speech in this case, he used Indonesian, but when he reported the talk he had with his interviewer, in his narrative he code-switched to English (lines 537, 544). The code-switching he employed showed how he changed his footing, from being the reporter of the speech to the protagonist (character) in his story. He marked his encounter with his interviewer, who is a speaker of North American English, with his code-switching. In changing his footing from describing the setting of his narrative and the conversation he had with his interviewer, Uli did not use any laminator verb like ‘he said or she said’, but he immediately code-switched to English. This way he frames his reported speech.

Excerpt2
(Lines deleted)

527. Uli: Tahun kedua udah tahun pertama-nya udah lewat year second-DET that FUT enter year second already pass the second year, (we) were about to enter the second year

528. tahun keduanya itu mau masuk tahun kedua year second-DET that FUT enter year second

529. summer kan (.2) saya di Eugene summer PRT 1SG in Eugene in the summer, I was in Eugene, right.

530. kan ngeplai ngeplai ngeplai ngeplai (.2) PRT apply apply apply apply You know, (I) kept on applying (for a job)

531. h.h. terus ketemu ama Norin then meet with Norin then (I) met Norin

532. apa itu wawancara sudah diterima:: what that interview already PASS-accept what was it, (I was) interviewed, then (I) was accepted

533. senengannya kan (.) ini Titanic kan like-3SGPOSS PRT this Titanic PRT her hobby, you know, this Titanic, right.

534. Luki: H.h.

535. Uli: Di in uh office-3SGPOSS that picture-GEN ship Titanic In her office, there was a picture of Titanic ship.

536. Luki: H.h.
Uli: Wah you must like you must like Titanic very much.

oh yeah I watched the movie seven times

whoops

Luki: H.h.

Vini: Huh huh

Uli: Seven TIMES h.h.h. wah

it’s a beautiful movie (blah blah blah blah)

wah.

We can see from this excerpt how with code-switching, Uli changed his footing, from being a storyteller to the characters of his story: himself and the interviewer (his co-participant in his story or described scene). In lines 537–544, Uli reported the speech of him asking his interviewer (l. 537), his interviewer’s answer (l. 538), and his assessment (l. 539). The same thing happens in line 542, in which he was enacting himself talking in disbelief to his interlocutor (in his reported speech) in response to his interlocutor’s action of watching ‘Titanic’ seven times, and her response that gives an account of why she watched the movie seven times (l. 543). Uli’s marking his reported speech (with no laminator verbs) by code-switching from one language to a completely different language adds a new dimension to Goffman’s footing.

The data from both excerpts show how code-switching indicates the changing of footing, indexes ethnicity and social identity and the relationships between co-participants. They also show how code switching is employed for participants’ alignment, invoking participation frameworks and how code-switching is pragmatically used in the immediate contexts. We can also see in this conversation how community members use bilingualism to construct their ethnic, racial and social identities.

Register shift

In the following discussion I focus on how code-switching in registers (formal and informal) embedded in narratives and reported speech is performed in telling narratives in Indonesian. In this narrative the speaker transforms his personal experiences, and as a result this practice constitutes a social organization involving both the speaker and the ratified participants in an on-going interaction. Furthermore, with his code-switching, the speaker indexes the relationships between him and his hearers, and the characters of his stories that also index class identity.

This narrative took place at Stef’s house in California. Stef, Uli, Tomi, and Rudi were in Stef’s garage. In this story-telling activity, Stef was telling his co-participants about his experience in handling a problem his bank faced. One of his customers, a Hajj cheated the villagers by buying the title deeds of their lands (PPAT) illegally from his local village chief (Camat). The villagers were waiting for their title deeds to be issued, and the camat who was handling the title deeds received the villagers’ title deeds from the local department of agriculture (Agraria). However, the Hajj paid the camat 5 million Rupiahs (equaling to $ 2000, the time the story took place) to get those title deeds and used them as collateral to get a loan from the bank where Stef was working. When the villagers found out about this, they were very angry because without the title deeds they could not claim their lands, and they might even face the possibility of losing their lands. One of the villagers apparently sent his friends (a policeman and a soldier) who also brought the
Hajj with them to Stef’s bank and asked him to handle the problem appropriately.

Excerpt 3:
1. Stef: Wah udah gitu Sabtu-sabtu udah wah already like-that Saturday-PL 
   “Well, after that, on Saturday.”
2. gua hampir pulang jam dua, I almost go-home o’clock two,
   “I was about to go home at two o’clock.”
3. lu tau ngehak yang datang siapa, (.2) you know NEG LK come who
   “You know who came?”
4. polisi sama tentara: police and soldier
   “a police and a soldier”
5. saudaranya si: itu weh (.4) langsung ("gini) relative-GEN the that weh direct
   (like this)
   “the relative(s) of the uh, (he) directly (said like this)”
6. Pak Stefanus (. )saya sih ngehak mau tahu urusannya Mr. StefanusI PRT NEG want know
   problem-DET
   “Mr. Stefanus, I, you know, don’t care about the problem”
7. ("yang salah) siapa saya mau (?toh) LK wrong who I want
   “Whose fault (it is) I want to…”
8. yang penting (tanah ini) dibayar. LK important (land this) PASS-pay
   “The important thing is (this land) has to be paid.”
9. Rudi: Uwah= Oh-my
   “Oh my”
10. Stef: =Pak Hajiya diajak di situ GILA ngehak.
    Mr Hajj PASS-invite PREP there crazy NEG
    “The Hajj was brought there, isn’t it crazy?”
11. Tomi: Lu nggejawab jawabnya apa?= you answer answer-NMLZ what?
    “As for you, what was your answer?”
12. Stef: Wuah, anak buah gua udah sepi: man well child fruit my already quiet man
    “Well, my staff was already gone, man.”
13. itu Sabtu jam dua udah pada pulang. that Saturday o’clock two already
    PL go-home
    “That Saturday at two o’clock (everybody was) gone.”
14. Tomi: Dia tahu timingnya ya. 3SG know timing-DET yes.
    “He knew the timing, didn’t he?”
15. Stef: Wah, tahu ("dia) timingnya. well know (he) timing-DET
    “Well, apparently (he) knew the timing.”
17. Stef: Gua tinggal (?sen-) I stay
    “I stayed…”
18. Pak Wi kan masih ada kan (. ) bos
gua yang mem-
Mr. Wi PRT still exist PRT boss my LK
“Mr. Wi, you know, was still there, you know, my boss, who…”

19. masih ada di atas. (.2)
still exist PREP upstairs
“was still upstairs.”

20. Langsung gua [kol apa, Laksus di
bawah.
direct I call what, officer PREP down
stairs
“I immediately called, what is it, the officer downstairs.”

Mr. Slamet, yes Mr. Slamet
“Mr. Slamet, yes Mr. Slamet”

22. Pak Slamet tolong dampingi saya.
Mr. Slamet, please accompany me
“Mr. Slamet, please accompany me”

23. Ya Pak.
Yes sir
“Yes, Sir.”

24. Segera ya. Kayaknya saya perlu
didampingi.
soon yes be-like-NMLZ I need
PASS-accompany
“Quickly okay, It seems that I need to be accompanied.”

25. Ya Pak, yah. Satu orang atau perlu
saya ngajak
yes Sir, yes one person or need I
invite
“Yes, Sir, yes. One person or do I need to come “

26. anu sama Pak itu (.)
uh with Mr. that
“with uh that Mr…”

27. yang gwendut itu yang dulu
kepalanya (. ) masih
LK fat that LK past head-GEN still
“The very fat one, who used to head the…”

28. Pak siapa itu waduh lupa. Pokoknya
yang bu- Laksus itu.
Mr. who that alas forget important
LK officer that
“Who was that Mr., oh my, I forget. Basically that special service officer.”

29. Oh ya mungkin you dulu aja dah.
oh yes perhaps you first just PRT
“Oh yes, perhaps you should come alone first.”

don’t too striking PRT
“Don’t attract any attention.”

31. Ini soalnya anu saudaranya
this problem-the uh relative-GEN
this problem is, uh the relative of
“Because the problem is, uh the relative of”

32. yang punya tanah ini anu apa (.)
LK own land this uh what
“the person who owns this land uh, what is it,”
33. Satu polisi satu tentara.  
   one police one soldier  
   “is a police and a soldier.”

34. Tentaranya kopral keliatannya  
    soldier-DET corporal apparently  
    “The soldier is apparently a corporal.”

In this excerpt, Stef establishes the setting of the story, which is crucial in his narrative because the drama (the larger event) revolves around this setting. In line 3, Stef builds the unexpectedness of the event by addressing the recipients with a rhetorical question: *lu tau nggak yang datang siapa*. (2) ‘You know who came’. The pause holds suspense over who they were. But from the way Stef frames the rhetorical question, the recipient would project that Stef would not expect those people, a policeman and a soldier (in their uniforms) to come to his office that Saturday when the bank was closing.

In his talk, Stef animates and reports different characters’ speech and their actions which depict individual as well as social types in this data. Stef’s animations and reported speech presuppose the socio-cultural knowledge of the participants, and provide a semantic field for the participants’ analysis of the social world and how social entities are placed together in that social world. They make it possible for the participants to make inferences in the conversation. What seems to be an individual or particular animation is often construed in a particular kind of social entity.

Furthermore, the deployment of linguistic forms in this case, the formal and informal registers also help the participants to analyze the animated characters’ expressions and disambiguate reported speech from the narrator’s current talk, commentary, word search, etc. For example: Stef uses formal ‘I’ (*saya*) when animating and informal ‘I’ (*gue*) when he is not animating. Additionally, Stef’s code-switching between the formal register ‘*saya*’ and the informal one ‘*gue*’ indexes his relationships with his hearers. From this code-switching, we can see how intimacy, ethnicity, and social strata are revealed. The deployment of linguistic forms and embodied actions in this excerpt identifies the participants as the addressed/unaddressed as well as knowing and unknowing participants that will contribute differently to the building of the story telling sequence. All of this deployment constitutes the fact that telling a narrative in natural conversations is socially organized and participant designed.

**Conclusion**

The data show the process of establishing social relations. They also reveal what social reality is yet to be discovered and how co-participants are engaged in social reality in the real world. During the unfolding courses of actions in situated activities, co-participants of the interactions take up multiple social identities, showing the relationships between the speakers and hearers and between the protagonists or characters in their narratives that have different power, hold different positions in their real world, have different ethnicities and even speak different languages. Code-switching being deployed in the interactions indicates that speakers and hearers are bearers of complex and multiple social identities.
End Note

1. The conversations were transcribed using Conversation Analysts’ approach introduced by Gail Jefferson (Sacks, et. al., 1974).

2. Linguistic conventions used in the transcripts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DET</td>
<td>determiner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUT</td>
<td>future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>genitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LK</td>
<td>linker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>negation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMLZ</td>
<td>nominalizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASS</td>
<td>passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERF</td>
<td>perfective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREP</td>
<td>preposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRT</td>
<td>particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOP</td>
<td>topic/focus marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANS</td>
<td>transitive marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1SG</td>
<td>first person singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SG</td>
<td>second person singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG</td>
<td>third person singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SGPOSS</td>
<td>third person singular possessive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REDPL</td>
<td>reduplication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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