

Gaul, conversation and youth genre(s) in Java¹

Howard Manns
Monash University

Abstract

This paper provides a nuanced understanding of *Bahasa Gaul* ‘the language of sociability’. It does so by examining more than 25 hours of casual youth conversations in East Java. I show how *Bahasa Gaul* is used to construct and respond to Indonesian youth discourse in conversation. I position the discussion with regard to two related notions: intersubjectivity and indexicality. Youth discourse is firstly shown to be patterned and sequential. Speakers use *Bahasa Gaul* to boldly enact and respond to stances when negotiating intersubjectivity. Secondly, speakers are shown to invoke a Jakarta ‘voice’ to enact stances which are bold, cheeky and even potentially offensive. However, these stances are often performed rather than merely spoken. Performance simultaneously positions these stances within overlapping frames of irony and *ramai* ‘noisiness’. These frames are shown to be essential to the construction of the social category *gaul* in contemporary Java.

Introduction

Gaul, literally ‘social’, has emerged as the most discussed youth identity in post-Suharto Indonesia. *Gaul* is at the core of the struggle of young middle class urbanites to find their place in contemporary Indonesia. Smith-Hefner (2007, p. 185) analyses *gaul* as an identity that articulates the “desire of Indonesian youth for new types of social belongings through friendships that are more egalitarian and interactively fluid, as well as more personally expressive and psychologically individualised”. Among other things, *gaul* emphasises informality, self-confidence and cool cosmopolitanism (Smith-Hefner, 2007). *Gaul* youth are upwardly mobile and outwardly looking (Smith-Hefner, 2007). Moreover, they view upward economic success as being inextricably linked to the outward construction of a sizable and diverse social network (Manns, 2011).

Bahasa Gaul ‘the language of sociability’ is an important resource for the construction of a *gaul* identity. Jakarta and a Jakarta-centric mass media industry are the

¹ This paper has benefited greatly from conversations and correspondences with Julie Bradshaw, Novi Djenar, Robert Englebretson, Michael Ewing, Simon Musgrave, Catur Siwi Dia Rachmatika and Nancy Smith-Hefner. However, none of these individuals have seen this paper nor should my gratitude here be interpreted as their support for the ideas herein. Any mistakes or infelicities remain my own.

primary sources for *Bahasa Gaul* for Indonesian youth. Jakarta has long been the reference point for upwardly and outwardly looking youths throughout Indonesia (see, among others, Errington, 1986; Oetomo, 1990; Adelaar & Prentice, 1996; Sneddon, 2003, 2006; Ibrihim, 2007; Smith-Hefner, 2007). *Bahasa Gaul* includes styles borrowed from the colloquial variety of Indonesian spoken by educated Jakartans (cf. Sneddon, 2006). It also includes mostly ephemeral abbreviations, lexical items and idiomatic expressions popularised by the mass media. *Bahasa Gaul*'s features will be described in greater detail below, as will the relationship between *Bahasa Gaul* and Jakarta Indonesian.

Bahasa Gaul has been described in a general sense (e.g. Smith-Hefner, 2007; Manns, 2010) but few researchers (e.g. Djenar, 2008, 2012; Djenar & Ewing, 2012) have demonstrated how its use is patterned or structured. The current paper explores how *Bahasa Gaul* is used in casual youth conversations in Malang, East Java. In doing so, I show how use of *Bahasa Gaul* is patterned and positioned within a structured cognitive framework. Specifically, I show how *gaul* styles are selected at key points within conversations to enact stances. It is these stances, I argue, as much as the selection of the styles themselves, that enable young speakers to construct *gaul* as a social category. Less explicitly, but nonetheless importantly, this paper informs debates as to the impact of Jakarta language styles on urbanites outside of Jakarta. This, in turn, may contribute to an understanding of the historical emergence of a labelled language variety (cf. Agha, 2003; Johnstone, Andrus & Danielson, 2006), namely Colloquial Indonesian (cf. Sneddon, 2001; Englebretson, 2003, 2007; Ewing, 2005).

This paper will be of interest to those engaged with the Indonesian language on a theoretical and/or pedagogical level. It will also be relevant to researchers who explore youth as a social category in Indonesia and beyond. Yet, this paper's keenest audience will be those concerned with genre and generic variation. Genre is a useful concept for understanding the

transnational and transglobal flow of language. For example, the hip hop genre has its roots in the African American community. Consequently, African American English is a critical resource for indexing hip hop. However, researchers have shown that agentive speakers in places like Japan (Pennycook, 2003), Nigeria (Omoniyi, 2009) and Australia (O’Hanlon, 2006) do not adopt African American English wholesale. Rather, they adopt elements of the source African American culture and mix them with local styles to create a simultaneously local and global self.

In a similar manner, this paper shows how local Javanese youth orient to the national *gaul* phenomenon through generic practices in conversation. Conversation is arguably a diffuse genre but it is a genre nonetheless (Coupland, 2007). Genres may be defined as “culturally recognised, patterned ways of speaking, or structured cognitive frameworks for engaging in discourse” (Coupland, 2007, p. 15). Along these lines, Coupland (2007, p. 15) posits a participant-focused view of genre:

[The main criterion for genre is] that participants have some significant awareness, as part of their cultural and communicative competence, of how the event-types they are engaging with are socially constituted ways of speaking.

The current paper discusses this awareness in terms of the dialogic organisation of conversation (cf. Bakhtin, 1981). Dialogic in this case refers to how every utterance (or indeed language feature) takes its meaning from prior utterances and/or prior uses of the same utterance (Du Bois, 2007). In other words, conversation participants are continuously drawing on and reacting to the words of others. The dialogic nature and use of *Bahasa Gaul* will be made clearer throughout this paper. This clarification, in turn, will lead to a discussion of how *Bahasa Gaul* indexes a socially constituted way of speaking in Malang. However, it is firstly essential to operationalise a definition for *Bahasa Gaul* as it pertains to this paper.

Bahasa Gaul

There is firstly a distinction to be made between *bahasa gaul* in the general sense and *Bahasa Gaul* in the canonical sense. Boellstorff (2004, p. 189) perhaps best encapsulates the sense of general *bahasa gaul* when he dubs it “[t]he language of association and interaction”. This is the language that Indonesians use among themselves to interact in informal contexts, and it takes many forms depending on the interlocutors or context. For example, among the Malang working class, *bahasa gaul* is Javanese and a local ludling known as *bahasa walikan* ‘front-to-back language’. Among the middle class, *bahasa gaul* is typically Javanese, a variety of Indonesian or a mix of both.

Bahasa Gaul in the canonical sense is less straightforward. The application of labels to language varieties in a diffuse and/or changing speech community is problematic (Errington, 1985). For instance, in Malang, many would label the variety of Indonesian spoken by the middle class above *Bahasa Gaul*, others Jakarta Indonesian, and still others a variety of national, colloquial Indonesian. Malang’s sociolinguistic ecology is shifting and this is illustrated by focusing on the Jakarta transitive suffix *-in* in Malang. Ewing (2005) calls the Jakarta-provenance suffix *-in* a “robust marker of informal style” in Colloquial Indonesian. However, Manns (2011) showed that Malang speakers were generally aware of the suffix’s Jakarta provenance but disagreed about its social value. Most considered *-in* to have become part of a national, colloquial Indonesian in line with Ewing’s observations. Yet, most people also cited its links to *Bahasa Gaul*. Some believed this suffix was exclusively linked to *Bahasa Gaul*, and at least one participant considered its use to be a trend which had already passed. The lack of agreement on *-in* mirrors views of *Bahasa Gaul* in Malang and this leads to the need to operationalise a definition for the current paper.

Some language styles may be categorised as *Bahasa Gaul* styles without controversy in Malang. These uncontroversial styles include ephemeral abbreviations, blends, lexical

items and idiomatic expressions, which are included in popular and widely available dictionaries (e.g. Sahertian, 2001; Emka, 2007; Haikal, 2007). For instance, *PD*, pronounced *pede*, is an abbreviation for *percaya diri* ‘to believe in oneself’. *BT*, pronounced *bete*, is an English-derived abbreviation of ‘bad tempered’ and means ‘to be in a bad mood’ when used as *Bahasa Gaul*. Youth frequently learn these styles from Jakarta-based mass media outlets, actors and musicians. *Bahasa Gaul* in this sense draws on a number of sources including homosexual argot, English and *Prokem* (Smith-Hefner, 2007), the latter an argot associated with gangsters and criminals (Rahardja & Chambert-Loir, 1988).

Some language styles are more controversially labelled *Bahasa Gaul* for the purposes of this paper. As noted above for *-in*, there is disagreement in Malang about how language styles with Jakarta provenance are viewed (i.e. *Bahasa Gaul*, Jakarta Indonesian or Colloquial Indonesian). For the purposes of this paper, any style viewed locally as having provenance in Jakarta but in use in Malang is labelled *Bahasa Gaul*. This includes, but is not limited to, the aforementioned suffix, the discourse markers *deh* and *dong* and the pronouns *gué* and *lo* (alternatively *gua* and *lu*). It will be shown throughout this paper that these Jakarta-provenance styles are often selected for and in response to *gaul*-related stances. However, unlike the more ephemeral *Bahasa Gaul* styles discussed in the previous paragraph, the impact of Jakarta Indonesian styles may be more lasting. Djenar (2012, p. 49) writes, “[t]hat the colloquial Jakartan Indonesian has had a significant influence on the language of urban youth is unquestionable”. This is indeed the case in Malang. Diachronic studies may show that the *Bahasa Gaul* styles of contemporary Malang have become the Colloquial Indonesian styles of future. This makes the current paper’s categorisation of these styles as *Bahasa Gaul* both apt and useful.

Some work has been done on the functions of *Bahasa Gaul* styles and their relevance to *gaul* identity. Smith-Hefner (2007) provides a thorough description of *Bahasa Gaul* as

well as a preliminary description of its functions. Among other things, she finds that young Indonesians frequently used *Bahasa Gaul* to discuss taboo topics. For example, a young Indonesian going out on a date might be warned by friends to buy a *safeting* ‘condom’, so he or she won’t end up *MBA*, an abbreviation meaning ‘married by accident’. Smith-Hefner (2007) and Manns (2010) have shown that *plesetan*, literally ‘slip of the tongue’, is an important means through which youth exhibit their creative linguistics abilities. *Plesetan* is a punning and word game in which speakers creatively manipulate words and meanings through word blending or the manipulation of sounds (Jurriëns, 2009). Manns (2010) found that online chatters would often engage in *plesetan* to poke fun at one another. For instance, in one example, one chat forum participant suggested that the men in the forum were *romeo* ‘romantically inclined’. A third participant followed this comment by playfully suggesting: *romeo* = *rombongan meong* ‘a group of cats’.²

Thus, the youth identity *gaul* and its associated language styles have been moderately well-described. This section has presented some of this research and an operationalised definition of *Bahasa Gaul* as it pertains to this paper. I now move to show how the use of *Bahasa Gaul* is structured and positioned within a cognitive frame. Following recent trends in sociolinguistics, this is done by discussing *Bahasa Gaul* with reference to stance, intersubjectivity and indexicality. This paper will show how Malang youth construct the social category *gaul* through stance-taking with *Bahasa Gaul*. As noted above, these stances will be discussed in terms of dialogicality. Du Bois (2007, p. 140) writes:

Dialogicality makes its presence felt to the extent that a stancetaker’s words derive from, and further engage with, the words of those who have spoken before—whether immediately within the current exchange of stance utterances, or more remotely along the horizons of language and prior text as projected by the community of discourse.

² *Meong* also means ‘to make love’ in homosexual argot. Thus, an alternative reading of this could be ‘group of people having sex’.

These stances will be shown to be dialogically structured and sequenced through the notion of intersubjectivity. These stances will be dialogically positioned with regard to prior text, communities of discourse and cognitive frames through indexicality. The result will be a more nuanced understanding of *Bahasa Gaul* and its use.

Stance, intersubjectivity & indexicality

Stance has become a productive analytical tool for studies of style and stylistic variation (Jaffe, 2009). Du Bois (2007, p. 163) provides a useful and well-cited working definition of stance:

[s]tance is a public act by a social actor, achieved dialogically through overt communicative means, of simultaneously evaluating objects, positioning subjects (self and others), and aligning with other subjects, with respect to any salient dimension of the sociocultural field.

Social categories are built around common stances through social practice as discussed above (Eckert, 2012). These stances are indexed locally in discourse through the use of linguistic and non-linguistic styles drawn from the wider community (Eckert, 2012). Repeated stances can emerge as stabilised repertoires of styles linked to situations and/or social identities (Ochs, 1990; Bauman, 2004; Johnstone, 2009). Thus, with reference to the current paper, we might expect youth concerned with *gaul* to take stances through the use of *Bahasa Gaul*. Furthermore, certain styles, not originally *gaul*, may come to be linked to *Bahasa Gaul* due to their repeated use for *gaul*-like stances.

Stance is closely aligned with and often described alongside intersubjectivity (e.g. Kärkkäinen, 2003, 2007; Bucholtz, 2003; Bucholtz & Hall, 2005; Heritage & Raymond, 2005; Du Bois, 2007; Haddington, 2007; Rauniomaa, 2007; Du Bois & Kärkkäinen, 2012). Du Bois (2007, p. 140) defines intersubjectivity as “the relation between one actor’s subjectivity and another’s”. Within conversations, stances often emerge as a result of two independent actors jointly engaging in stance-taking (Du Bois & Kärkkäinen, 2012). Du Bois & Kärkkäinen (2012) propose that the intersubjective relationship between

conversational utterances may be understood through the sequential perspective. The sequential perspective is closely aligned with Conversation Analysis (CA) in that both provide frames for understanding how social action is accomplished through turn-taking (Du Bois & Kärkkäinen, 2012). Furthermore, CA concepts have been drawn on to inform the sequential perspective. For instance, Haddington (2007) has shown how the notion of ‘preference’, a core CA concept, may inform studies of stance and intersubjectivity.

There are procedural and analytical differences between the sequential perspective and CA in spite of their symbiotic relationship. The basic analytical component of CA is the adjacency pair whereas in the sequential perspective it is stance lead/stance follow. The adjacency pair emerges from observations that many social actions in conversation are organised into pairs (or triplets), including questions-answers, greetings, leave-taking and requests (Heritage & Clayman, 2010). The sequential perspective is concerned with the negotiation of intersubjectivity within such adjacency pairs and thus how stance lead (one speaker’s subjective stance) is reacted to and built upon by stance follow (another speaker’s subjective stance).

For example, Du Bois (2007) uses what he calls ‘dialogic syntax’ to illustrate the negotiation of intersubjectivity through stance lead and stance follow. Du Bois (2007, p. 140) writes: “[d]ialogic syntax looks at what happens when speakers build their utterances by selectively reproducing elements of a prior speaker’s utterance”. He illustrates dialogic syntax with the following example:

1	SAM;	I don’t like those.
2		(0.2)
3	ANGELA;	I don’t either. (p. 159)

Here, Angela uses *either* to index an intersubjective relation between Sam and herself. In this case, this relation is a shared negative evaluation of an object. Sam engages in what Du Bois refers to as stance lead and Angela responds with a stance follow. Du Bois points out that the

form *either* is required in the stance follow here, and this supports the role that this form plays in “indexing the intersubjective relationship between two stances in dialogic juxtaposition” (p. 161). The current paper will rely on stance lead and stance follow to explore how intersubjective stances are negotiated in youth conversation. This, in turn, will show how the use of *Bahasa Gaul* is to a certain degree structured.

Indexicality is a concomitant of stance in sociolinguistic investigations of identity. Du Bois & Kärkkäinen (2012, p. 435) write, “[c]ombining indexicality with stance theory yields a more dynamic understanding of the practices through which social actors constitute sociocultural constructs, such as identity and epistemic authority”. Studies of stance frequently draw on Ochs’ (1992) notion of direct and indirect indexicality. Ochs (1992) argues that linguistic variables normally viewed as directly linked to identities are, in fact, indirectly related. This indirect relationship is mediated by stance, social events and social acts (Ochs, 1992). For instance, Englebretson (2007) and Manns (2012) have shown that non-Jakarta youth do not use Jakarta pronouns because they wish to directly index Jakarta identity. Rather, these speakers select these pronouns to draw on stereotypical qualities of Jakarta speakers, such as ‘coolness’, ‘toughness’ or ‘outspokenness’. In keeping with Ochs (1992), Manns (2012) argues that stances like these enable Malang youth to indirectly index *gaul*.

The concept of indexicality and the relevance of the Jakarta ‘voice’ in Malang are developed in the current work. Kiesling’s (2004, 2009) notion of ‘interior/exterior’ indexicalities enables us to position the stances enacted with *Bahasa Gaul* within a structured cognitive frame, namely *gaul* and its related practices. Kiesling (2009, p. 177) defines exterior indexicality as “indexical meaning that is transportable from one speech event to another, and connect[ed] to social contexts that endure from one speech event to another, or at least change very slowly” (Kiesling, 2009, p. 177). Interior indexicality, on the other hand,

is “indexical meaning created within, and particular to, the speech event” (Kiesling, 2009, p. 177). In other words, this is the meaning created through the mobilisation of exterior indexicality within the immediate frame.

Kiesling (2004, 2009) illustrates this concept by exploring the use of *dude* by fraternity members at an American university. He finds *dude* carries an exterior indexicality of ‘cool solidarity’. This is due to its indexical links to “counterculture, laid back stances of so-called ‘surfers’ and ‘stoners’ that American men found attractive in the 1980s” (Kiesling, 2009, p. 178). Kiesling (2004) found that cool solidarity could be mobilised to various ends at the interactional level and this is interior indexicality. For instance, he found that the form *dude* might be used as an affective exclamation to focus attention on a key point in a narrative. This is seen in the following example:

40 Pete: DUDE it was like boys in the hood man ai:n’t no: lie:
41 Hotdog: And they’re all they’re fucked up on crack, wasted
42 they’re all lookin’ at us they start comin’ to the car,
43 so Pete’s like FLOOR IT.
44 so I take off , and ,
(Kiesling, 2004, p. 294)

Here, Pete selects *dude* to emphasise and evaluate a key point in a narrative about having been lost in a poor, urban area in the middle of the night. In a different context, the form *dude* may be mobilised as a “confrontational stance attenuator” (Kiesling, 2004, p. 292). In other words, *dude* may be used to mitigate a potentially face-threatening act by keying the act as non-serious. This is seen here:

44 Pete: Fuckin’ ay man.
45 Gimme the red Dave. Dude. (1.0)
46 Dave: No.
(Kiesling, 2004, p. 294)

These interlocutors are playing Monopoly and Pete uses the bald imperative *Gimme the red*. He adds *dude* to mitigate this imperative. In all, Kiesling (2004) notes five interactional functions for *dude* and thus five ways in which exterior indexicality is mobilised to interior ends.

This paper will demonstrate how *Bahasa Gaul* is selected at key points within conversations to enact stances. It is these stances, I argue, as much as the selection of the styles themselves, that enable young speakers to construct *gaul* as a social category. In any case, the conversational practices of Malang youth are shown to be dialogic and structured. They are firstly dialogic in the sense that utterances are connected to the negotiation of intersubjectivity and this will be outlined in the following sections. They are also dialogic in the sense that speakers strategically use the semiotic potential imbued in Jakarta forms to accomplish stances. This potential is discussed in the current paper in terms of exterior indexicalities. Exterior indexicalities are referred to throughout this paper and their relevance to *gaul* consolidated in the discussion and conclusion.

I explore here the use of *Bahasa Gaul* in casual conversations by 25 young, educated Javanese individuals in Malang, East Java. More than 25 hours of casually-occurring conversations among these middle class participants were recorded, transcribed and analysed. In order to minimize the observer's paradox (cf. Labov, 1972), I was not present during any of the recordings. I drew on the sequential perspective and CA concepts to analyse the data. It has been noted that CA typically requires that an analyst have native speaker intuition regarding forms and functions (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1988). Thus, all analytical findings were cross-checked with research assistants and the participants themselves whenever possible.

***Bahasa Gaul* and interpersonal stances**

Stances taken with *Bahasa Gaul* are often nuanced and complex in terms of indexicality and this will be discussed throughout the remainder of this paper. However, it is firstly important to note that stances enacted with *Bahasa Gaul* are, in fact, occasionally taken up as acts of (*gaul*) identity (cf. Le Page & Tabouret-Keller, 1985). In other words, in Ochs' terms above, these stances are interpreted as being directly indexical of *gaul*. These are stances of

interpersonal alignment arguably forged through the shared consumption and use of *Bahasa Gaul* texts. These stances are normally performed rather than merely spoken. Performing a *Bahasa Gaul* utterance often entails speaking it more loudly and quickly and drawing out the pronunciation of the final syllable. However, some *Bahasa Gaul* utterances have idiosyncratic pronunciations based on prior use, for instance, in the mass media. Performed stances are sometimes taken up through the performed repetition of the form. This is the case in the following example:

(1)

1	Sheila:	Habis Finish	itu that			
2		aku 1SG	dapet got	kuliah university	di in	Malang Malang
3		GITU like.that	DE::H DM			
4	Catrine:	GITU like.that	DE::H DM	hehe		

Sheila: After finishing that, I started studying in Malang, it's like that.

Catrine: Like that, hehe.

The discourse marker *deh* strongly urges a listener to believe a proposition or complete an action. When performed, the Jakarta discourse markers *deh* and *dong*, the latter of which is discussed below, are spoken with a strong falling intonation with a slight upward lilt at the end. In the example above, Sheila describes how she came to study in Malang and finishes the utterance by performing the *Bahasa Gaul* idiom *gitu deh* 'that's the way it is/was, I tell you'. This may be viewed as a stance lead, albeit an uncontroversial one. In other words, we may expect that Catrine will not question Sheila's subjective narrative unless she knows or suspects that it isn't true. In the stance follow in line 4, Catrine repeats Sheila's performed act of identity and laughs. Repetition in Javanese culture means more than mere agreement or acknowledgement of information (Keeler, 2001). It has the same effect as an English

speaker saying *you bet* (Keeler, 2001). Repetition for interpersonal alignment is also noted in the following example:

(2)

- | | | | | | |
|---|--------|---------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|-------------|
| 1 | Catur: | Enak
delicious | diajak
PT-invite | ngobrol
AT-chat | |
| 2 | | kayak
like.this | kita
2PL | DO::NG
DM | Hen.
VOC |
| 3 | Henny: | IYA IYA LAH
of course | | | |
| 4 | Catur: | IYA IYA LAH
of course | | | |
- Catur: It's nice to be invited to talk like this, Hen.
Henny: Of course!
Catur: Of course!

Catur performs the form *dong* in line 2 in what is a clear stance of interpersonal alignment. Catur presents the subjective view that it is great to be able to talk with Henny in a stance lead. She presents this subjective evaluation as obvious through the use of *dong*. The discourse marker *dong* strongly asserts the truth of an utterance. It functions as a stronger assertion of the truth than the form *deh*. Henny recognises this stance as an assertion of interpersonal alignment. Henny responds with the performed idiomatic expression *iya iya lah* 'of course' in the stance follow in line 3. This expression was in common use at the time of this study due to its use on a popular television talk show called *Cerewis*, literally 'talkative'. Catur repeats the idiomatic expression, and thus, completes a three-turn act of interpersonal alignment.

Stances of interpersonal alignment such as these often occur within the genre of *curhat* literally, 'pouring out of one's heart'. *Curhat* is an informal genre of conversation in which a speaker discusses a troubling personal issue with an intimate friend. This is seen in the following example:

(3)

1	Jenny:	Kayaknya	lebih	dewasaan	kamu
		seem-STM	more	adult-COMP	2SG
2		sama	Sally	DE::H	
		with	Sally	DM	
3	Henny:	IYA IYA LAH			
		of course			
4		secara	gitu	lho	
		manner	like.that	DM	
	Jenny:	It seems like you are more mature than Sally.			
	Henny:	Of course. In this way, I am.			

This dyad comes at the end of a *curhat*. In the prior text, Henny has been confiding to Jenny that her sister is in a relationship with an immature boy who may be cheating on her. The form *deh* here is performed by Jenny line 2's stance lead to assert that Henny is more mature than her sister. Henny follows this stance by performing the idiomatic expression noted above, *iya iya lah*. Thus, Henny follows the use of *deh* with a stance of interpersonal alignment.

We may understand interpersonal stances and intersubjectivity here on two levels.

Firstly, Coupland (2007, p. 154) points out that the performative use of a form:

instigates, in and with listeners, processes of social comparison and re-evaluation (aesthetic and moral) focused on the real and metaphorical identities of speakers, their strategies and goals, but spilling over into re-evaluation of listeners' identities, orientations and values.

The performance of *Bahasa Gaul* arguably instigates reflection among participants about identity and membership in the 'imagined community' of *gaul* (cf. Anderson, 1983). Thus, a stance lead of a performed *Bahasa Gaul* utterance occasionally results in a stance follow of a performed *Bahasa Gaul* utterance (often a repetition of the same utterance). Secondly, the performance of *Bahasa Gaul* arguably frames utterances with regard to the Javanese concept *ramai*. The concept of *ramai* 'crowded, noisy' (*rame* in Javanese) is an important component of Javanese society (C. Geertz, 1960; H. Geertz, 1961; Wolfowitz, 1991; Sutton, 1996; Keeler, 2001; Wallach, 2008). Unlike in Western societies, *ramai* is often evaluated

positively in Java (Sutton, 1996). With regard to spoken interaction, spontaneous communication is viewed positively when it is *ramai* (Wolfowitz, 1991). Wolfowitz writes, “[i]n ordinary conversation style, what is valued is a sense of liveliness and drama, so that even rather unremarkable occurrences are given an air of excitement” (1991, p. 60). *Ramai* may be viewed in terms of exterior indexicality and this will be returned to below.

***Bahasa Gaul* and dispreferred stances**

Haddington (2007) draws on the CA notion of ‘preference’ in illustrating the structured nature of intersubjectivity. Preference organisation is also a useful concept for discussing stance and *Bahasa Gaul*. *Bahasa Gaul* is frequently selected for dispreferred responses or in instances when a dispreferred response is expected from a listener. The discourse marker *deh* is used for a dispreferred response in the following example:

(4)

- | | | | | | | |
|---|--------|--|---------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------|
| 1 | Wendy: | Jauh
far | | | | |
| 2 | Ari: | Jauh,
far | Wendy,
VOC | gitu?
like.that | | |
| 3 | | Kayaknya
like-STM | nggak
NEG | jauh
far | DEH ,
DM | Wendy
VOC |
| | Wendy: | It’s far. | | | | |
| | Ari: | Far, Wendy, yeah? It seems like it’s not far, Wendy. | | | | |

Wendy expresses her view that a potential job is far from the bus station in the stance lead. The preferred response in this example would be agreement. However, in the stance follow, Ari first repeats Wendy’s response in line 2 before negating and modifying this response with *deh*. Thus, Ari gives the dispreferred response of disagreement and selects the form *deh* to urge Wendy to reconsider her evaluation that the job is in fact far from the bus station. In the following example, the discourse marker *deh* is used by a speaker who expects and receives a dispreferred response:

(5)

1	Farzad:	Perasaan opinion	kamu 2SG	yo yeah	wes PRF
2		cerita tell	DEH DM		
3	Catrine:	Bukan NEG			
	Farzad:	What's your opinion? Go ahead and tell me.			
	Catrine:	No.			

Here, the interlocutors are discussing plans for an upcoming debate. The topic has turned to the arrogance of the judges at a previous event. Farzad asks Catrine to speak directly and honestly about her dislike for these judges in the stance lead. However, prevailing Javanese cultural practices suggest that one should suppress the open expressions of negative feelings (Mulder, 2007). Consequently, Farzad likely expects that Catrine will be hesitant to do so. Therefore, he also selects *deh* to urge her to speak about the judges without reservation in the stance lead in line 2. Catrine refuses and thus gives the dispreferred response in the stance follow. A dispreferred response is given once again in the next example but this time with the *Bahasa Gaul* idiomatic construction *ngapain* ‘what are you (I/we/he/she/they) doing?’:

(6)

1	Bibin:	Yang REL	jelas clear		
2		besok tomorrow	Bibin 1SG	pulang go.home	
3	Mia:	Lho DM	mbak VOC		
4		Antum 2SG	NGAPAIN AT-what-APP	sih DM	
5		pulang go.home	mbak? VOC		
	Bibin:	What is clear, is that I'm going home tomorrow.			
	Mia:	What, <i>mbak</i> ? What are you doing going home, <i>mbak</i> ?			

Bibin is excited about going home to visit her family in Madura, an island just north of Java, and expresses this in the stance lead. The preferred response in this instance would perhaps be an utterance in which Mia shares in Bibin's excitement or asks her casually what she plans to do. However, Mia confronts Bibin in the stance follow, albeit jokingly, to ask her why she would want to go home. In addition to the idiomatic construction *ngapain* (line 4), Mia uses a sassy voice intonation and the discourse marker *sih* to index that this is a playful confrontation. The discourse marker *sih* in this instance has a similar meaning to the English 'then' as in 'why would you want to go home, then?'

The use of *Bahasa Gaul* for dispreferred responses may be understood on two levels. Firstly, as Englebretson (2007) and Manns (2012) have shown, non-Jakarta speakers may adopt Jakarta styles to invoke certain attributes associated with their speakers. In this case, speakers are arguably drawing on the perception that Jakarta speakers are outspoken and bold. Middle class Jakartans are often described in terms of *individualisme* (Mulder, 2007; Wallach, 2008). In Indonesian, *individualisme* has a meaning more closely approximating the English 'selfishness' (Wallach, 2008). This often leads Jakarta elites to be viewed as arrogant (Wallach, 2008). In a review of Jakarta society at the end of the New Order, Redana (1997, p. 141) lamented, "people aren't embarrassed or modest any more, they only become rich, or want to be spoken of as being rich".³ This leads Jakarta forms to have an exterior indexicality of 'boldness'. Yet, such boldness may be problematic in Javanese communication, which is guided by an ideology of politeness and harmonious relations (cf. C. Geertz, 1960; Wolfowitz, 1991; Keeler, 2001) and this leads to the second point of discussion.

These dispreferred stances are often though not always performed rather than merely spoken. Thus, the observations made about performance above are also apt here. Coupland (2007, p. 154) notes that performance of linguistics forms leads to "processes of social

³ *Orang tidak lagi "malu," sungkan, menjadi atau disebut kaya.*

comparison and re-evaluation (aesthetic and moral) focused on the real and metaphorical identities of speakers”. The selection and performance of *Bahasa Gaul* blurs the line between the real and metaphorical identities. Malang youth are noted performing *Bahasa Gaul* to project a certain level of irony. The selection of *Bahasa Gaul* enables participants to do what Du Bois (1986) has called ‘speaking the culture’. Haiman (1998, p. 87), reviewing Du Bois (1986), writes: “the speaker of formulaic utterances conceals or submerges his or her true core self in order to ‘speak the culture’”. Speaking the culture through *Bahasa Gaul* enables the enactment of stances which are strategically ironic. *Bahasa Gaul* enables a speaker to index a shared membership in an imagined community (cf. Anderson, 1983) called *gaul*. Speaking *gaul* culture enables participants to accomplish immediate goals by exploiting the possibility that they are not to be interpreted literally. This enables such stances to be accomplished without coming into conflict with existing Javanese cultural practices. In fact, as was noted in the previous section, performance also brings stances within a frame of *ramai*.

***Bahasa Gaul* and deontic stances**

Deontic stances strongly urge belief or action on the part of a listener. For instance, the form *deh*, referred to above, is more deontic than epistemic because it strongly and directly urges belief or action on the part of a listener. It is more deontic in the sense that it enacts a stance deriving from “subjective reaction and personal feelings” rather than epistemic knowledge (Berman, 2004, p. 108). Thus, these stances have the potential to be face-threatening acts, especially within Javanese culture as noted above.

Bahasa Gaul is used for deontic stances in a similar manner to dispreferred stances above. In fact, examples (4) and (5) may be viewed as deontic in addition to being dispreferred responses. Speakers draw on the perceived boldness of Jakartans while at the same time blurring the line between author and utterance (cf. Clift, 1999). The suffix *-in* is

often used in imperative, deontic stances as in the following example. Here, an *anak soleh* ‘devout Muslim’ speaker reminds a friend to buy her a religious souvenir on a trip:

(7)

1	Mia:	Ayo	mbak				
		go.ahead	VOC				
2		beliin	ane	ma’ em			
		buy-APP	1SG	food.as.souvenir			
	Mia:	Do it, <i>mbak!</i> Buy me some holy water!					

The selection of *-in* marks this utterance as a playful and ironic stance lead. This utterance may be interpreted at face value (Mia wants a souvenir) or as a joke (Mia does not want a souvenir). In this example, it is highly likely that Mia wants a souvenir. Yet, the selection of *-in* indexes a kind of ironic ambiguity which reduces the likelihood that this utterance will be interpreted as face-threatening. In any case, the stance follow for a deontic stance is often unremarkable. In short, the participants sometimes acquiesce and sometimes not. However, participants are noted at times using *Bahasa Gaul* in a stance follow to counter the original stance. This is seen in the following example:

(8)

1	Mia:	Terus	NGAPAIN?	Jangan	jangan	ntar	di sana
		straight	AT-what-APP	don’t	don’t	later	at there
2		DONG	DONG	DONG	DONG	nggak	DONG
		DM	DM	DM	DM	NEG	DM
3	Bibin:	hehe					
		<laughter>					
4	Mia:	Dosennya	ngomong	apa?	Itu	apa	lagi?
		lecturer-DEF	speak	what	that	what	again
5	Bibin:	Bukan	hanya	DONG	DONG.	Kamu	akan
		Neg	only	DM	DM	2SG	FUT
6		merasakan	bagaimana	uh	apa	sibuknya.	
		AT-feel-APP	how	uh	what	busy-DEF	
	Mia:	Right, what are you doing? Don’t go there later, duh, no duh.					
	Bibin:	<laughter>					
	Mia:	What will the lecturer say? What else?					
	Bibin:	It’s not a matter of ‘duh’. You’ll begin to experience how, uh, why things are busy.					

Here, Mia attempts to persuade Bibin from attending an event held by a lecturer. Mia performs the *Bahasa Gaul* idiom *dong dong dong* to implore her not to attend in the stance lead in line 1 (adding two additional *dongs* for extra emphasis). *Dong dong dong* was in popular use at the time of this study. This was due to its use on the popular television talk show *Cerewis* as with *iya iya lah* above. *Dong dong dong* conveys a strongly emphasised ‘duh, what were you thinking?’ as it is derived from the discourse marker *dong*. However, it is performed rather than spoken and this blurs the line between speaker and utterance as noted with the dispreferred responses above. The expression *dong dong dong* is normally performed by pronouncing the three *dongs* quickly, like a bell. In doing so, the speaker often pokes the listener or him or herself in the head with each *dong*. The playful nature of this stance is seen in Bibin’s first stance follow, which is simply laughter. Mia further supports her initial stance lead by asking Bibin what she expects to learn by attending the event. In the subsequent stance follow, Bibin draws on the *Bahasa Gaul* idiom of the original stance lead to indicate that it is not a matter of *dong dong* ‘duh, what are you thinking?’. She then explains why it is not merely a matter of *dong dong dong*.

The suffix *-in* is often selected with the discourse marker *dong* in imperative, deontic utterances. This is seen in the following example:

(9)

- | | | | | | | |
|---|--------|-------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|--------------|
| 1 | Radin: | Dugem
clubbing | saya
1SG | hanya
only | sekali
one.time | saja
just |
| 2 | | pergi
go | ke
to | dugem.
clubbing | | |
| 3 | Catur: | Gimana
how | ceritain
story-APP | DO::NG!?
DM | | |
- Radin: As for my clubbing, I’ve only been to a nightclub one time?
Catur: What was it like, tell me, will you!?

Catur selects the suffix *-in* and *dong* here to implore Radin to discuss his clubbing experience. The selection of both of these variables indexes a playful irony which in fact is strategically focused. Catur truly wants Radin to discuss his experience but loosely cloaks this aim by ‘speaking the culture’. Catur performs this utterance using the playful voice intonation described above. This enables Catur to index this stance with regard to boldness, *ramai* and *gaul*. However, imperative utterances with the suffix *-in* do not need to be performed. Example (9) is performed because of the presence of the discourse marker *dong*. Example (7) above was not performed and this is the case for a majority of the imperative uses of *-in*.

Many of the observations made about dispreferred stances are equally as applicable to deontic stances. The overlap between the two was noted at the start of this section. In a general sense, speakers mobilise the exterior indexicality of ‘boldness’ to accomplish deontic stances. Stance follow in relation to deontic stances was noted to be generally unremarkable. However, some speakers are noted countering deontic stances with *Bahasa Gaul* in stance follow. Within this section, examples (7), (8) and (9) included use of the suffix *-in* and there are a few observations to make about the use of this suffix in Malang. This suffix is not often performed in the manner described for other *Bahasa Gaul* styles. A full discussion of this suffix is beyond the scope of the current paper. However, it is worth speculating in a general sense on why this form may not be performed. Firstly, this may simply be due to its bound nature. Most *Bahasa Gaul* forms are free morphemes and idiomatic expressions. They may, as a result, more easily develop their own histories independent of other forms. Secondly, the suffix *-in* may be more fully incorporated into the local variety of Indonesian than the other forms. I earlier showed how there was disagreement in the metapragmatic commentary about how the suffix *-in* should be viewed in Malang. Future studies may show whether this variant becomes part of the local repertoire or drops away as at least one participant has suggested.

***Bahasa Gaul* and cheeky stances**

I have implicitly been arguing that it is stances as much as the selection of *Bahasa Gaul* that enables young speakers to construct *gaul* as a social category. This is perhaps clearest in the use of *Bahasa Gaul* to enact ‘cheeky’ and self-confident stances. These stances include tongue-in-cheek arrogance, insults and the use of constructed dialogues to claim to have misbehaved. These stances are often performed rather than spoken, again blurring the line between speaker and utterance. Both insult and tongue-in-cheek arrogance are illustrated in the following example. Here, Tika is describing me, the researcher, to Samson. Samson and I both come up at the ‘short’ by the end of the following exchange.

(10)

- | | | | | | | | |
|---|---------|---------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| 1 | Samson: | Ya...
yeah | pasti
definitely | sama
same | aku
1SG | | |
| 2 | | tinggian
tall-COMP | dia
3S | pasti
definitely | | | |
| 3 | Tika: | IYA IYA LAH
of course | | | | | |
| 4 | Samson: | Kurang
less | ajar
study | | | | |
| 5 | Tika: | Tapi...
but | | | | | |
| 6 | Samson: | Tapi
but | yang
REL | pasti
definitely | kerenan
cool-COMP | GUÉ
1SG | DONG
DM |
- Samson: Yeah, surely he’s taller than me.
Tika: Duh, of course!
Samson: That’s rude.
Tika: But...
Samson: But surely I’m cooler than him and you know it.

Tika takes a playful jab at Samson’s height in line 3 through the use of the *Bahasa Gaul* expression *iya iya lah*. Rather than merely confirming that I am taller than Samson, she emphasises that ‘of course’ this is the case. Samson takes offense (real or feigned) by saying *kurang ajar*. This is literally ‘uneducated’ but it more accurately means something along the lines of ‘that was uncalled for’. *Kurang ajar* is frequently selected in the stance follow to

cheeky stance leads. Samson recovers his pride, partially at my expense, in line 6. He does this by selecting *gué* to emphasise that he is ‘cool’ in comparison to me. He also adds a performed *dong* to emphasise that this is the case. Samson is originally from Kediri and attends university in Malang. However, he also works as a fashion model in Jakarta. In this example, Samson’s selection of *gué* enables him to invoke his Jakarta lifestyle which includes clubbing, modelling and other ‘cool’ activities (see Manns, 2012).

Cheeky stances are frequently insults but these are almost always performed rather than spoken through *Bahasa Gaul*. It was argued that by performing *Bahasa Gaul*, speakers simultaneously index ironic distancing and *ramai* ‘noisy, bustling’. Speakers are noted exploiting this ambiguity to accomplish face-threatening stances, such as providing a pejorative evaluation of a listener. For example, this speaker performs English and *dong* to pejoratively evaluate a listener’s weight:

(11)

1	Minggir, AT-edge	awas careful			
2	SHOULD should	YOU 2SG	CAN can	DO do	DO::NG DM
3	ah uh	katanya say-STM			
4	tambah add	langsing slim			
5	ah uh	rugi effort	kamu 2SG		
6	turun go.down	berapa how.much	kilo kilogram	sih? DM	

You’re coming up to the edge, be careful. You really should, uh, you said that you were

Here, the speaker playfully warns his best friend that she should lose weight. The stylised use of *dong* and English in line 2 enables the speaker to embed this subjective evaluation of his listener within multiple layers of discourse. This strategy shifts the responsibility of interpreting this stance to the listener. This stance is presented as a potential act of identity

due to its performed forms. Yet, in actuality, this stance may be a very honest evaluation of the listener presented as a Trojan horse.

Lastly, speakers often use *Bahasa Gaul* within constructed dialogues to claim to have taken bold and self-confident stances with non-present adults. These stances, I argue, enable a speaker to project the kind of rebellious image which is relevant to the construction and substantiation of *gaul* identity. Tannen (2007) finds that ‘constructed dialogue’ is a more accurate label for what has traditionally been called ‘reported speech’. She (2007, p. 17) writes that “framing discourse as dialogue is not a ‘report’ at all; rather, it is the recontextualisation of words in a current discourse”. The notion of constructed dialogue is well-suited to the reporting of prior exchanges in Javanese discourse. Such reporting has previously been labelled as ‘modelled speech’ in Javanese discourse (Keeler, 1987; Errington, 1998). Modelled speech is the direct quotation of conversations had with non-present others. It is similar to English reported speech, but modelled speech more typically involves a full shift to the kind of language used in the prior or hypothetical context.

Bahasa Gaul is often selected in constructed dialogue to playfully claim to have taken bold stances where this is unlikely to have been the case. For example, the speaker in the following extract describes an interaction with her mother:

(12)

1	Aku	suruh	mamaku
	1SG	influence	mother-1SG
2	cariin	DO::NG	
	look-APP	DM	

I tried to get my mother to do it, [I said] just look for it!

Here, Mery brags to a friend about how she demanded that her mother find a copy of a film for her. It is not impossible, but improbable that Mery enacted such a strong stance with her mother. The use of *dong* in line 2 enables Mery to project a sassy and self-confident persona by virtue of this modelled stance taken with an adult and authority figure. Once again,

speakers are able to draw on the ‘bold’ voice of Jakartans to enact stances in the immediate context. Furthermore, these stances are performed rather than merely spoken and this frames these stances as *ramai*. In other words, in both cases, speakers are able to mobilise exterior indexicalities to interior ends. I consolidate and clarify the notion of exterior/interior indexicalities in the concluding discussion below.

Discussion and conclusion

The dialogic nature of conversation and *Bahasa Gaul* has been illustrated throughout this paper. Firstly, conversation is dialogic in the sense that speakers are responding to the immediately preceding text. Conversation participants take subjective stances with regard to another’s prior subjective stance. Intersubjectivity emerges as a result of two independent actors jointly engaging in stance-taking (Du Bois & Kärkkäinen, 2012). The preceding sections have shown how the use of *Bahasa Gaul* is patterned and sequenced in casual conversations in Malang. Speakers select *Bahasa Gaul* in ‘stance lead’, among other things, to invoke interpersonal alignment, persuade a hearer to accept a viewpoint or complete an action or to present cheeky, pejorative evaluations of another. Conversation participants respond with *Bahasa Gaul* in ‘stance follow’ to perform interpersonal alignment, present dispreferred responses or to take cheeky stances of their own.

In any case, speakers draw on indexicality to enact these stances and this brings us to the second understanding of the dialogic nature of conversation. Conversation is dialogic in the sense that speakers draw on linguistic forms’ semiotic links to prior speakers and/or contexts. Bakhtin (1981) has noted that part of the meaning of an utterance is its social history, its social presence and its social future (Ochs, 1992; Coupland, 2001). Thus, an utterance may have several different ‘voices’ (Ochs, 1992) and speakers activate these voices in a context to enact stances. This paper draws on Kiesling’s notion of exterior indexicality to show how the Jakarta voice is activated in conversations to enact stances. Furthermore, this paper showed how these voices are performed rather than being merely spoken. This

enables a metaphorical distancing between speaker and utterances. It also means the exterior indexicality of *ramai* is activated. With this in mind, the notion of exterior indexicality requires further discussion and argument. In sum, more needs to be done to show how *Bahasa Gaul* and contemporary youth practices may be understood within cognitive frames and this will be the purpose of the remainder of this paper.

The Jakarta ‘voice’ and its use by non-Jakartans have long been referred to in a general sense. Smith-Hefner (2009) reviews Swastika who finds that “that in imitating Jakartan speech, young people in the provinces aspire to the hip, modern, and cosmopolitan lifestyle of those who live in metropolitan Jakarta”. Sneddon (2003, p. 155) notes, “[t]o speak like a Jakartan is to be like a Jakartan: up-to-date, prosperous and sophisticated, whatever the reality may be”. Englebreston (2007) and Manns (2012) demonstrate that in addition to the hip, modern and sophisticated qualities associated with Jakarta Indonesian, there is also a certain bold, self-confidence linked to the dialect. This boldness was demonstrated again in the current paper with regard to *Bahasa Gaul*.

This paper introduced the notion of exterior indexicality and proposed the exterior indexicalities of ‘boldness’ and *ramai* for the Malang context. There are multiple indexicalities associated with any form. A form’s social history and social presence are complex and there are indeed multiple voices attached to any form. I will close this paper by expanding upon ‘boldness’ and *ramai* as exterior indexicalities and cognitive frames. I will also introduce a third overarching indexicality related to *gaul* in Malang: *enjoy aja*. This label is in part arbitrary but it will be shown that it encapsulates the contemporary *gaul* experience in much the same way that *keepin’ it real* has become a mantra for hip hop (Cutler, 2003).

Taking as a starting point Englebretson (2007) and Manns (2012), this paper has shown how speakers draw on the exterior indexicality of ‘boldness’ to enact stances. This

indexicality was particularly useful for enacting cheeky stances. Bold stances like these enable Malang youth to respond to and construct *gaul* as a social category. These stances arguably empower local young people who wish “to declare their independence of traditional expectations” (Smith-Hefner, 2007, p. 197). This is particularly the case in the enactment of cheeky stances with adults. However, bold and self-confident stances enacted with *Bahasa Gaul* ostensibly come into conflict with Javanese conversational norms which stress harmony and freedom from imposition.

This leads many speakers to playfully perform these stances and this has consequences for the stance and identity on two levels. Firstly, this enables a speaker to index a certain degree of irony by inserting metaphorical distance between the self and utterance. It was discussed above how this is relevant to the enactment of *gaul* identity. However, secondly, and more relevant to the current discussion, the performance of a form invokes the exterior indexicality of *ramai* ‘noisy, bustling’. It was noted above that *ramai* is positively evaluated in Javanese culture and it is important to Javanese relationships. Special events and ceremonies require *ramai* and in contemporary times this has come in the form of large, loud speakers and amplification systems (Sutton, 1996; Keeler, 2001). Children become socialised at a very young age to accept and even enjoy the chaos of *ramai* (C. Geertz, 1960; Sutton, 1996). C. Geertz (1960, p. 49) writes, “[i]t is hoped, people say, that the child will grow up liking the crowds, the helter-skelter, and the constant buzz of joking conversation the Javanese call *rame*, which finds its prime exemplification in the market”.

Ramai is valued among Malang’s young Javanese. Participants present a positive evaluation of *ramai* locations or behaviour (linguistic or otherwise) in the corpus and in interviews. For instance, in the following example, taken from the corpus, Henny discusses having fun in Malang. Henny points out that whether one has fun in Malang is dependent on finding a location with a large number of young people and an atmosphere of *ramai*.

(13)

1	Yo yeah	bisa can	aja just	sih DM
2	enak delicious	yo yeah		
3	tergantung depends	lokasinya location-DEF	juga also	kan DM
4	Iya yeah	makanya then-STM	tuh that	
5	cari look	lokasi location	yang REL	ramai noisy
6	yang REL	banyak lots	anak child	mudanya young
7	kan DM	itu that	a DM	

Yeah, you can have fun, it just depends on the location, you know? Yeah, like, you have to find a location where it is noisy and there are lots of young people. It's like that, isn't it?

Manns (2011, forthcoming) shows that young people prefer radio language which is spoken loudly and quickly. This is one factor which motivates one announcer at a local youth radio station to use what she calls in English her *smiling voice* in broadcasts. She uses a voice which is louder, faster and higher in pitch than a normal speaking voice. Furthermore, she lengthens many final syllables, especially in words which occur utterance-finally. This is specifically in response to the popularity of *ramai*. Notably, the voice intonation used by the announcer is indeed similar to the one adopted by the speakers in this paper. Thus, in sum, speakers who perform *Bahasa Gaul* may be simultaneously responding to and constructing *gaul* and Javanese identity. Performed stances are essential to positioning the self within these *gaul* and Javanese frames.

In closing, I would like to suggest that youth practices may be viewed in terms of the overarching concept of a single *Bahasa Gaul* expression: *enjoy aja* 'just enjoy'. In addition to being a *Bahasa Gaul* form, *enjoy aja* may be viewed as an exterior indexicality linked to *Bahasa Gaul* forms more generally as well as a cognitive frame for understanding *gaul*

stances. *Enjoy aja* has oft been referred to in metapragmatically-focused interviews I have conducted (see Manns, 2011). It is most typically used to describe linguistic practices related to ‘joking around’ or ‘having fun’. *Enjoy aja* can be traced to a popular advertising campaign for the *L.A. Light* cigarette company. It has since gained popularity as an idiomatic phrase linked to *gaul*. Unlike many of the more ephemeral *gaul* idioms (e.g., *so what gitu lho* ‘so what, that’s just the way it is’), *enjoy aja* continues to be used more than a half decade after its first appearance.

This is arguably because *enjoy aja* has become a mantra for *gaul* culture in the way that Cutler (2003) argues *keepin’ it real* has been a mantra for hip-hop culture. Cutler (2003, p. 212, drawing on Rickford & Rickford, 2000) argues that *keepin’ it real* “exhort[s] individuals to be true to their roots and not to ‘front’ or pretend to be something they are not”. *Enjoy aja*, I argue, encapsulates *gaul*. Smith-Hefner (2007, p. 198) describes *gaul* in terms of “middle-class youth’s heightened concern for casual informality, greater emotional expressivity, and the communication of a new and constantly evolving popular Indonesian culture” (Smith-Hefner, 2007, p. 198). *Enjoy aja* plays a key role in indexing casual informality. It also speaks to the rejection of the previous generation’s norms. Smith-Hefner (2007, p. 186) notes that *gaul* “articulates a rejection of what is viewed as the previous generation’s orientation toward patrimonialism, formality, and fixed social hierarchy” (Smith-Hefner, 2007, p. 186). In other words, there is no need to be overly concerned with such things; rather, one should *enjoy aja* ‘just enjoy’.

In conclusion, many of *Bahasa Gaul*’s features are ephemeral but its impact on the Indonesian language may be more lasting. This is particularly the case due to *Bahasa Gaul*’s links to Jakarta Indonesian (cf. Smith-Hefner, 2007). There is increasing reference in the literature to Colloquial Indonesian (e.g. Englebretson, 2003; Sneddon, 2003; Ewing, 2005; Djenar, 2008). This variety is discussed without reference to geographical links (Djenar,

2008) but it is influenced by Jakarta Indonesian (Sneddon, 2003; Ewing, 2005). The current paper has shown that the following quote from Djenar (2012, p. 49) is certainly relevant for Malang, “[t]hat the colloquial Jakartan Indonesian has had a significant influence on the language of urban youth is unquestionable”.

This paper has taken steps to show the degree to which the impact of Jakarta Indonesian has been felt in Malang, Indonesia. In doing so, it has established conversation as among the genres used by young people to construct and respond to the social category *gaul*. The dialogic nature of *gaul* conversation was illustrated on two levels. It was firstly shown how speakers use *Bahasa Gaul* to enact and respond to stances drawing on the notion of intersubjectivity. Secondly, it was shown how speakers mobilise exterior indexicalities linked to *Bahasa Gaul* to enact stances which indirectly index *gaul*. In sum, this paper has shown how the social category *gaul* has “culturally recognised, patterned ways of speaking, or structured cognitive frameworks for engaging in discourse” (cf. Coupland, 2007, p. 15). In doing so, it has provided a more nuanced understanding of *gaul* and conversation as a genre.

Glossing conventions

The orthography used for the examples generally follows the conventions set out by the 1972 spelling reforms for the Indonesian and Malay languages. Some modifications have been made to account for non-standard pronunciations. This paper follows Leipzig Glossing rules with the following exceptions:

APP	applicative
AT	agent trigger prefix
COMP	comparative
DM	discourse marker
EXIST	existential marker
NV	non-volitional marker
PT	patient trigger prefix
RED	reduplication
REP	repetition
STM	epistemic stance marker

References

- Adelaar, S. & Prentice, D. (1996). Malay: the national language of Malaysia. In S.A.Wurm, P. Muhlhausler and D. Tyron (Eds.), *Atlas of Languages of Intercultural Communication in the Pacific, Asia and the Americas* (pp.729-733). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Agha, A. (2003). The social life of cultural value. *Language and Communication*, 23: 231- 273.
- Anderson, B. (1983). *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso.
- Bakhtin, M. (1981). *The Dialogic Imagination*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Bauman, R. (2004). *A World of Others' Words: Cross-cultural Perspectives on Intertextuality*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Berman, R. (2004). Introduction: Developing discourse stance in different text and types of language. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 37 (2): 105-124.
- Boellstorff, T. (2004). Gay language and Indonesia: Registering belonging. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 14(2): 248-268.
- Bucholtz, M. (2003) Sociolinguistic Nostalgia and the Authentication of Identity. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 7(3): 398–416.
- Bucholtz, M. & Hall, K. (2005). Identity and interaction: a sociocultural linguistic approach. *Discourse Studies*, 7(4-5): 585-614.
- Clift, R. (1999). Irony in conversation. *Language in Society*, 28(4): 523-553.
- Coupland, N. (2001). Language, situation, and the relational self: theorizing dialect-style in sociolinguistics. In P. Eckert and J. Rickford (Eds.), *Style and Sociolinguistic Variation* (pp. 185-210). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Coupland, N. (2007). *Style: Language Variation and Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cutler, C. (2003). “Keepin’ it real”: White hip-hoppers’ discourses of language, race, and authenticity. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 13(2): 211-233.
- Djenar, D.N. (2008). On the development of a colloquial writing style: examining the language of Indonesian teen literature. *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land-, en Volkenkunde*, 164 (2/3): 238–268.
- Djenar, D.N. (2012). Almost unbridled: Indonesian youth language and its critics. *South East Asia Research*, 20(1): pp. 35-51.
- Djenar, D.N. & Ewing, M. (2012, October). Indonesian Youth Language and Involvement in Print Genres. Paper presented at Grammar and Genre, Turku Finland.
- Du Bois, J. (1986). Meaning without intention: lessons from divination. In J. Hill & J. Irvine (Eds.), *Responsibility and evidence in oral discourse* (pp. 48-71). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Du Bois, J. (2007). The stance triangle. In R. Englebretson (Ed.), *Stancetaking in Discourse Subjectivity, Evaluation and Interaction* (pp.139-182). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- Du Bois, J. & Kärkkäinen, E. (2012). Taking a stance on emotion: affect, sequence, and intersubjectivity in dialogic interaction. *Text & Talk*, 32(4): 433-451.
- Eckert, P. (2012). Three Waves of Variation Study: The Emergence of Meaning in the Study of Sociolinguistic Variation. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 41: 87-100.
- Emka, M. (2007). *Kamus Gaul Hare Gene!!!* Jakarta: GagasMedia.
- Englebretson, R. (2003). *Searching for Structure: The Problem of Complementation in Colloquial Indonesian Conversation*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Englebretson, R. (2007). Grammatical resources for social purposes: Some aspects of stancetaking in colloquial Indonesian conversation. In R. Englebretson (Ed.), *Stancetaking in Discourse* (pp. 69-110). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Errington, J. (1985). *Language and Social Change in Java: Linguistic Reflexes of Modernization in a Traditional Royal Polity*. Athens: Ohio University Press.
- Errington, J. (1986). Continuity and change in Indonesian language development. *Journal of Asian Studies*, 45(2): 329-353.
- Errington, J. (1998). *Shifting Languages: Interaction and Identity in Javanese Indonesia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ewing, M. (2005). Colloquial Indonesian. In S. Adelaar and N. Himmelmann (Eds.), *The Austronesian Languages of Asia and Madagascar* (pp. 227-258). London and New York: Routledge.
- Geertz, C. (1960). *The Religion of Java*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
- Geertz, H. (1961). *The Javanese Family*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
- Haddington (2007). Positioning and alignment as activities of stancetaking in news interviews. In R. Englebretson (Ed.), *Stancetaking in Discourse* (pp. 283-317). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Haiman, J. (1998). *Talk is Cheap: Sarcasm, alienation, and the evolution of language*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Haikal, M. (2007). *Humor & Kamus Gaul*. Jakarta: Better Book.
- Heritage, J. & Clayman, S. (2010). *Talk in Action*. Interactions, Identities, and Institutions. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Heritage, J. & Raymond, G. (2005). The Terms of Agreement: Indexing Epistemic Authority and Subordination in Talk-in-Interaction. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 68(1): 15-38.
- Hutchby, I. & Wooffitt, R. (1988). *Conversation Analysis: Principles, Practices and Applications*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Ibrihim, I. (2007). *Budaya Populer Sebagai Komunikasi: Dinamika Popscape dan Mediascape di Indonesia Kontemporer*. Yogyakarta: Jalasutra.
- Johnstone, B. (2009). Stance, style and the linguistic individual. In A. Jaffe (Ed.), *Stance: Sociolinguistic Perspectives* (pp. 29-52). New York: Oxford.

- Johnstone, B., Andrus, J. & Danielson, A. (2006). Mobility, indexicality, and the enregisterment of 'Pittsburghese'. *Journal of English Linguistics*, 34(2): 77–104.
- Jurriëns, E. (2009). *From monologue to dialogue: radio and reform in Indonesia*. Leiden: KITLV Press.
- Kärkkäinen, E. (2003). *Epistemic Stance in English Conversation: A Description of Its Interactional Functions with a Focus on 'I think'*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Kärkkäinen, E. (2007). The role of *I guess* in conversational stancetaking. In R. Englebretson (Ed.), *Stancetaking in Discourse: Subjectivity, Evaluation and Interaction* (pp. 183-220). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Keeler, W. (1987). *Javanese Shadow Plays, Javanese Selves*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Keeler, W. (2001). *Javanese: A Cultural Approach*. Athens: Ohio University for International Studies.
- Kiesling, S. (2004). Dude. *American Speech*, 79(3): 281-305.
- Kiesling, S. (2009). Style as stance: Stance as the explanation for patterns of sociolinguistic variation. In A. Jaffe (Ed.) *Stance: Sociolinguistic Perspectives* (pp. 171-194). New York: Oxford.
- Labov, W. (1972). *Sociolinguistic Patterns*. Philadelphia: Pennsylvania University Press.
- Le Page, R.B. and Tabouret-Keller, A. (1985). *Acts of Identity: Creole-Based Approaches to Language and Ethnicity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Manns, H. (2010). Indonesian slang in Internet chatting. In S. Babatunde, A. Odenbunmi, A. Adetunji & M. Adedimeji (Eds.), *Studies in Slang and Slogans* (pp. 71-99). Munich: Lincom Europa.
- Manns, H. (2011). *Stance, style and identity in Java*. Unpublished PhD thesis, Monash University, Melbourne, Australia.
- Manns, H. (2012). First-person pronominal variation, stance and identity in Indonesia. *Australian Journal of Linguistics*, 32(4): 435-456.
- Manns, H. (forthcoming). Scripting radio talk amidst language shift in Indonesia. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication*.
- Mulder, N. (2007). *Inside Indonesian Society: Cultural Change in Java*. Yogyakarta, Indonesia: Kanisius.
- O'Hanlon, R. (2006). Australian Hip Hop: A Sociolinguistic Investigation. *Australian Journal of Linguistics*, 26(2), 193-209.
- Ochs, E. (1990). Indexicality and socialization. In J. Stigler, G. Herdt, & R. Shweder (Eds.), *Cultural Psychology: The Chicago Symposia* (pp. 287-308). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ochs, E. (1992). Indexing gender. In A. Duranti & C. Goodwin (Eds.), *Rethinking Context: Language as an Interactive Phenomenon* (pp. 335-358). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Oetomo, D. (1990). The Bahasa Indonesia of the middle class. *Prisma*, 50, 68-79.
- Omoniyi, T. (2009). "So I choose to Do Am Naija Style": Hip Hop, Language, and Postcolonial

- Identities. In H. Alim, A. Ibrahim, & A. Pennycook (Eds.), *Global Linguistic Flows: Hip Hop Cultures, Youth Identities, and the Politics of Language* (pp. 113-138). New York: Routledge.
- Pennycook, A. (2003). Global Englishes, Rip Slyme and performativity. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 7(4): 513-533.
- Rahardja, P. & Chambert-Loir, H. (1988). *Kamus Bahasa Prokem*. Jakarta: Pustaka Utama Grafiti.
- Rauniomaa, M. (2007). Stance markers in spoken Finnish: *Minun Mielestä* and *minusta* in assessments. In R. Englebretson (Ed.), *Stancetaking in Discourse: Subjectivity, Evaluation and Interaction* (pp. 221-252). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Redana, B. (1997). Ongkos sosial gaya hidup mutakhir. In I. Ibrahim (Ed.), *Lifestyle Ecstasy: Kebudayaan Pop Dalam Masyarakat Komoditas Indonesia* (pp. 52-70). Yogyakarta: Jalasutra.
- Rickford, R. & Rickford, R. (2000). *Spoken Soul: The Story of Black English*. New York: John Wiley.
- Sahertian, D. (2001). *Kamus Bahasa Gaul*. Jakarta: Pustaka Sinar Harapan.
- Smith-Hefner, N. (2007). Youth language, gaul sociability and the new Indonesian middle class. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 17(2): 184-203.
- Smith-Hefner, N. (2009). Language shift, gender, and ideologies of modernity in Central Java, Indonesia. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 19(1): 57-77.
- Sneddon, J. (2001). Teaching informal Indonesian: Some factors for considerations. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*, 24(2): 81-95.
- Sneddon, J. (2003). *The Indonesian Language*. Sydney: The University of New South Wales.
- Sneddon, J. (2006). *Colloquial Jakartan Indonesian*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Sutton, R. (1996). Interpreting electronic sound technology in the contemporary Javanese soundscape. *Ethnomusicology*, 40(2): 249-268.
- Tannen, D. (2007). *Talking Voices: Repetition, Dialogue, and Imagery in Conversational Discourse* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wallach, J. (2008). *Modern Noise, Fluid Genres: Popular Music in Indonesia, 1997-2001*. Madison, WI: The University of Wisconsin Press.
- Wolfowitz, C. (1991). *Language Style and Social Space: Stylistic Choice in Suriname Javanese*. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press.