

Features of Indonesian as spoken in Bandung

Michael C Ewing
University of Melbourne

This presentation is a preliminary report on features of Indonesian as spoken in Bandung. Data comprise eight recordings of spontaneous informal conversation among young adult peers, recorded in Bandung in 2014. The interactions are predominantly in colloquial Indonesian, but also contain features that can be attributed to Sundanese provenience (as well as features associated with Jakarta Colloquial Indonesian, Javanese, English and other sources). I first summarise some key features of the language used in these data that can be attributed to influence from Sundanese, the dominant regional language in Bandung, including in areas of phonology, lexicon, and morphosyntax. The main focus of the presentation is a more detailed look at the use of Sundanese lexicon. Certain discourse particles are the most commonly used Sundanese elements in what is otherwise Indonesian interaction. Some speakers make occasional use of Sundanese pronouns, and Sundanese vocabulary is also used, predominately at points of heightened engagement and explicit stancetaking. This can range from a single lexical item in a predominately Indonesian utterance, to extensive use of Sundanese in what amounts to codeswitching over a number of intonation units. Crucially, different speakers display different patterns, frequencies and interactional practices with regards to Sundanese elements that occur in their speech. Individual speakers will also vary in their use of Sundanese elements in different contexts. Motivations for this variation may include topic, participants' linguistic profile and personal styles and levels of engagement. Thus, Indonesian as spoken in Bandung can be seen in terms of an aggregate of practices that can coalesce into different stylistic turns, shifting with speaker and context. This study helps inform how we might consider theorising regionally inflected Indonesian, suggesting that a heteroglossic approach that stresses language features as resources for semeiotic and interactional work might be more productive than a polyglossic approach stressing stable, clearly delineated varieties of language.