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**Summary**

Zane Goebel’s “Language, Migration, and Identity: Neighborhood talk in Indonesia” aims to fill gaps in the scholarship on the diversity of inter-ethnic talk in Indonesia. Despite receiving extensive attention from the scholarly community, much of the earlier research on Indonesia has utilized archival, interview, or survey methodologies as opposed to participant observation and the study of conversational interaction. Goebel had conducted over two years of ethnographic fieldwork in two discrete communities within Semarang, a city on the north coast of Indonesia. This extensive fieldwork has served to rectify this, providing a thorough examination of the intricacies of language use in a predominantly transient setting.

In the introductory chapter, Goebel frames the discussion that is at the core of his book by closely identifying the gaps in prior research on language use in Indonesia. Goebel’s work looks at situated talk within two wards (subsections of larger neighborhoods) in Semarang in an effort to examine how talk plays a role in mediating social relations or influences the construction or maintenance of identity. The introduction also details the theoretical foundation of the book, discussing Agha’s (2007) work, while also grounding the research in Wenger’s (1998) concept of community of practice and Wortham’s (2006) research on the emergence of social identity.

In Chapter 2, Goebel begins with an in-depth discussion of enregisterment and semiotic registers, drawing extensively again from Agha (2007) for his theoretical grounding. This follows with a short discussion on enregisterment in the Indonesian context, as well as the place of government policy, the schooling and educational system, and local and regional languages within this process. Chapter 2 also examines a number of clips from popular Indonesian television shows, which Goebel believes could play a role in the enregisterment process. He details the differing linguistic choices that are made in the programming of these popular serials, which the author argues reflects the metapragmatic discourse of the Indonesian state in relation to dominant and minority languages of the country.

Chapter 3 presents primarily non-linguistic signs, which Goebel argues help to constitute the semiotic registers that are discussed throughout the book. He also works to show how these signs, along with local practices, become enregistered in these communities. Particular attention is paid to how specific spaces, people, or activities can become part of a semiotic register in Wards 5 and 8. Through the various forms of participation in ward life, community members work to construct and mold conceptions of identity while positioning themselves and others within (or outside of) many different “categories of personhood” which are detailed throughout the remainder of the book.
Through this discussion Goebel draws on multiple frames of expectation (Goffman 1974) within these wards, which he notes work to establish some kind of normative behavior or expectations relating to appropriateness in the community. Chapter 3 also proposes that ward members’ own trajectories of socialization (Wortham 2005) affect their linguistic choice as it relates to usage of Indonesian or languages other than Indonesian, namely Krama and Ngoko Javanese. This chapter also provides the reader with detailed descriptions of both Ward 5 and Ward 8, serving as a firm ethnographic and descriptive grounding for the setting of the research.

Chapter 4 begins by detailing some of the theoretical foundations of the study of code-switching (Gumperz 1982a, Myers-Scotton 1993). Goebel notes some potential areas where the Myers-Scotton model of code switching has been problematized in earlier ethnographic work. Instead of a model of identity-based code-switching Goebel adopts a more temporal approach for this book, which he grounds in the work of Rampton (1995a, 1995b, 1998) and Wortham (2006).

From this point Goebel continues the chapter by classifying different lexical signs and the varied speech levels present in Javanese, which is crucial to the remainder of the text. In this chapter Goebel also admits that the methodology he has proposed in this book does not constitute a “one-size-fits-all” framework. As he describes it, his methods have holes and they do “leak” but that this methodology provides a useful way in which to approach these types of highly transient communities. Despite apparent leaks in the methodology, this chapter is especially well constructed and gives the reader a clear overview of the kind of participant observation that Goebel has done, while also showing the reader exactly where his data came from and how he went about collecting it.

One problem area does emerge in this chapter, however, with respect to how Goebel relates a collection of speech patterns to specific speech categories detailed by Gafaranga and Torra (2002): sign alternation as the medium, medium repair, and code-switching. These concepts all have a firm theoretical grounding, but a more holistic description of these categories and why they are relevant would have been helpful. Clearer coverage of these issues in Chapter 4 would help the reader later in the book, as these terms and themes are called upon regularly throughout the remainder of the text.

Chapter 5 examines the linguistic practices of the female members of Ward 8. This analysis is carried out, both in this chapter and in subsequent ones, through an analysis of speech as it unfolds during monthly ward meetings between residents. This chapter sets up the discussion on the various frames of expectation that exist in the ward, which work to mold or shape the actions and expectations of residents. These frames of expectation are argued to help establish what kinds of practices are considered normative in the community as well as processes of social identification and positioning that are taking place simultaneously.

By drawing on the work of Ochs and Capps (2001), Goebel argues that through co-constructed talk, social identities are formed and changed in these wards. These practices
are instrumental in the indexing of categories of personhood, alongside other signs in the locally emerging semiotic registers that he proposes. Goebel attempts to show how the co-construction of self and the “other” through language choice can be used to position community members within these specific categories, or within related semiotic registers more generally. This chapter also works to question the linkages between prevailing language ideologies and specific ethnic identities. Goebel problematizes this through showing in his data how processes of adequation or crossing happen across meeting attendees regardless of their ethnic background.

Chapter 6 analyzes the processes involved in becoming a “good ward member”. Goebel does this through an examination of the forms of learning that appear to be taking place among newcomers to the community, which can in turn help them to integrate and assimilate to the normative expectations of the ward. He shows how community members can learn, through the course of being a ward member, the appropriate use of specific linguistic forms and signs. Goebel also uses this chapter to begin to show how degrees of daily contact and interaction among ward members can reflect their patterns of linguistic use. Specifically how levels and hours of work or time spent outside of the ward can play a role in shaping the linguistic choices made in interactional exchanges.

One useful method of representation that Goebel makes use of in this respect are detailed half-matrices which show the forms that make up the habitual linguistic exchanges of specific ward members. This gives the reader an opportunity to see what the predominant language forms are in communication between specific pairs of people discussed in the book. Through this representation Goebel does more work towards showing how normative practices are developed across speech acts as well as the continual reification of expectations about what is normal in ward life.

In Chapter 7, Goebel introduces the issue of Indo-Chinese ethnicity in the context of the two wards, however the issue is treated more extensively in the following chapter. This chapter weaves together the complex network of different factors that all contribute to the creation and maintenance of semiotic registers and processes of enregisterment in these communities. In particular the importance of financial issues is introduced as a factor, which he argues is tied to how ward members are identified and categorized in the community. This involves the further development of classifications of personhood that take place throughout the ward meeting discussed in the chapter.

Linguistically, Goebel notes in this chapter that in the ward meeting under examination interethnic talk was conducted in Indonesian, while intraethnic talk took place predominantly in Javanese. This worked to further solidify the category of the “other” as being associated with [?] Indonesian, a point which he had raised previously. Interestingly, in this chapter Goebel also argues that since there are very few “original inhabitants” in the ward, the expectations associated with linguistic sign usage could be lessened. This works to reflect the overarching goal of the book, to examine the way that language is used—or can be used—within transient communities.
Chapter 8 focuses specifically on ward members who are of an Indo-Chinese ethnic background and the associations between these ward members and categories of personhood relating to “deviance” or “deviant behavior”. Goebel frames this discussion through noting an upswing in representations of the Indo-Chinese community in the media. The types of typically “deviant” categories of personhood that were established in the previous chapter are now linked to a single person in the ward who is of an Indo-Chinese background. Eventually Goebel notes that this person’s Chinese ancestry is explicitly called upon in indexing his deviant nature. Goebel notes that these more explicit connections between Chineseness and deviance came at a time when the national government was authorizing overt racism towards the Indo-Chinese. This reflects that an awareness and integration of ethnographic information from outside the ward-level is crucial to a thorough analysis of the community.

The connections made between actual linguistic exchange and signs that Goebel argues are indexed as Chinese or reflecting Chineseness is really the major contribution of the chapter. Goebel notes that this was an area that was previously restricted to historical, sources without being empirically grounded in actual speech data. Indeed, this is a major positive step towards an analysis that seeks to integrate more macro level ideologies and stereotypes relating to ethnicity and language use with speech data. Throughout the arc of Goebel’s argument in this chapter he also continually draws on data from his transcripts that in turn provide further views on the kinds of habitual linguistic exchanges that are taking place in these communities, and also how these exchanges work to reify the normative values that are tied to linguistic and nonlinguistic signs.

Goebel ends this chapter with a brief word of caution. He notes that although the situation that he describes resembles a koineization of linguistic signs (Kerswill 2002), it is not truly the kind of process that is at work. He argues that the conditions of contact in these communities differ quite significantly from those described by Kerswill and others. Methodologically Goebel’s approach is also inherently different than those employed in variationist sociolinguistic work. Although it was not the main point of this particular chapter, a more thorough discussion on why this particular situation is not an example of koineization would have been an insightful addition for those readers who are more firmly grounded in variationist sociolinguistic work. Including that information would have further supported his methodological considerations from earlier chapters and helped to strengthen his argument.

Through looking at linguistic exchanges taking place during a card-game in Ward 5, Chapter 9 investigates language practices and their relation to overarching language ideologies in Indonesia. Goebel notes that one of his main goals for this chapter is to point out the differences that exist between these ideologies and actual situated linguistic practice. He discusses in some detail how his findings contrast prevailing language ideologies, noting that there appears to be a large discrepancy between ideology and practice, based on his research. Here again Goebel reiterates that regular contact between ward members and the frequency of their interactions appears to play a major role in the development of their trajectories of socialization. This in turn works to influence their linguistic usage and the degree and frequency of interaction.
In the concluding chapter, Goebel reiterates the main goals of the book while highlighting some of the important findings from his research. As he discusses, linguistic and nonlinguistic signs not only work to identify people but also do work to construct community expectations of appropriate social conduct. To conclude Goebel provides a diagrammatic sketch of how these types of transient communities could be studied and the types of data that researchers interested in the undertaking may want to consider in their own work. Simultaneously, there is a reemphasis of the importance of taking an ethnographic approach to the research, while noting that studies on migrant or transient communities rarely focus their attention towards conversational data, an area that forms the core of this book.

Evaluation

Overall, Goebel’s “Language, Migration, and Identity: Neighborhood talk in Indonesia” is a valuable addition to the body of work that exists on language in Indonesia, as well as linguistic anthropology more generally. This book can be useful for readers interested in linguistic anthropology or sociolinguistics and is well suited as a text for a graduate level seminar. The methodological discussions in the book would prove especially useful in this regard. Goebel draws on an extensive and complex body of theoretical work, but his writing style and attention to detail make it possible for a reader with little prior exposure to grasp his main arguments. This book is by no means a casual read and as Goebel notes, comments from reviewers of his manuscript attest to how challenging of a book it can be. However, that certainly doesn’t detract from what is on the whole quite a rigorous and well thought out publication.
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