

## Register of Builders Community in Javanese Speaking Communities

Memet Sudaryanto <sup>1✉</sup>, Eka Dyah Puspita Sari<sup>2</sup>, Muhammad Rohmadi<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Indonesian Language Education, Faculty of Humanities, Universitas Jenderal Soedirman, Purwokerto, Indonesia

<sup>2</sup> English Letters, Faculty of Humanities, Universitas Jenderal Soedirman, Purwokerto, Indonesia

<sup>3</sup> Indonesian Language and Letters Education, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Sebelas Maret, Surakarta, Indonesia

### Article Info

History Articles

Received:

17 May 2021

Accepted:

15 June 2021

Published:

30 August 2021

Keywords:

register, builders,  
sociolinguistic

### Abstract

The registers of builders in the Javanese speaking community show unique data. It is important to describe the purpose, the characteristics of the formation, and the social context that influence speech to show the complexity of registers that appear in the language community of builders. In order to achieve these objectives, a descriptive qualitative analysis was performed on conversations among builders using a phenomenological approach in a sociolinguistic perspective. Data were taken from conversations between builders, builders with the foreman, and clients with builders. Data were obtained from social media conversations in private groups through passive observer. The data were validated through triangulation method. Based on the results of the interactive analysis, it was found that (1) the purpose of using registers was to make the conversation effective so they were easily accepted and to show the identity of community members, (2) registers of construction community members in Javanese-speaking societies used nominal markers, numerals, adjectives, and verbs, (3) the socio-cultural context built in the conversation between builders was shown from the speaker's needs and speech responses. The speech produced by members of the building community speaking in Javanese society included idealism, norms, rules, and behavior as habits in the community. Sociolinguistics, as a branch of linguistics that studies the interplay between language behavior and social behavior, showed that the builder community used language in socializing to convey and express their field of work and to get acquainted with new members of the community with a special language. Based on the results of data triangulation, it showed that the tendency of Javanese speakers in the construction community did not understand interpersonal relationships and privacy in conversation.

✉ Correspondence address:

E-mail: memet.sudaryanto@unsoed.ac.id

## INTRODUCTION

Community, as a part of the language community, shows a certain cultural system. Communities have similar activities, so they demand intensive associations and community groups with the same mission. The similarity of situation forces a community to create new communication systems and tools that are more flexible and comfortable to use. Community emerges from the intensity of the meeting, the same vision, as well as the special purpose in sharing the same environment. Language communities have interpersonal communication tools that show common identities and characteristics.

Language registers are spoken and pronounced, and they also demand responses to interlocutor stimuli in response to these sounds, in which these sounds in an active community language are going to continue to develop from one time to another (Pavesi, 2018). These changes are related to the system or, perhaps, the emergence of new vocabulary and new sound symbols. Registers in a community have specific characteristics: conventional, oral, symbolic, developing, dynamic, diverse, and arbitrary. The main characteristic of registers in a community is symbolic, that is, a language is also a symbol and language code which indicates a language is only owned by that community (Sudaryanto et al., 2014).

The working community uses language in socializing to convey and express their field of work and get acquainted with new communities with a special language. In a wider community, workers create a community language as a medium to communicate among workers (Budiarsa, 2017). The language in the community uses symbols that can only be understood by the community, although the use of the diction is sometimes considered harsh and different from society in general. (Llamas, 2011)

Sociolinguistics is essentially a study related to the state of society and the language contained therein (Finegan & Biber, 2009). Society in this case is a language society, in which the entire community uses language as a

means of communication and interaction between individuals in groups. Every group in society, stand in the same place, age, gender, occupation, and so on, uses the same language, and has the same assessment of the norms of language use. It can form a spoken or language society. In a language society, it allows the emergence of a language community and the use of language that is only understood by certain groups of communities. With a community that understands a certain language, language variations emerge and unite each language in that community.

Language society does not have a limited scope, but it is very broad and universal and is not only in standard, formal, casual, or intimate situations. The use of language in a community is not fixed on circumstances, situations, types of conversation, but, in general, the conditions are formed by the agreement that occurs in the community. Therefore, language as a symbol of arbitrary sound does not have a bound form and can be used by the community to relate, cooperate, interact, and identify themselves.

The variety of languages, especially in Indonesia, is currently developing rapidly. The existence of slogans, slings, registers, acronyms, puns and various other forms are adapted from political situation, culture, religion, and issues occurring in Indonesia. All of them are studied in linguistics, especially sociolinguistics as a branch of science that studies the relationship between language and society (Collins, 2017). One of the interesting topics in sociolinguistic research is community language which is studied through group register analysis (Stamou, 2012). Register is a variation of language used in a group or in a particular community based on a sociolinguistic perspective on the basis of language agreement in the group. The agreement starts from the efforts of people involved in communicating quickly, precisely, and efficiently to create special expressions used by their own groups.

Each member of the language community has the same point of view from a speech (Barkaoui, 2016). The group members can form the same perspective because they share the

same knowledge, experience, and interests. Furthermore, each member in the language community is also formed due to fairly routine meeting periods, thus making a group of people tend to have the same object of conversation. With the frequency of meetings of each member of the language community, it makes people use and apply the same language system. This language system is called a register (Coupland, 2009). It can be implied that the intensity of the meeting is able to change the communication to be more intimate and that communication can be an aspect of changing existing speech from one another.

The formation of the linguistic process requires each speaker to understand himself based on the context of the speech, to ask fellow members of the community, or to ignore speech while waiting for other members to respond. As a result of such interactions, eventually the form of speech (the language) leads to certain characteristics, for instance, reduction of syntactic structure and reversal of normal word order in sentences (Johnstone & Marcellino, 2010). Therefore, the characteristics of the community speech (language), in addition to reflect the identity of a particular group, can also describe what conditions the group is doing. The concept of register has been expressed by many sociolinguists with different understandings. The choice of registers is not only due to certain situations that require the use of registers, but also selection of registers also determines the situations in which they are used. If described, Hymes explains the role of the register in determining the usage situation (Hymes, 2013). In certain situations, registers are capable of determining different situations, depending on their intended use and the meaning contained therein.

Registers can simply be defined as language variations based on the function of their use. In this concept, register is not limited to the choice of words, but also includes the choice of using text structures. The register covers all the choices of linguistic or linguistic aspects (Lestari, 2011). Many linguists refer to register as a style or style of language. Variations

in the choice of registers depending on the context and situation, among others, consist of 3 variables. They are field, tenor, and mode (Saddhono & Rohmadi, 2014). The three of them always work simultaneously to form a configuration of meaning.

Register concept is related to the concept of language variation because the emergence of language variations is made possible by various factors that influence it (Inderasari & Oktavia, 2018). Register is one of linguistics studies in relation to sociology in the presence of variables of familiarity status, family ties, attitudes, and goals for each group member. Registers are used by certain communities as a form of intimacy, symbols and attitudes of their users (Nurhasanah, 2015). The use of language tends to have a different impact on listeners.

This register is often used in a particular community, such as broadcast community, pedicab drivers, traders, transvestites, and even educated communities, such as students and university students. A builder in a Javanese speaking community who usually joins a community also uses register in his daily life. Registers are not only used as a communication mean of one community, but also outside the community (groups of builders in other Javanese speaking communities and the general public).

Variation in registers is a communication situation that occurs regularly in society (in terms of participants, settings, communication functions). It tends to bring out features of structure and language use that are different from other communication situations. People who are involved in direct communication situations tend to develop the same vocabulary, intonational features, and sentence fragments and phonology in certain situations. The characteristics of such register facilitate rapid communication, while other characteristics can foster a close feeling.

Register is a variety of languages based on usage, that is, the language used depends on what is being done and the nature of its activities. Register reflects another aspect of the social level: the social process. It is a kind of social activities that usually involves people

(Callahan, 2018). Register is a form of meaning that is particularly associated with a particular social context. It means that there are a lot of activities and little conversation, which is sometimes referred to as the language of action.

This study used some approaches: setting and scene, participants, ends, act, key, instrumentalities, norms, and genres (Hymes, 2013). Setting and Scene refer to the physical surroundings in general. In communication, it is considered as the place, especially time and cultural situation/circumstances. It describes the situation, place, and time of a conversation. Participants are the parties involved in the discussion. They can be speakers and listeners, greeters, or message senders and recipients. In this case, the intended parties are street kids who are communicating with fellow street kids and street kids communicating with outsiders.

Ends refer to the results of speech, the intent and purpose of the speech. Every narrative has a purpose in its narrative, as well as street kids. When street kids communicate with fellow street kids and parties outside the street kids, they have a purpose and the intent of their speech. Act Sequence refers to the form of speech and the content of speech, with regard to the words used, how they are used, and the relationship between what is said and the topic.

Key stands out for the tone, manner and enthusiasm in which a message is conveyed, for instance with pleasure, seriously, concisely and with arrogance. In the key, every street kid can be observed how the tone when communicating with the interlocutor, so that it can become a benchmark for conversation. Instrumentalities are elements of analysis that refer to the lines used, such as oral, written, telegram channels. Most of the street kids in Surakarta city use spoken language in their conversation, both to other street kids and to outside parties (As Sabiq, 2020). On the other hand, not all street kids are fluent in written language. This fact encourages the use of spoken language which is more dominant.

Norms refer to the norms or rules of conduct in interacting with interlocutors. This interaction collaborates with the behavior and

movements of street kids which can be interpreted as a single communication unit. Genres refer to the type of form of delivery. Speakers and interlocutors in communicating use direct or indirect oral presentation. In this case, it is also considered when there are other parties who influence speech to show the complexity of registers that appear in the language community of builders.

## METHOD

Information and conversation data in private groups of builder communities in the Javanese-speaking communities were analyzed by using a qualitative approach. The phenomenon of language was studied by using descriptive inquiry method that focused on the study of appearance, experience acquisition, and language awareness shown by speakers, i.e., builders in the Javanese-speaking communities. Flow data analysis techniques used Miles and Huberman consisted of informant identification, preparation and preparation of instruments, data collection, data reduction, data display, data verification, and conclusions drawing (Miles & Huberman, 2012) (Sudaryanto, Saddhono, et al., 2020). The information in the data was a conversation between builders and clients, builders and foremen, and between builders. Conversations occurred in private groups indicated the tendency for words or phrases to be registered as workers' registers (Johnson & Stake, 2006). The data was collected by means of interviews with tapping, listening, recording, and note taking techniques. The validity of the data was tested by triangulation of methods and researchers (Williamson et al., 2017). Triangulation method was done by applying some methods to validate the data. It was done by observing the data from social media, interview, and content analysis. The interviews included individual interviews, group interviews, and interviews with key informants and language experts. Researcher triangulation was done through focused group discussion. The discussion presented some researchers in sociolinguistics to study the data that were

generalized and identified (Sudaryanto, Ulya, et al., 2020). Reduced data was assessed based on register theories and sociolinguistics to ensure that the analysis process was conducted correctly. The distribution of data after the reduction process was presented to sociolinguists and linguists to validate the function and purpose of selecting registers in the working community.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Sociolinguistic studies helped language listeners to understand a language with the surrounding social context. A person's different social level made it difficult for his partners to understand an interaction, while the layers of society in Indonesia were very diverse. Based on these reasons, a sociolinguistic study was needed to help solve the problem of interaction between community members.

Each member of the group thought that they could know each other because they both shared the same knowledge, experience and

interests. In addition, because the meeting period was quite routine, a group of people had the same object of conversation (Milroy & Gordon, 2008). With the meetings frequency of each member of the language community, it made people use and apply the same language system (Coupland, 2009). The high intensity of members meeting in the builder's language community showed that the communication patterns were formed by the same situation, common need, and communication context, in which they were related to finding job information, problems and work solutions related to carpentry, and complaints at work.

The data in this study were grouped from the process of forming words/phrases, i.e., affixation, reduplication, compounding, shortening, and reverse derivation. However, in this study, only words and phrases that were formed through back-derivation and shortening were taken. In addition, several words were finished forms which were adapted and adopted into registers in builders.

Forming	Words/ Phrases	Meaning
Back derivation	<i>Capel</i>	<i>Calon Pelanggan</i> (Potential Customers)
	<i>Ratakir</i>	<i>Rakus, tamak, kikir</i> (Greedy, covetous, stingy)
	<i>Jalubar</i>	<i>Jangan lupa bayaran</i> (Don't forget the salary)
	<i>PSBB</i>	<i>Podo Seneng Bareng-bareng</i> (Being happy together)
	<i>CC</i>	<i>Cocok-Cocokan</i> (Matched)
	<i>Adil</i>	<i>Ambil langsung deal</i> (Take and deal)
	Etc.	Etc.
Abridgment	<i>Sen</i>	<i>Senior</i> (Senior)
	<i>Dor</i>	<i>Mandor</i> (Foreman)
	<i>Matril</i>	<i>Material</i> (Material)
	<i>Subkon</i>	<i>Subkontraktor</i> (Subcontractor)
	<i>Lok</i>	<i>Lokasi</i> (Location)
	<i>Sarit</i>	<i>Satu rit</i> (One way)
Etc.	Etc.	
Adaptation and Adoption	<i>Purun</i>	Meaning based on context
	<i>Kenek</i>	
	<i>Tumbal</i>	
	<i>Laden</i>	
	<i>Sendhika</i>	
	<i>Inbox</i>	
Etc.		

**Table 1.** Example of register data findings on builders' community

Construction builders in Javanese-speaking societies did not recognize any gradation of diction with whom they were speaking. They also showed no different behavior when talking to older people. In that community, every speaker and recipient were

considered to have the same educational, economic, social status and experience background. Work communities that shared the same language symbols could generate new terms and distinctive speech strategies.

Data114

Stimulus: "*kebanyakan [capel]<sup>114</sup> tidak membutuhkan pekerja di bidangmu*"

Respons: "*jangan begitu lah, [sen].*"

Stimulus: "most [*capel*]<sup>114</sup> do not need workers in your field"

Response: "don't be like that, [*sen*]"

Direct conversation between builders was analyzed by triangulation methods from the experts. Tone of speech also determined the social meaning of the speaker. Based on the data card above, it showed the use of a construction builder's tone of speech in the Javanese speaking community when responding to other builders. Recipients conveyed their response with a tone of compassion and a little angry joking.

However, from the speech, there was no impression of anger and there was no value for the speaker's harsh feelings. The two of them seemed to be in an intimate manner in speaking, so it really reduced the essence of his anger.

The word formation [*capel*] was a special register created in the acronym form of the word candidate and customer. The literal meaning of [*capel*] based on the utterance was that some of

the interlocutors in the communication forum were people who employed builders or capital owners. Speech situations that were built for communication with [capel] were respectful, polite, obedient, and humble. Meanwhile, the contextual meaning of [capel], meant [potential customer] or recipient, was someone with an elevated speech requirement based on the context of social needs. The builder had a communication society so that the recipient was receptive and not offended. The use of the term [capel] was made to make it easier to pronounce and shorter in conveying certain messages.

Registers in the context of speech between builders had a clear identifier (Finegan & Biber, 2009). As a mean of communication, the register shown by speakers in a community had to be able to accommodate the speaker's feelings and thoughts, and be able to lead to mutual understanding between speakers and listeners or readers (Hadi, 2017). A person could communicate well in a language if the person mastered the language system. Whether or not language was a general communication tool, it was very much determined by the perfection of the system or language rules of the user community.

Data198

Stimulus: "dibutuhkan [kenek]<sup>198</sup> dengan kriteria sehat jasmani dan siap lembur"

Respons: "Saya ikut kerja, Pak."

...

Respons: "Seumpama butuh [tumbal] saya siap."

Stimulus: "required [kenek]<sup>198</sup> with the criteria of being physically healthy and ready to overtime"

Response: "I joined the job, sir."

...

Response: "Suppose you need [tumbal], I am ready"

Based on the data card above, the construction workers on the stimulus gave the same response. The responses shown from the interlocutors mostly indicated willingness and offer. The willingness shown in the speech was like data on 198, in which the interlocutors put a telephone number that could be contacted so that subsequent communication could be easier. Furthermore, some speakers who were not [kenek] was going to be volunteer if their skill specifications were needed. [Kenek] had a literal meaning as a co-driver, although in the context of the construction community, there was a shift in meaning as a project director.

The registers shown in the data distribution above showed a shift in meaning as (1) the meaning of words based on context, and (2) the literal meaning that was understood by the public at large. Based on the context of the speech, all builders in the Javanese-speaking community who were involved in the speech were very familiar. Besides, they also had the

same reference in interpreting the speech. With the same meaning, the purpose of the speech event could be achieved without causing confusion or misconception in the speech. The registers appeared showed a reduction in the syntactic structure and a reversal of the normal word order in the sentence.

The form of speech used by builders in Javanese-speaking communities looked more expressive and used straightforward words, without any satire. Type of delivery with narrative stories, without any aesthetic expressions or expressions, were full of multiple meanings. This form was supported by describing someone, then continuing from one story to another, when a woman liked a man, then another friend chimed in.

A language society was not only a group of people who used the same language, but a group of people who also shared the same norms in using language forms. Therefore, every group in society with the same place, age, gender,

occupation, etc., shared the same language and had the same assessment of the norms of language use (Eckert, 2017). That group could form a language society. Some data, both words and phrases, were identified as registers of usage that arose because these words experienced receptive differences in meaning. The difference shown by speakers and interlocutors occurred when interacting between the younger and the older. These differences included little peculiarity of style to show a sense of courtesy, submission, while there is no respect from the old to the young, even no nurturing attitude (Cook, 1997). This conversation used a type of delivery with narration and commands. It could be seen from the attitude shown by the speakers wanting to dominate.

Language registers for builders showed more usage of Javanese and Indonesian vocabulary and less usage of English vocabulary. Some registers referred to the use of slang words, abbreviations, acronyms, and also found the impingement and addition of phonemes or syllables. Most of the registers were used to express the taste scores, both verbally and nonverbally. The proportion of the delivered stimulus in each speech had different responses. This indicated the level of interpersonal relationships in accordance with the level of privacy desired by the speaker. Every activity performed in the field of work was a description of daily activities, from personal to social.

The characteristic use of the builder's language could not be separated from the form of his interactions with other people. When builders interact with clients, they exhibited different styles of language and chose more polite words (Saddhono, 2012). However, when fellow builders returned to communicate, they used language that seemed harsh and mocked each other. The communication tools used between builders showed a close relationship regardless of social status. It could be seen in the Javanese language diction (the lowest level in the structure of the Javanese language) used (Kidwell, 2017). It was also found that the choice of language used to communicate was

Javanese, Indonesian, a mixed of Javanese-Indonesian, and sometimes a mixed of English.

Based on data obtained in conversations on social media, some builders used special registers which were only known to some community members. Even so, the verbal communication patterns shown by the builders tended to be more straightforward. Many of the terms made by the builder group functioned as confirmation of their group identity, while for the nonverbal communication patterns, builders in Javanese-speaking communities were more expressive in expressing their feelings.

The existence of code switching and code mixing, as well as the variety of languages used by builders in Javanese speaking communities when communicating with one another, was an intimate variety. The phenomenon of using code switching generally used the destination languages, which were Indonesian and English. Meanwhile, the choice of language variety chosen was intimate or familiar language in form of not only verbal communication, but also nonverbal communication. Nonverbal communication was a communication when participants used symbols rather than words, such as tone of voice, intonation, eye gaze, lip shape, and facial expressions.

The literal meaning of a word could be seen based on a different language dictionary, as well as registers which had a different meaning from its literal meaning (Eckert, 2017). The register had a meaning known only to certain communities (Wagner, 2012). The first characteristic of the study of builders' registers in the Javanese-speaking community of Surakarta was a shift or change in meaning. In relation to the use of interaction, cooperation, and relationship, the register shown by the construction community showed the use of the arbitrator aspect.

There was also the use of concise forms in communication between builders in Javanese speaking societies. The use of this abbreviated form was not only in the arrangement of words with affixes, but also two or more words summarized into one word in the register. Several terms that appeared and denoted the



function of registers were [Jalubar<sup>57</sup> and PSBB<sup>71</sup>]. [Jalubar] stood for [don't forget the salary] in the context that between builders they used the term as a linguistic expression of "if you have worked, don't forget to ask for payment" or in other terms "hard work must be paid according to your capacity". [Jalubar] was used to insult clients or foremen who were often late in providing salaries. Meanwhile [PSBB] stood for [important is happy, together] or most importantly all builders were happy together. This expression often appeared when they got an accident or forgot to be paid by a client even though they had worked hard. The term [PSBB] was also closely related to the momentum of the corona pandemic which had left many construction workers unemployed.

The emergence of adherence in constructing the builder's register language demonstrated the intimacy and effectiveness of the speech. The reduction of the syllable at the beginning of the word for building tools was used to show its true meaning. The semantic aspects of meaning in the speech register of workers showed the sense that could be achieved if the speaker and the interlocutor or the writer and reader shared the same language or mutually agreed upon (Tagliamonte, 2006). Furthermore, the register marker was also based on the feeling value associated with the speaker's attitude towards the thing being discussed (Schembri & Johnston, 2013). Each word had a meaning related to the value of taste which was sometimes conveyed in a tone which showed the relationship between the speaker and the listener (Eisenstein et al., 2011). The acceptance of the recipient affected the good intentions of feeling happy or unhappy. This was the effect of the business being performed.

The disclosure of the use of harsh words showed the condition of builders in a strong Javanese speaking community, suwak as a form of ridicule. In addition, there was also the word rabi which refined the meaning of intercourse. Certain registers that had a value of harshness turned out to have a subtlety of meaning when used with others, so that there was respect for

the speaker or it gave the effect of paying respect to the interlocutor.

The register as a group identity could have a meaning that transcended the boundaries of intervention in the context of social relations. Based on the scope, it could be said that the builders register was used by a group of speakers within a more flexible group scope. Physical environmental conditions that tended to be closed with social arrangements with shorter duration of interaction indicated that the construction work community had a high intensity but it was necessary.

This research showed language register finding on builders' community in social media, direct observation, and interview with the speaker. Language use in direct speech was dominated by Javanese, while language use in social media was dominated by Indonesian, and some phrases used English. The register emerged showed some characteristics as term adaptation, back derivation, and abridgement that were affected by social and speech factors on speakers' job.

## CONCLUSION

The registers used by builders in the Javanese-speaking communities are used to convey their ideas, desires, feelings and experiences to their fellow builders. Speakers often use builders' language registers to talk to people outside their community, but they have not met the maximal quality of the registers, i.e., they do not get the response as expected. The linguistic structure of the register in builders is formed by a shift in meaning through a process of analogy, phrase afferation, and the emergence of new terms. Registers have a central role in communication among community members, especially in the field of work as construction workers. Registers are used to accommodate feelings and thoughts of speakers, and are able to build feelings of mutual understanding between speakers.

## REFERENCES

- As Sabiq, A. H. (2020). Localized English for Ngapak Javanese Speakers as Language Instruction. *ENGLISH FRANCA: Academic Journal of English Language and Education*, 4(2). <https://doi.org/10.29240/ef.v4i2.1818>
- Barkaoui, K. (2016). What Changes and What Doesn't? An Examination of Changes in the Linguistic Characteristics of Ielts Repeaters' Writing Task 2 Scripts. In *IELTS Research Reports*.
- Budiarsa, I. M. (2017). Language, Dialect and Register Sociolinguistic Perspective. *RETORIKA: Jurnal Ilmu Bahasa*, 1(2), 379–387. <https://doi.org/10.22225/jr.1.2.42.379-387>
- Callahan, E. (2018). Language Variation in a Triethnic Community. In *Emerging Hispanicized English in the Nuevo New South*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315159515-3>
- Collins, J. (2017). Dilemmas of Race, Register, and Inequality in South Africa. *Language in Society*, 46(Metapragmatics of Mobility), 39–56. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S004740451600083X>
- Cook, G. (1997). Language Play, Language Learning. *ELT Journal*, 51(3), 224–231. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/51.3.224>
- Coupland, N. (2009). Language, Situation, and the Relational Self: Theorizing Dialect-Style in Sociolinguistics. In P. Eckert & J. R. Rickford (Eds.), *Style and Sociolinguistic Variation* (pp. 185–210). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511613258.012>
- Eckert, P. (2017). Age as a Sociolinguistic Variable. In F. Coulmas (Ed.), *The Handbook of Sociolinguistics*. Blackwell Publishing Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781405166256.ch9>
- Eisenstein, J., Smith, N. A., & Xing, E. P. (2011). Discovering Sociolinguistic Associations with Structured Sparsity. *ACL-HLT 2011 - Proceedings of the 49th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, 1365–1374.
- Finegan, E., & Biber, D. (2009). Register Variation and Social Dialect Variation: The Register Axiom. In P. Eckert (Ed.), *Style and Sociolinguistic Variation* (pp. 235–267). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511613258.015>
- Hadi, I. (2017). Fruit Seller Register: a Language Use Study of Work. *Metalingua*, 15(1), 25–40.
- Hymes, D. (2013). Foundations in Sociolinguistics: An Ethnographic Approach. In *Foundations in Sociolinguistics: An Ethnographic Approach*. Psychology Press. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315888835>
- Inderasari, E., & Oktavia, W. (2018). Pemakaian Register Bahasa Kru Bus Akap di Terminal Tirtonadi Surakarta. *Dialektika: Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra, Dan Pendidikan Bahasa Dan Sastra Indonesia*, 5(2), 159–178. <https://doi.org/10.15408/dialektika.v5i2.7815>
- Johnson, K. E., & Stake, R. E. (2006). The Art of Case Study Research. *The Modern Language Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2307/329758>
- Johnstone, B., & Marcellino, W. M. (2010). Dell Hymes and the Ethnography of Communication. In *Handbook of Sociolinguistics*. Sage Publication, Inc. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446200957.n4>
- Kidwell, T. (2017). Understanding Culture: A Literature Review Comparing Three Cultural Pedagogies. *Register Journal*, 10(2). <https://doi.org/10.18326/rgt.v10i2.221-233>
- Lestari, P. M. (2011). REGISTER PENGAMEN: STUDI PEMAKAIAN

- BAHASA KELOMPOK PROFESI DI SURAKARTA. *Lingua*, 6(1), 146–166.
- Llamas, C. (2011). Sociolinguistics. In J. Simpson (Ed.), *The Routledge Handbook of Applied Linguistics* (pp. 501–514). Routledge.  
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203835654>
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, M. A. (2012). Analisis Data Kualitatif: Buku Sumber Tentang Metode-Metode Baru. In Universitas Indonesia\_UI Press.
- Milroy, L., & Gordon, M. (2008). Sociolinguistics: Method and Interpretation. In *Sociolinguistics: Method and Interpretation*. Wiley-Blackwell.  
<https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470758359>
- Nurhasanah, S. (2015). The Use of Community Language Learning (CLL) Method to Increase the Students' Participation in Classroom Conversation. *Register Journal*, 8(1), 81–94.  
<https://doi.org/10.18326/rgt.v8i1.81-98>
- Pavesi, M. (2018). Reappraising Verbal Language in Audiovisual Translation: from Description to Application. *Journal of Audiovisual Translation*, 1(1), 101–121.  
<https://doi.org/10.47476/jat.v1i1.47>
- Saddhono, K. (2012). Kajian Sociolinguistik Pemakaian Bahasa Asing dalam Pembelajaran Bahasa Indonesia untuk Penutur Asing (BIPA) di Universitas Sebelas Maret. *Kajian Linguistik Dan Sastra*, 24(2), 176–186.  
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.23917/cls.v24i2.96>
- Saddhono, K., & Rohmadi, M. (2014). A sociolinguistics study on the use of the Javanese language in the learning process in primary schools in Surakarta, Central Java, Indonesia. *International Education Studies*, 7(6), 25–30.  
<https://doi.org/10.5539/ies.v7n6p25>
- Schembri, A., & Johnston, T. (2013). Sociolinguistic Variation and Change. In *The Oxford Handbook of Sociolinguistics* (p. 208). Edinburgh University Press.  
<https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511801624>
- Stamou, A. G. (2012). Representations of Linguistic Variation in Children's Books: Register Stylisation as a Resource for (Critical) Language Awareness. *Language Awareness*, 21(4), 313–329.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2011.604421>
- Sudaryanto, M., Saddhono, K., & Lina. (2020). APPLYING ITEM RESPONSES THEORY FOR MEASURING STUDENT'S ABILITY IN ACADEMIC SPEAKING. *Humanities & Social Sciences Reviews*.  
<https://doi.org/10.18510/hssr.2020.8234>
- Sudaryanto, M., Sumarwati, & Suryanto, E. (2014). Register Anak Jalanan Kota Surakarta. *BASASTRA Jurnal Penelitian Bahasa, Sastra Indonesia Dan Pengajarannya*, I(April), 514–528.
- Sudaryanto, M., Ulya, C., Rohmadi, M., & Kuhafeesah, K. (2020). Inter-rater Assessment on Listening Media for Foreign Language Speakers.  
<https://doi.org/10.4108/eai.9-11-2019.2295064>
- Tagliamonte, S. A. (2006). Analysing Sociolinguistic Variation. In *Analysing Sociolinguistic Variation: Key Topics in Sociolinguistics*. Cambridge University Press.  
<https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511801624>
- Wagner, S. E. (2012). Age Grading in Sociolinguistic Theory. *Linguistics and Language Compass*, 6(6), 371–382.  
<https://doi.org/10.1002/lnc3.343>
- Williamson, K., Given, L. M., & Scifleet, P. (2017). Qualitative data analysis. In *Research Methods: Information, Systems, and Contexts: Second Edition*.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-102220-7.00019-4>