

**The University of Hong Kong**

**Faculty of Arts (Department of Linguistics)**

**Second Semester 2022-2023**

**LING 3003: Linguistics Field Trip**

Papuan transfer in the use of Standard Indonesian:

Morphosyntactic, lexical and phonological evidence

To: Dr. Kofi Yakpo

From: Chan Hoi Yan (UID: 3035822885)

Leher Athena Franziska (UID: 3035698349)

Submission date: 15 May, 2023

## **1. Abstract**

With increasing contact between the Indonesian central government and its Papua provinces, many studies have focused on Papuan attitudes towards the Standard Indonesian as a lingua franca, and the diminishing of Papuan culture and heritage. However, to date, few studies have specifically looked at contact between Standard Indonesian and Papuan languages. The present study therefore aimed to explore: 1) whether young Papuan speakers show Papuan features in their use of Standard Indonesian, and what such features are; 2) whether a stronger command of Papuan varieties resulted in a greater degree of transfer. Papuan and Indonesian speakers were recruited to partake in a video-description task in Standard Indonesian, with alternating conditions of patient animacy. They were also prompted with questions that would elicit differences in voice and verbs of transfer. Our results showed that Papuan speakers indeed used syntactic structures unique to Papuan languages and included Papuan-Indonesian code-mixing at the lexical and morpheme level. Additional findings included individual speaker inconsistency in formality and code-mixing, which we attribute to adherence to task demands and Papuan languages' status as low-prestige varieties.

## 2. Introduction

### *2.1 Study background*

Following Indonesian takeover of present-day West Papua and Papua province in 1963, Standard Indonesian has increasingly gained influence as a language of trade, communication with the central Jakarta government – so much that it is referred to as *bahasa umum* ('general language' or 'lingua franca') among Papuans (Makihara & Schieffelin, 2007). Some studies have carried out comparative analyses on Papuan languages and Standard Indonesian, including reduplication phenomena (Karubaba, 2018), voice systems (Paauw, 2008), and prosodic stress and boundaries (Sonja et al., 2018). Others have taken a sociolinguistic perspective, investigating Papuan attitudes towards Indonesian governance and the prevalence of Standard Indonesian (De Vries, 2012; Mikihara & Schieffelin, 2007; Sumule & Iheanyi-Igwe, 2020). However, to date, very few studies have specifically focused on contact between the two languages. As such, it is worth investigating whether Papuan speech features are transferred into Papuan speakers' use of Bahasa Indonesia.

In this report, "Standard Indonesian" or "Bahasa Indonesia" will denote both high and low varieties of Malay used on Java Island, including formal literary Indonesian and Colloquial Indonesian. "Papua" or "Papuan" will denote the areas taken up by Indonesian provinces West Papua and Papua. Consistent with Kluge (2017)'s definition, that encompasses the entire region to the left of the Papua border up to the borders of the Bird's Head Peninsula. The Papuan varieties are dispersed across West Papua and Papua province, with about 200 Papuan varieties are spoken in West Papua province alone. Although Papuan Malay is

typologically Austronesian (not fitting the traditional definition of a Papuan language as being non-Austronesian, such as in Foley (1986)), it is chosen here as a 'representative' variety of the Papuan geographical region for comparison with Bahasa Indonesia. Under extensive contact with non-Austronesian languages in the region, Papuan Malay displays many typical Papuan features. These include serial verb constructions, genitive-noun order for showing possession or little use of clause-final conjunctions (Kluge, 2021). With many Papuan varieties being threatened and decreasing in use, many Papuan tribes have transitioned to Papuan Malay for communicative purposes, resulting in increasing speakers (around 1.2 million speakers, as of 2021) (Kluge, 2021). Therefore, it is likely that Papuan speakers of different tribal backgrounds will have had contact with Papuan Malay.

## ***2.2 Typological and syntactic differences between Papuan Malay and Standard Indonesian***

Typologically, Standard Indonesian and Papuan Malay are both part of the Malayic subgroup in the Malayo-Polynesian family and are classified under the Austronesian branch. It is believed these two languages (along with other varieties of Malay) have a common root in Southwestern Borneo but were dispersed 2000 to 2500 years ago. As a result, Papuan Malay and Standard Indonesian share some structural similarities, including a basic word order of SVO and a nominative-accusative case system. However, given their geographical distance and Papuan Malay's contact with Papuan and Austronesian varieties in Papua, nowadays, there is little to no intelligibility between the two languages (Kluge, 2017).

As a starting point for evaluating Papuan transfer in Standard Indonesian, two important structural differences exist between the two languages – they are respectively voice and use of verbs of transfer. In terms of voice, Standard Indonesian has both active and passive voice. In Indonesian, active verbs are marked with the prefix *men-*; on the other hand, passive verbs either take the prefix *di-* or go without a prefix (Sneddon, 1996). In the first type of passive, which takes the prefix *di-*, the agent is demoted to an adjunct with the optional particle *oleh* ('by') (Cole & Yassir, 2006). An example of this is given in (2.2.1). In the second type of passive, the verb does not take any passive prefix; although the theme is promoted to subject by appearing first in the clause, the agent is not demoted to an adjunct (Cole & Yassir, 2006). Instead, the agent appears as an obligatory pronominal prefix on the verb, as seen in (2.2.2). In other words, the type 2 passive is restricted to cases where the agent is a pronoun.

(2.2.1) Surat itu ditulis ([oleh] Siti) kemarin.  
 Letter DEM PASS-write by Siti yesterday  
 'The letter was written by Siti yesterday.'

(2.2.2) Buku itu kau-baca, kan?  
 book that 2.SG-read right  
 'The book that you read, right?'

(Cole & Yassir, 2006: 65)

Meanwhile, Papuan Malay is generally believed to only use active voice. Although there are situations where the patient takes subject position, such as in (2.2.3), it is unclear whether it counts as a passive due to the semantic nature of the verb. Moreover, this construction is not present in all forms of Papuan Malay. Although it is used in Serui or the Cendrawasih region, it is not used at all in Northern regions (Paauw, 2008). Even if the 'patient as subject' structure is present in a Papuan Malay variety, it is still much less commonly used than in Standard Indonesian (Paauw, 2008). More crucially, the acceptability of this structure depends on animacy - it is usually only humans or animate patients that can take subject position (Sawaki, 2021).

(2.2.3) Sa    pu    ade    dapa            pukul  
          1.SG   POSS young brother/sister suffer hit  
          'My young brother/sister suffered a hit.'

(Karubaba, 2017: 59)

Another main difference between Papuan Malay and Standard Indonesian is how verbs of transfer are used. In Papuan Malay, the verb *kasi* ('give') is commonly used to form causatives and double object constructions. As seen in examples (2.2.4) and (2.2.5), *kasi* is combined with another verb. However, the *kasi* construction's reading varies with the affected entity's level of agentivity. If the affected entity is inanimate or has no control over its actions, *kasi* is given a directive meaning. On the other hand, if the affected entity can perform volitional acts, *kasi*'s reading can either be directive or assistive (meaning that the

causer only assists the causee in the act, rather than being fully responsible for the outcome) (Kluge, 2017). More importantly, *kasi* can refer to the transfer of intangible objects, giving readings such as ‘give a resurrection / give a removal’.

(2.2.4) Tapi dong kasi bangkit dia lagi kasi hidup dia  
But he give be.resurrected 3.SG again give live 3.SG  
‘[he’s already (dead),] but they resurrect him again, make him live’

(2.2.5) Kam kas keluar pasir dulu!  
2.SG give go.out sand first  
‘you remove the sand first!’

(Kluge, 2017: 484)

On the other hand, Standard Indonesian *memberi* (‘give’) is typically only used in double object constructions. As seen in (2.2.6), it often appears with suffix *-kan* to denote benefactive constructions. Crucially, unlike Papuan Malay, *memberi* usually applies to the transfer of tangible objects. Although the suffix *-kan* can be used to form causatives such as in (2.2.7), verbs of transfer are not found with this construction. In addition, many speakers of Standard Indonesian would find combining *memberi* with an intangible object ungrammatical.

(2.2.6) John memberi-kan buku itu kepada Mary

John give-BEN book DEM to Mary

'John gave the book to Mary'

(Givón, 1997: 235)

(2.2.7) Ibu men-idur-kan Susan

Mom act-sleep-BEN Susan

'Mom lullabied Susan.'

(Dwijatmoko, 2021: 37)

### ***2.3 Research questions and hypotheses***

Based on the above differences between Standard Indonesian and Papuan Malay, one would expect less use of passive voice and a different use of verbs of transfer when Papuan speakers use Standard Indonesian. Moreover, even if Papuan speakers do use the passive voice, this might be more likely when the patient is animate. The present study aims to investigate Papuan transfer to Standard Indonesian from two main perspectives:

- 1) Do Papuan speakers make use of Papuan features in Standard Indonesian? If so, what are the key ways in which their speech differs from non-Papuan speakers of SI?
- 2) Does a better command of their Papuan variety (and comparatively weaker command of Standard Indonesian) result in more transfer of Papuan features?



To answer these questions, we recruited Papuan and non-Papuan, Indonesian-speaking students who were studying at a university in Yogyakarta. They were asked to complete a task of video-describing, with questions prompting differences in voice and *give* constructions.

### 3. Methods and materials

#### *3.1 Participants*

Eighteen subjects from the Sanata Dharma University participated in this experiment. Subjects were put into two groups: (1) native Bahasa Indonesian speakers and (2) native Papuan speakers to conduct a between-subject experiment. The group of native Bahasa Indonesian speakers consists of seven subjects while the group of native Papuan speakers consists of eleven subjects. Regarding the group of native Bahasa Indonesian speakers, all subjects met the following inclusion criteria: they are (1) university-educated, (2) most proficient in Bahasa Indonesia (based on self-report from a language use survey) (3) and speaks Bahasa Indonesia with friends and family. As for the group of native Papuan speakers, all subjects met the following inclusion criteria: they are (1) university-educated, (2) grew up in Papua, (3) speaks both Bahasa Indonesia and Papuan languages but are most proficient in Papuan languages and speaks Papuan style of Bahasa Indonesia (based on self-report from a language use survey). All subjects gave their informed consent before participating.

Informants were interviewed about their linguistic background with a language use survey verbally before participating in the experiment. They were asked about the languages they speak with their parents and friends. They were also asked questions like which language they use more frequently and which language they are stronger in. In doing the interview,

they were told that the data are engaged for research without any subjective opinion from the researchers. The survey was conducted verbally to (1) ensure that participants fully understand the question, (2) allow researchers to clarify any misunderstandings or confusion that the participants might encounter, (3) allow researchers to ask follow-up questions based on the responses given by the participants to gather more detailed information.

### ***3.2 Experimental Design***

The experiment was conducted at the school campus. Video description task was adopted to elicit the target items and investigate their usage of active voice and passive voice. The target verbs include both animate and inanimate patient conditions that are easily depictable.

Participants had to orally describe brief videos that conveyed progressively complicated scenarios with interacted items as part of the task. Regarding the stimuli of the task, there are two sets of videos. Each set of videos comprised six videos with six different target verbs: push, hit, pull, follow, hug and chase. Animacy is one of the independent variables that was controlled. For example, for the verb push, it involves an animate patient 'boy' in set A and an inanimate patient 'water bottle' in set B. Half of the participants from the Bahasa Indonesia group and half of the participants from the Papuan group viewed set A. The setting for set B is the same. The participants were told to describe what was done to \_\_\_\_ (the patient of the sentence) in Bahasa Indonesia '*Jelaskan apa yang dilakukan pada \_\_\_\_.*' before watching each video to trigger the production of a passive construction. They were

also asked to describe the relationship between the two objects in the video in Bahasa Indonesia '*Jelaskan hubungan antara dua benda di video ini.*'.

There is no time constraint on the task and participants could rewatch the video if needed. They were also told that there were no correct answers for the responses, and they were free to make any responses to obtain results that are possible in a natural setting. They were also told to make responses as if they were having casual conversation with friends to avoid responses that are too formal which would not occur in natural setting.

Set A

Scenario	Animacy	Expected response in active voice	Expected response in passive voice
Push	animate	The girl pushed the boy.	The boy was pushed by the girl.
Hit	inanimate	The girl hit the wall.	The wall was hit by the girl.
Pull	animate	The girl pulled the boy.	The boy was pulled by the girl.
Follow	inanimate	The girl followed the motorcycle.	The motorcycle was followed by the girl.
Hug	animate	The girl hugged another girl.	The girl was hugged by another girl.
Chase	inanimate	The girl chased the motorcycle.	The motorcycle was chased by the girl.

Set B

Scenario	Animacy	Expected response in active voice	Expected response in passive voice
Push	inanimate	The girl pushed the water bottle.	The water bottle was pushed by the girl.
Hit	animate	The girl hit the boy.	The boy was hit by the girl.
Pull	inanimate	The girl pulled the backpack strap.	The backpack strap was pulled by the girl.
Follow	animate	The girl followed the boy.	The boy was followed by the girl.
Hug	inanimate	The girl hugged the lamppost.	The lamppost was hugged by another girl.
Chase	animate	The girl chased the boy.	The boy was chased by the girl.

The stimuli were pre-recorded and presented with a computer. The experiment was administered individually. As in a group setting, participants might influence each other's responses through social cues or peer pressure which might be difficult to control. By administering the experiment individually, these random noises could be minimized and ensure that the responses given by participants are based on their own understanding and interpretation of the stimuli. Also, if the experiment was administered in a group setting, participants might be distracted by the presence of others. By administering the experiment individually, it can be ensured that each participant is fully focused on the task and their responses are kept confidential which allow them to feel comfortable eliciting their responses. However, the questions for each stimulus were verbally asked by researchers to allow

participants to respond naturally and freely without feeling self-conscious about written responses or other recording methods.

Responses from the participants were recorded. It is to ensure that the responses are accurately captured and can be played back for transcription and analysis. This can help to avoid errors.

A Qualitative analysis was adopted for the data available. The audio collected from the task was first transcribed from verbal responses to a written format in Bahasa Indonesia. The responses in Bahasa Indonesia were further translated into English to facilitate analysis as there was not sufficient knowledge of the language used by the participants to analyze the responses accurately.

The transcribed responses from participants were then coded for their content. Since the major focus of the study is on voices, the responses were first categorized into active voice responses and passive voice responses. For responses made by Papuan speakers, as they speak a Papuan style of Bahasa Indonesia, Papuan features in their Bahasa responses were then identified.

## 4. Data analysis

In this section, examples will be drawn from Papuan and non-Papuan speakers' responses for an analysis of their differences. While sections 4.1 to 4.4 will be a comparison of Papuan and non-Papuan data, section 4.5 and onwards will describe additional features found in Papuan respondents' speech.

### 4.1 *The use of active voice*

As mentioned in section 1, while Standard Indonesian has the passive voice, Papuan Malay only relies on the active. It was therefore expected that Papuan participants would use more active sentences in their responses. Our results were consistent with this hypothesis. Non-Papuan students consistently responded in passive voice, as seen in (4.1.1) to (4.1.2). Interestingly, their responses are all type 1 passives taking prefix *di-*, which means they chose to not use pronouns to refer to the agents. Moreover, although the agent is optional in type 1 passives, the majority of our responses included the *oleh* phrase. According to our Indonesian informants, the type 1 passive puts more emphasis on the agent and patient, whereas the type 2 passive is usually used to put emphasis on the action. Therefore, type 1 passives may have been used as they were specifically requested to describe the relationship between the two entities, causing them to focus on the agent as well.

(4.1.1) Laki-laki      itu      di-dorong      oleh      seorang      perempuan  
Man                  DEM   PASS-push      PREP a                  lady  
'That man is pushed by a lady.'

(4.1.2) Dia   mengejar   motor yang sedang   di-kendarai   oleh  
seseorang.

3.SG chase           motor REL currently   PASS-ride   PREP  
someone.

‘She is chasing a motorbike which is being ridden by someone.’

When it came to the Papuan students, although their responses were more varied, they generally used more active sentences than their non-Papuan counterparts. As seen in (4.1.3) and (4.1.4), some responses were complete active sentences where the agent took a sentence-initial position. However, some other responses in active voice omitted the object, as seen in (4.1.5) and (4.1.6) (Subject deletion is allowed in Standard Indonesian). Since participants were given questions with patient-focus, the omission of the subject may be an attempt to focus on the patient while retaining the use of active voice, a structure they might be more comfortable using.

(4.1.3) Dia   me-naik   kan           tas-nya.

3.SG up-move   PROG           bag-POSS

‘She is moving up her bag.’

(4.1.4) La   memeluk   tiang lampunya   tetapi tidak goyang.

3.SG hug           post lamp-DEM   but   not   move



'She hugs the lamppost but isn't moving.'

(4.1.5) Peluk tiang lampu.

Hug post lamp

'[She is] hugging the lamppost.'

(4.1.6) Meng-geser botol

ACT-move bottle

'[She is] moving the bottle.'

#### ***4.2 Captioning versus descriptive language***

Apart from differences in voice, there are also differences in the way the two groups described the videos. As seen in the non-Papuan examples of section 4.1, responses were usually declarative statements describing the two entities from third person perspective. Interestingly, many of the Papuan responses were from a first person point-of-view. As seen in (4.2.1), the respondent produces an interrogative on the part of the agent, who follows the patient in the video. Another first person response is the imperative in (4.2.2), once again taking the perspective of agent.

(4.2.1) Kau mo kemana?

2.SG want go.where?

'Where do you want to go?'

(4.2.2) Kau tunggu sa!  
2.SG wait 1.SG  
'You wait for me!'

Meanwhile, some responses were comments as an outsider and directed towards the agent. Although we hypothesized differences based on object animacy, this did not seem to be a contributing factor. Comparing responses across the groups, for both animate and inanimate objects in the HIT scenario, the responses were imperatives (examples (4.2.3) and (4.2.4) for animate and inanimate patient, respectively). This result was unexpected – given the question prompt which focused on the theme, it is surprising that participants directed their speech at the agent. Only in one verb context was a clear difference in animacy observed: For the HUG scenario, all participants responded with *sa saying kau* ('I love you') for the animate condition, while the inanimate condition only resulted in declarative description of the video.

(4.2.3) Jang bikin ribut!  
Don't make noisy  
'Don't make noise/noisiness!' (animate patient)

(4.2.4) Jangan kau pukul!  
Don't 2.SG hit

'Don't you hit it!' (inanimate patient)

Looking at individual speaker variation, patient animacy also did not seem to affect their use of imperatives. Examples (4.2.4), (4.2.5) and (4.2.6) all come from participant A4. Just looking at (4.2.4) and (4.2.5), it seems that the respondent speaks from the patient's perspective whenever it is animate. However, even though (4.2.6) has an animate patient, he adopts third person perspective instead.

(4.2.5) Jangan        kau    tarik    sa!  
Don't            2.SG   pull    1.SG  
'Don't you pull me!'                    (animate patient)

(4.2.6) Jangan        dorong        dia!  
Don't            push            3.SG  
'Don't push him!'                    (animate patient)

### **4.3 Formality**

A third difference between the Indonesian and Papuan groups was formality. Consistent with our request to answer in a casual manner, Indonesian responses included more informal lexical items. As seen in (4.3.1) and (4.3.2), the informal terms for 'boy' (*cowo* and *cowok*) and 'girl' (*cewe* and *cewek*) are used. Example (4.3.3) shows an informal pronunciation for *seneng* ('happy'), which would be pronounced *senang* in formal contexts.

A final indicator of informality in their responses is shortening words; as seen in (4.3.4), *ngejar* ('chase') would normally be *mengejar* in formal contexts. Here, the active voice prefix *me-*, *men-* or *meng-* is removed, as explained by one of our Indonesian participants, to communicate more efficiently. It is also important to note that the Indonesian participants were consistent in formality, using the same informal noun phrases like *cowo* and *cewe* throughout all their responses.

(4.3.1) Cowo di-dorong cewe

Boy PASS-push girl

'The boy is pushed by the girl.'

(4.3.2) Cowok itu berjalan diikuti cewek di belakang-nya

Boy DEM walk follow girl in behind-POSS

'That boy walks while being followed by the girl behind him.'

(4.3.3) Cewe seneng di-peluk

Girl happy PASS-hug

'The girl is happy being hugged.'

(4.3.4) Cewek itu lari ngejar cowok

Girl DEM run chase boy

'That girl is running to chase the boy.'

On the other hand, the Papuan responses were more formal morphologically, lexically and syntactically. Morphologically speaking, the formal active prefix *me-* is kept on the verb, as seen in (4.3.5) and (4.3.6). (4.3.6) is also a formal Indonesian construction of 'leave + NP + behind + possessive'. Examples (4.3.7) and (4.3.8) show lexical formality. The formal word for 'but', *tetapi*, is used in place of informal *tapi*, and the formal word for 'punch', *ninju*, is used rather than informal *nonjok*.

(4.3.5) Dia    me-naik-kan                    tas-nya.  
           3.SG   ACT-move.up-PROG        bag-POSS  
           'She is moving up her bag.'

(4.3.6) Dia    me-ninggal-kan    perempuan    di    belakangnya.  
           3.SG   ACT-leaving-PROG   woman        in       behind-POSS  
           'He is leaving the woman behind him.'

(4.3.7) La    me-meluk    tiang    lampunya    tetapi    tidak    goyang.  
           3.SG   ACT-hug        the       lamppost    but       NEG    move  
           'She hugs the lamppost but does not move.'

(4.3.8) Me-ninju      temen-nya  
ACT-punch    friend-POSS  
'Punching her friend.'

Another key observation we made about the Papuan students was their inconsistency with formality. For instance, (4.3.7) and (4.3.9) were produced by the same speaker. However, formal pronoun *la* is used in the former, and informal pronoun *dia* in the latter. This pattern is repeated with another respondent, who switches between informal word *cewe* and formal word *laki-laki* (both refer to 'boy') in examples (4.3.10) and (4.3.11).

(4.3.9) Dia    me-narik      tali    tas-nya      untuk    meng-ecilkan.  
3.SG   ACT-pull      string   bag-POSS    for    ACT-make.small  
'She pulls the string of the bag to make it small.'

(4.3.10) Cewe-nya    lagi    mengikuti    motor  
Girl-that      PROG   follow      motorbike  
'The girl is following the motorbike.'

(4.3.11) Laki-laki-nya    di-tarik  
Boy-that      PASS-pull  
'The boy gets pulled.'

#### ***4.4 Differences in syntactic structure***

##### ***4.4.1 Imperatives***

As mentioned in section 4.2, some Papuan students produced imperatives rather than declaratives in their responses. As seen in (4.4.1.1) and (4.4.1.2), the addressee is included in the construction and placed between the auxiliary and main verb. On the other hand, although imperatives are not given in the non-Papuan examples (since non-Papuan respondents did not address the agent as if it was a dialogue), in Indonesian, the conventionally accepted structure would be *Jangan pukul (dia)* ('Don't hit (him or her)'). As seen, Indonesian imperatives do not normally include the addressee.

(4.4.1.1)      Jangan      kau      pukul!  
Don't            2.SG   hit  
Don't you hit (him/her)!

(4.4.1.2)      Jangan      kau      tarik      sa!  
Don't            2.SG   pull      1.SG  
'Don't you pull me!'

#### 4.4.2 Verbs of transfer

Consistent with our earlier hypothesis, only Papuan students made use of causative constructions where the object was intangible. As seen in (4.4.2.1), a tight quality is made direct object. However, as seen in (4.4.2.2) and (4.4.2.3), Indonesian participants used either passives or declarative sentences to express this change in quality (*ditarik*, 'being pulled' or *mengencangkan*, 'to tighten').

(4.4.2.1)      Kasih    kencang      tas.  
                 Give    tight              bag  
                 'Tighten the bag (literally, 'give the bag tightness).'

(4.4.2.2)      Strap-nya    memanjang    karena      di-tarik  
                 Strap-NOM    lengthen      because      PASS-pull  
                 'That strap looks longer because it is being pulled.'

(4.4.2.3)      Dia    mengencangkan      tas-nya  
                 3.SG    tighten                      bag-POSS  
                 'She tightened her bag.'



#### 4.5 Phonology of Papuan Malay

For consonants of Papuan Malay, one of the phenomena is the dropping of /h/. *Kasih* is an Indonesian vocabulary which means 'give'. As seen in (4.5.1), *Kasih* existed without *h* in word-final position as a Papuan vocabulary. Whereas in (4.5.2), the Indonesian vocabulary *jangan*, which means 'don't' was shortened into *jang* in the speech of a Papuan speaker. This is due to a practice of neutralizing all the nasal consonants to /ŋ/. In (4.5.3), the /d/ phoneme in Indonesian vocabulary *dorong* was changed into /s/ phoneme.

(4.5.1) Kasi    kencang    tas  
          give    tight            bag  
          'Give a tightening to the bag strap'

(4.5.2) Jang    kau    dorong    sa!  
          Don't 2.SG push            1.SG  
          'Don't you push me!'

(4.5.3) Botol-nya    di-sorong  
          Bottle-that    PA-push  
          'That bottle is being pushed'

As for the vowels of Papuan Malay, as seen in (4.5.4), the Papuan Malay vocabulary for 'hug' is *polo*, which is different to the Indonesian vocabulary of the same meaning, *peluk*.

This might be attributed to the phenomenon of loss of the schwa sound in Papuan Malay. Whereas in (4.5.5), the Papuan speaker employed *ninju* for the meaning ‘punch’ which would be *nonjok* in Bahasa Indonesia.

(4.5.4) Tiang lampu            di-polo  
The lamppost        PA-hug  
‘The lamppost is being hugged.’

(4.5.5) Me-ninju        temen-nya  
ACT-punch    friend-POS  
‘Punching her friend’

#### ***4.6 Papuan use of pronouns***

The pronouns of Papuan Malay vary with those of Bahasa Indonesia. The data collected reflects the Papuan pronouns in first person singular, second person singular and third person singular.

For 1.SG, Papuan speakers tend to chop down a part of the Indonesian vocabularies and make them into Papuan colloquial Indonesian. As seen in (4.6.1), the Indonesian vocabulary *saya* which means ‘I’ was cut down into *sa*. For 2.SG and 3.SG, the papuan pronouns employed are *ko* and *de* respectively, differing from the Bahasa Indonesia pronouns, *engkau* or *kamu* for 2.SG and *dia* for 3.SG.

(4.6.1) Sa      sayang      kau.  
1.SG love      2.SG  
'I love you.'

(4.6.2) Ko      pukul      dia.  
2.SG hit      3.SG  
'You hit him.'

(4.6.3) Kaka      perem      de      pukul      kaka      laki-laki  
HON      lady      3.SG hit      HON      boy  
'The lady, she is hitting the boy.'

#### ***4.7 Code mixing between papuan and Bahasa***

From the data collected, code mixing of word class dominates since participants were only required to describe the video in one short sentence which might limit the appearance of code mixing of phrase class and sentence class.

As seen in (4.7.1), a Papuan pronoun *sa* was used in the Bahasa Indonesia response given by the Papuan speakers. As mentioned earlier, Papuan speakers tend to chop down a part of the Indonesian vocabularies and make them into new Papuan slang. As seen in (4.7.2), the Indonesian vocabularies *perempuan* which means 'lady' was cut down into *perem*. These Papuan slangs were then used in their Indonesian speech, eliciting code mixing.

(4.7.1) Sa      sayang      kau.

I      love      you

'I love you.'

(4.7.2) Kaka              perem              de      pukul      kaka      laki-laki

HON              lady              3.SG      hit              HON      boy

'The lady, she is hitting the boy.'

In the following, some vocabularies from Papuan languages were code-mixed into the Papuan speakers' Indonesian speech. As seen in (4.5.3), *sorong* is a Papuan vocabulary for 'push', whereas in Indonesian, it would be *dorong*. Also in (4.5.4), *ko* is a Papuan vocabulary for the pronoun 'you', whereas in Indonesian, it would be *kau* for 'you'. As seen in (4.5.5), *polo* is a Papuan vocabulary for 'hug', whereas in Indonesian, it would be *peluk* for 'you'.

(4.7.3) Botol-nya      di-sorong

Bottle-NOM      PA-push

'That bottle is being pushed'

(4.7.4) Ko      pukul      dia.

2.SG      hit      3.SG

'You hit him.'

(4.7.5) Tiang lampu di-polo

The lamppost PA-hug

'The lamppost is being hugged.'

Apart from code mixing on word level, we also found code-mixing on morpheme level. For Papuan Malay passive construction, passive voice markers *kona* or *dapa* would be adopted, while under Bahasa Indonesia passive construction, the prefix *di-* would be adopted as a passive voice marker as seen in (4.7.6) and (4.7.7). In (4.7.6) and (4.7.7), the Bahasa Indonesia passive marker *di-* was used with verbs in Papuan Malay *sorong* and *polo*, resulting in code mixing on morpheme level.

(4.7.6) Botol-nya di-sorong

Bottle-NOM PA-push

'That bottle is being pushed'

(4.7.7) Tiang lampu di-polo

The lamppost PA-hug

'The lamppost is being hugged.'

#### ***4.8 Inter-Speaker Variation and intra-speaker variation***

a. Inter-speaker variation

Inter-speaker variation refers to the variation between speakers, rather than within the speech of an individual (Sangster, 2002)

Regarding the age of the Papuan speakers, the oldest is the speaker Papuan B-2, who is 27 years old and the youngest is the speaker Papuan A-1 who is 19 years old. For speaker Papuan B-2, (4.8.1- 4.8.4) are the responses made by him or her. The utterances involve many Papuan Malay characteristics as mentioned above. As for speaker Papuan A-1, her speech (4.8.5- 4.8.6) was very Indonesian with no Papuan feature found in speech.

(4.8.1) Botol-nya      di-sorong

Bottle-NOM    PASS-push

'That bottle is being pushed'

(Papuan B-2)

(4.8.2) Ko      pukul    dia.

2.SG    hit      3.SG

'You hit him.'

(Papuan B-2)

(4.8.3) Kenapa      ko      pergi

why              2.SG    leave

'Why are you leaving?'

(Papuan B-2)

(4.8.4) Tiang lamphu di-polo  
The lamppost PASS-hug  
'The lamppost is being hugged.' (Papuan B-2)

(4.8.5) Dia di-dorong oleh seseorang  
3.SG PASS-push PREP someone  
'She is pushed by someone.' (Papuan A-1)

(4.8.6) Dia di-peluk oleh seseorang  
3.SG PASS-hug PREP someone  
'She is hugged by someone.' (Papuan A-1)

Concerning the effect of gender, the data are collected from 7 males and 4 females. Male speakers are showing more Papuan features when compared to female speakers. Out of the 4 female speakers, three of them (Papuan A-1 Papuan A-2 and Papuan A-6) produced very Indonesian utterances, whereas the other female Papuan speaker (Papuan B-4) showed Papuan features like word order and code-mixed one Papuan vocabulary into her speech.

(4.8.7) Dia di-dorong oleh seseorang  
3.SG PASS-push PREP somebody  
'She is pushed by somebody.' (Papuan A-1)

(4.8.8) Motor itu di-kendarai oleh seseorang  
motorcycle DEM PASS-ride PREP somebody  
'That motorcycle is ridden by somebody.' (Papuan A-1)

(4.8.9) Sa sayang kau  
1.SG love 2.SG  
'I love you.' (Papuan A-6)

(4.8.10) Saya ikut  
1.SG follow  
'I wanna come along.' (Papuan A-6)

(4.8.11) Me-ninju temen-nya  
ACT-punch friend-POSS  
'Punching her friend' (Papuan B-4)

(4.8.12) Kasih kencang tas.  
Give tight bag  
'Tighten the bag (literally, 'give the bag tightness).' (Papuan B-4)

When it comes to their social network, all speakers reported that they spend more time with their Papuan friends. However, not every Papuan speaker showed Papuan features in their



speech. Out of 11 Papuan speakers, 5 of them (Papuan A-1, Papuan A-2, Papuan A-3, Papuan B-3 and Papuan B-5) produce utterances with no Papuan features at all, showing that the effect of social network is not significant to the style of their speech.

b. Intra-speaker variation

Intra-speaker variation exists within the language of a single speaker (Sangster, 2002). In the following, we would investigate three speakers (Papuan A-6, Papuan B-2 and Papuan B-3).

Regarding speaker Papuan A-6 (21 years old), she is reported to 1) speaks Bahasa Indonesia with parents, 2) speaks Papuan style of Bahasa Indonesia with friends, 3) spends more time with Papuan friends than locals, 4) uses Papuan style of Bahasa Indonesia more frequently and 5) is stronger in Papuan than in Bahasa Indonesia. Overall, her speech shows very little Papuan features. However, style shifting was found in her utterances (4.8.9 and 4.8.10). For first person singular, in 4.8.9, she used the Papuan pronoun *sa* ('I') whereas in 4.8.10, she style-shifted her speech to using the Indonesian pronoun *saya* ('I').

Concerning speaker Papuan B-2 (27 years old), he is reported to 1) speaks both Papuan style of Bahasa Indonesia and dialects from Serui tribes with parents, 2) speaks Papuan style of Bahasa Indonesia with friends, 3) spend time with both Papuan and local friend, 4) uses Papuan more frequently and 5) is stronger in Papuan than in Bahasa Indonesia. Overall, his speech is the most Papuan of all Papuan speakers. Out of 6 responses that he gave, 5

of them included Papuan features. He code-mixed Papuan vocabularies *sorong* ('push') and *palo* ('hug') with Indonesian passive morpheme *-di* as in 4.7.3 and 4.7.5. He also used Papuan pronouns *ko* ('I') in his Indonesian speech as seen in 4.6.1.

When it comes to speaker Papuan B-3 (20 years old), he is reported to 1) speaks only Bahasa Indonesia with parents, 2) speaks Papuan style of Bahasa Indonesia with friends, 3) spend time with both Papuan and local friend, 4) uses Papuan and Papuan style of Bahasa Indonesia at the same frequency and 5) is stronger in Papuan than in Bahasa Indonesia. Overall, his speech is the most Indonesian of all Papuan speakers. His speech shows no Papuan features at all (See appendix 7.3 for Papuan B-3). Neither did he code-mix Papuan vocabularies nor use any Papuan pronouns in his responses.

## 5. Discussion

### *Animacy and the use of passives*

Consistent with our hypothesis, Papuan speakers indeed made use of more active sentences and used the *give* construction with intangible qualities. Moreover, animacy did not appear to affect their use of passives, or whether they took patient or third person perspective while captioning the videos. This could be due to a lack of passive voice in their particular Papuan variety; in other words, since animacy does not determine how active sentences are produced, there would be no reason for them to consider animacy during the experiment. However, as our background survey on participants found, although some spoke Papuan varieties (such as Kamoro or Awyu) in full, a majority of them only spoke

Standard Indonesian with Papuan characteristics with their parents. They reported understanding their Papuan variety but not being able to verbally use it. Since the passive is already rarely used, it is possible it does exist in a given Papuan variety, but simply was not retained in Papuan style Standard Indonesian.

### *Individual speaker variation in formality*

An unexpected discovery was individual speaker inconsistency among the Papuan groups. In our Indonesian participants, informal pronouns, word-shortening or altering were consistently used. However, individual Papuan participants would switch back and forth between informal and formal personal pronouns or noun phrases. The use of formal language, on one hand, could be due to two reasons: Firstly, Papua has the lowest literacy rate and years of schooling, as well as the highest drop-out rate among all Indonesian provinces; as a result, it is often portrayed as an obstacle to Indonesian national development (Parker & Sudibyo, 2022). In addition, Papua's public schools are obligated to adopt a curriculum entirely in Standard Indonesian, with a focus on Javanese (particularly Jakartan) history and culture (Sumule & Iheanyi-Igwe, 2020). During our experiment, Papuan participants had to converse with native speakers of Standard Indonesian (for translation purposes), who come from more developed regions of Indonesia and speak the prestige language. It is therefore unsurprising if they felt self-conscious about their command of SI, leading them to hypercorrect and adopt formal characteristics in their speech. Secondly, since our Papuan participants likely had most contact with SI in school, a formal setting, it is possible that they are simply more familiar with the formal register. However,

the task demand to converse casually may have led to a mix of both registers: In our survey on our participants, all but one had spent over two years studying in Yogyakarta. Reporting spending their time with both Javanese locals and Papuans, they tended to use Papuan-style Indonesian with Papuan friends, and to fit in with locals, they would speak colloquial Standard Indonesian. Since both are an informal form of Indonesian, they were likely familiar enough with the register to comply with the task, causing a clash between informal and formal speech.

### *Captioning through direct speech*

Another unexpected finding was Papuan participants' tendency to caption the videos through a patient's or third person perspective. A plausible explanation for this may be the need for specific descriptions in Papuan languages; an event is usually broken down into all its component acts, each represented by a verb (Foley, as cited in De Vries, 1990). Although the supporting examples provided by De Vries are respectively in Kalam and Kombai (examples 5.1 and 5.2), a less extreme version can be found in Papuan Malay as well. This is seen in example (5.3). As explained by De Vries, if an action involves mental events of thinking, this likely includes inner speech and therefore direct quotes are used. In our experiment, it is possible that contexts such as HUG, FOLLOW or CHASE were perceived as either motivated by the agent's inner thought, or involving the patient's commentary to the act, causing them to produce direct speech on their part.

(5.1) Yad am mon pk d ap ay-p-yn

1.SG go wood hit hold come put-PERF-1.SG

'I fetched firewood.'

(De Vries, 1990: 302)

(5.2) Khe ragane maru la-ra kha

3.SG rise go.up stand-and go

'He went away.'

(De Vries, 1990: 302)

(5.3) Sa cepat-cepat lari berdiri liat padahal ...

1.SG RDP-be.fast run stand see whereas

'I quickly looked but ...'

(Kluge, 2023: 3)

### *Pronouns*

Pronoun	Bahasa Indonesian	Papuan Malay
1.SG	Formal: saya	sa

	Informal: aku	
2.SG	Formal: engkau Informal: kamu New form: anda	ko/kamu
3.SG	dia	dia/de/dong
2.PL	New: Kalian Old: kamu	kamorang/ kamong
3.PL	mereka	dorang//dong dua//dong tiga

Pronoun forms are yet another identifying feature of the difference between Papuan Malay and Bahasa Indonesia. The pronouns of Bahasa Indonesia and Papuan Malay are listed in the table above. Regarding the first-person singular pronoun, Papua Malay uses 'sa', adopting the variant of the Bahasa Indonesia first person singular pronoun 'saya', which is used in a formal situation. As for the second- and third-person singular pronoun, the form used in Papuan Malay differs significantly to the forms used in Bahasa Indonesia.

For the third person singular pronoun 'dia', it can be used to refer to both animate and inanimate referents. As for inanimate referents, 'dia' could be used to refer to both singular and plural inanimate referents (Donohue & Smith, 1998). Although we have tried to include animacy as one of the independent variables in our experiment, no Papuan speakers are

found to have used 'dia' to refer to an inanimate referent. They prefer to address the inanimate referents directly instead of using pronouns.

The plural pronouns of Papuan Malay also differ significantly to the forms used in Bahasa Indonesia. The plural pronouns are formed by merging a singular pronoun with a suffix '-orang'. The rules are as follow:

1. 2.PL: kamu + orang → kamorang
2. 3.PL: dong + orang → dorang

However, data were not collected for the plural pronouns in Papuan Malay.

### *Phonology of Papuan Malay*

It is hard to identify the phonology of Papuan Malay as the language includes both individual and regional variation. Regarding the consonants of Papuan Malay, one of the features is the dropping of /h/. The /h/ consonant is dropped in every position unless it exists in between vowels. Papuan speakers also tend to neutralize the nasal consonants in the word final position. As mentioned above, the language includes individual speakers' variations. Some of the speakers will neutralize all the nasal consonants in the word final position into /ŋ/ while some of them will neutralize all the nasal consonants in the word final position into /n/ (Paauw, 2008).

Since Papua is a linguistically diverse region, the phonology of Papuan Malay might be influenced by the phonology of the indigenous languages in Papua. And thus, in the cases

of 'dorong' becoming 'sorong', 'nonjok' becoming 'ninju' and 'peluk' becoming 'polo', these changes might be attributed to the influence of the phonological structure of the indigenous languages, resulting in change of pronunciation or substitutions.

### *Code mixing*

Code-mixing occurs when a speaker switches between two or more languages during a discourse (Sitaram et al. 2019). Its occurrence is common in Indonesian speech (Barik et al., 2019). Within their speech, people tend to mix Bahasa Indonesian with their local languages, and thus creating colloquial Indonesian (Siregar et al., 2014). Everyday speaking and discussion are conducted in colloquial Indonesian (Sutrisno and Ariesta, 2019). Some regularly used words that have been code-mixed can even be understood by those who don't speak the original local languages. There are two reasons for the occurrence of code switching and code mixing in a community: 1) The speakers are not able to communicate using only the target language. 2) The speakers would like to achieve different communication objectives (Duran, 1994). Code mixing could be categorized into word class, phrase class and sentence class (Sumarsih et al., 2014). For Indonesian languages, code-mixing on morpheme level would also occur.

The phenomenon of code-mixing a Papuan slang or vocabulary into their Indonesian speech can be attributed to a few factors. First, in terms of identity and community membership, by adopting Papuan slangs or vocabularies in their speech, Papuan speakers could identify themselves as a member of the Papuan community. And thus, a sense of kinship or belonging



might be achieved. Second, in terms of communicative efficiency, some of the Papuan vocabularies or expressions might lack translation equivalent words in Indonesian. And therefore, code-mixing allows the speakers to fully express their idea, achieving more accurate and efficient communication. Third, in terms of tone, mixing Papuan slangs or vocabularies into their Indonesian responses might help to achieve different expressive purposes, whether the speakers would like to emphasize something or show his or her sense of humor. By code-mixing, a casual tone is also achieved. Finally, for most of the Papuan speakers, they are more proficient in Papuan style Indonesian and less proficient in Javanese Indonesian. Papuan speakers might make use of code-mixing to fill in the lexical gaps they have for Bahasa Indonesian.

#### ***Inter-Speaker Variation and intra-speaker variation***

##### a. inter-speaker variation

In terms of inter-speaker variation, we have looked into three variables: age, gender and social network. Regarding age, it is found that the speech of the oldest Papuan speaker (Papuan B-2: 27 years old) included a lot of Papuan features. The number of Papuan features found in his speech is highest among all speakers. While the speech of the youngest Papuan speaker (Papuan A-1: 19 years old) included no Papuan features, showing that age is one of the contributing factors to the inter-speaker variation. This might be due to the decreasing linguistic flexibility after puberty. Concerning gender, it is found that female Papuan speakers showed relatively fewer Papuan features in their speech than male Papuan speakers. And thus, it could be concluded that female speakers use

more prestigious variants than male speakers. Regarding social networks, the result from the data collected showed that the effect of social networks is not significant to the style of their speech.

b. intra-speaker variation

In terms of intra-speaker variation, it is found that speaker Papuan A-6 employed style shifting in her responses, shifting from a sentence of Papuan style (4.8.9) to a sentence of Bahasa Indonesian style (4.8.10). A style shifting from a less standard style to a standard style could be attributed to their lower socioeconomic status as mentioned in the above section on formality. Speaker might be more self-conscious about whether they included Papuan features in her speech to accommodate in the setting.

As for the speaker showing a lot of Papuan features in his responses and the speaker showing no Papuan features in his responses. It is shown that such variations are caused by a lot of factors. Regarding language contact, for speaker who is more exposed to Bahasa Indonesia would show less or no Papuan features in his responses whereas for speaker who is less exposed to Bahasa Indonesia would show more Papuan features in his responses. Concerning language proficiency, since the speaker showing no Papuan features in his responses speaks Bahasa Indonesia with his family, his Bahasa Indonesia proficiency would be better than others, resulting in using fewer Papuan features. However, for the speaker showing a lot of Papuan features in his responses, his proficiency in Bahasa Indonesia might not be as good as other speakers, and thus, relying on Papuan to fill in the lexical gaps.

### *Limitations*

One key limitation of this study is the variation in participants' sociolinguistic background – given that these participants come from different cities in West Papua or Papua province, with the diminishing use of Papuan in general, speakers may no longer be passing down heritage and knowledge related to the language. In our study, some participants were not able to name their Papuan tribe or the variety of Papuan spoken at home. In other words, although Papuan Malay is used here as the prototype variety, it is near impossible to confirm whether some participants' spoken varieties share features (e.g. causative constructions or the absence of passives) with Papuan Malay.

Another limitation is the extent to which participants' Papuan language even affected their Indonesian speech. Although most participants' parents were native speakers of a Papuan language (such as Paniai, Kamoro or Awyu), participants themselves were not fluent speakers of these languages. Instead, they described themselves as proficient in a Papuan style of Indonesian which retained the syntax or lexical items of their parents' Papuan variety. This was also what they reported using with Papuan friends and family, with their command of this variety being much stronger than their use of standard (or Javanese) Indonesian. Although our study did find evidence of Papuan transfer in their Standard Indonesian, the results might not be comparable to cases of native Papuan speakers, where the influence of Papuan would be much stronger.

## 6. Conclusion

Having confirmed the effects of Papuan transfer to Standard Indonesian, our results suggest a few directions for future research: Firstly, since our study was not done in natural settings, further studies could focus on code-mixing or even code-switching in conversations. Moreover, focus could be narrowed down to one geographic region and Papuan dialect to reduce speaker variation. Secondly, with the effects of Standard Indonesian as a lingua franca on the loss of Papuan varieties, possible means to revive these languages could be looked into. Finally, given possible social stigma surrounding the Papuan community and its languages, it is important to consider bridging the gap between Papua and other Indonesian provinces or elevating the status of the Papuan community.

## 7. Appendix

### *7.1 Language use survey for Bahasa Indonesia speakers*

1. Name
2. Age
3. Gender
4. Where are you from?
5. Where did you grow up?
6. What languages do you speak with your parents?
7. Where did your father come from? What languages does he speak?
8. Where did your mother come from? What languages does she speak?
9. What languages do you speak with your friends?
10. Do you spend more time with local buddies or buddies from other areas?
11. Which language do you use more frequently?
12. What language are you strongest in?

## *7.2 Language use survey for Papuan speakers*

1. Name
2. Age
3. Gender
4. Where are you from?
5. Where did you grow up?
6. What languages do you speak with your parents?
7. Where did your father come from? What languages does he speak?
8. Where did your mother come from? What languages does she speak?
9. What languages do you speak with your friends?
10. When did you move to Yogyakarta?
11. Do you spend more time with Papuan buddies or locals here?
12. Which language do you use more frequently?
13. What language are you strongest in?

### *7.3 Experimental stimuli (Video conditions)*

- The girl pushing the boy (animate patient) List A
- The girl pushing the water bottle (inanimate patient) List B
  
- The girl hitting the boy (animate patient) List B
- The girl hitting the wall (inanimate patient) List A
  
- The girl pulling the boy (animate patient) List A
- The girl pulling the backpack strap (inanimate patient) List B
  
- The boy following the girl (animate patient) List B
- The boy following the car / motorbike (inanimate patient) List A
  
- The girl hugging another girl (animate patient) List A
- The girl hugging the potted plant (inanimate patient) List B
  
- The boy chasing the girl List B
- The girl chasing the car List A

#### 7.4 Data of non-Papuan and Papuan groups

Non-Papuan / Indonesian speakers

LIST A - 1

Name: Novi

Scenario	Animacy	Response (Bahasa Indonesia)	Translation (English)
PUSH	+	Laki-laki itu didorong oleh seorang perempuan	That man is pushed by lady
HIT	-	Dinding itu dipukul oleh seorang perempuan	That wall is hit by lady
PULL	+	Laki-laki itu ditarik oleh seorang perempuan	That man is pulled by lady
FOLLOW	-	Motor itu dikendarai oleh seorang perempuan	That motorcycle is ridden by a lady
HUG	+	Wanita itu dipeluk temannya	That lady is hugged by her friend
CHASE	-	Motor itu dikejar oleh seorang perempuan	That motorcycle is chased by a lady.



LIST A - 2

Name: Andrea

Scenario	Animacy	Response (Bahasa Indonesia)	Translation (English)
PUSH	+	Dia didorong oleh temannya	He/she is pushed by her/his friend
HIT	-	Dindingnya dipukul oleh perempuan itu	Wall is hit by that girl.
PULL	+	Laki-laki itu ditarik sama temannya	That man is pulled by his friend.
FOLLOW	-	Perempuan itu mengikuti motor yang ada di depannya	That lady follows motorbike that is in front of her.
HUG	+	Perempuan di sebelah kiri dipeluk oleh temannya	Lady on the left is hugged by her friend.
CHASE	-	Perempuan itu lari-lari ngejar motor yang ada di depannya	That lady is running chasing motorbike that is in front of her

LIST- A3

Name: Eugenia

Scenario	Animacy	Response (Bahasa Indonesia)	Translation (English)
PUSH	+	Cowo didorong cewe	Boy pushed by girl
HIT	-	Tembok ditepuk-tepuk cewe	Wall tapped by girl.
PULL	+	Cowo diseret cewe	Boy dragged by girl.
FOLLOW	-	Motor cari parkir	Motorcycle looking for parking.
HUG	+	Cewe seneng dipeluk	Girl happy being hugged
CHASE	-	Motor dikejar cewe	Motorcycle chased by girl.

LIST B - 1

NAME: Vio

Scenario	Animacy	Response (Bahasa Indonesia)	Translation (English)
PUSH	-	Dia menggeser botol minum tersebut ke ujung meja	They pushed the water bottle into the edge of the table
HIT	+	Dia linglung	He dazed out
PULL	-	Dia ngencengin tali tas	She is tightening the backstrap
FOLLOW	+	Dia jalan lurus ke depan	The boy is walking straight

HUG	-	Dia meluk tiang lampu	She is hugging the lamppost
CHASE	+	Dia jalan sambil masukin tangan ke kantong	He walks while putting his hands to his pocket

LIST B - 2

NAME: Laura

Scenario	Animacy	Response (Bahasa Indonesia)	Translation (English)
PUSH	-	Botolnya kegeser dari tengah ke ujung	The bottle is being pushed from the center to the edge of the table
HIT	+	Cewek itu nonjok lengan cowoknya terus kepala cowoknya miring	That girl is hitting the boy's arm and the boy's tilting his head
PULL	-	Strapnya memanjang karena ditarik	The backstrap looks longer because it being pulled
FOLLOW	+	Cowok itu berjalan diikuti cewek di belakangnya	That boy walks while being followed by the girl behind him
HUG	-	Tiang lampu nya dipeluk sama ceweknya	The lamppost is being hugged by the girl

CHASE	+	Cewek itu lari ngejar cowok	That girl is running to chase the boy
-------	---	-----------------------------	---------------------------------------

LIST B-3

Mario

Scenario	Animacy	Response (Bahasa Indonesia)	Translation (English)
PUSH	-	Dia menggeser botol	She moved the bottle
HIT	+	Dia memukul pria itu	She hit that man
PULL	-	Dia mengencangkan tasnya	She tightened her bag
FOLLOW	+	Dia berjalan ke depan	He walks to the front
HUG	-	Tiang itu dipeluk oleh wanita itu	That pole is hugged by that lady
CHASE	+	Pria itu dikejar oleh wanita itu	That man is chased by that lady

Papuan speakers

LIST A - 1

NAME: Cicilia

Scenario	Animacy	Response (Bahasa Indonesia)	Translation (English)
PUSH	+	Dia didorong oleh seseorang.	She pushed by someone
HIT	-	Dinding diketuk oleh seseorang.	The wall was knocked by someone
PULL	+	Dia ditarik oleh seseorang.	He pulled by someone
FOLLOW	-	Motor itu dikendarai oleh seseorang.	The motorcycle is ridden by someone
HUG	+	Dia dipeluk oleh seseorang.	She hugged by someone
CHASE	-	Dia mengejar motor yang sedang dikendarai oleh seseorang. She active-chase motor that	She chasing the motorcycle that is ridden by someone.

LIST A -2

NAME: Jesnie

Scenario	Animacy	Response (Bahasa Indonesia) and gloss	Translation (English)
PUSH	+	Cowok itu lagi ditolak oleh seorang cewek	That boy is being rejected by the girl
HIT	-	Dindingnya ditepuk	The wall is being tapped
PULL	+	Laki-laki-nya di-tarik	The boy gets pulled
FOLLOW	-	Cewenya lagi mengikuti motor	The girl is following the motorbike
HUG	+	Cewenya lagi dipeluk	The girl is being hugged
CHASE	-	Cewenya mengejar motor	The girl is chasing the motorbike

LIST A -3

NAME: Dikson

Scenario	Animacy	Response (Bahasa Indonesia)	Translation (English)
PUSH	+	Cowok nya lagi di dorong	The boy is being pushed
HIT	-	Cewek nya ketuk dinding	The girl is tapping the wall
PULL	+	Cowok nya lagi ditarik	The boy is being pulled

FOLLOW	-	Cewek nya ngejar motor dari belakang	The girl is chasing the motorbike from behind
HUG	+	Cewek nya dipeluk	The girl is being hugged
CHASE	-	Cewek-nya lagi kejar motornya	The girl is chasing that motorbike

LIST A-4

Name: Izak

Scenario	Animacy	Response (Bahasa Indonesia)	Translation (English)
PUSH	+	Jangan dorong dia! Don't push	Don't push him/her
HIT	-	Jangan kau pukul!	Don't you hit (him/her)!
PULL	+	Jangan kau tarik sa!	Don't you pull me
FOLLOW	-	Kau mo kemana? You want go where?	You want go where?
HUG	+	Sa sayang kau. I love you	I love you
CHASE	-	Kau tunggu sa!	You wait for me!

		You wait me	
--	--	-------------	--

LIST A-5

Name: Brian

Scenario	Animacy	Response (Bahasa Indonesia)	Translation (English)
PUSH	+	Jang kau dorong sa!	Don't you push me!
HIT	-	Jang bikin ribut!	Don't make noisiness/noisy!
PULL	+	Jang kau tarik saya!	Don't you pull me!
FOLLOW	-	Kau mo kemana?	You want go where?
HUG	+	Sa sayang kau.	I love you
CHASE	-	Kau tunggu sa! You wait me	You wait for me

LIST A-6

Name: Yonike



Scenario	Animacy	Response (Bahasa Indonesia)	Translation (English)
PUSH	+	Didorong.	Pushed (passive)
HIT	-	Dilarang ribut! Forbidden noisiness	It is forbidden to be noisy (passive)
PULL	+	Ditarik.	Pulled (passive)
FOLLOW	-	Jangan pergi!	Don't go
HUG	+	Sa sayang kau.	I love you
CHASE	-	Saya ikut!	I wanna come along

LIST B-1

NAME:Sarto

Scenario	Animacy	Response (Bahasa Indonesia)	Translation (English)
PUSH	-	Botolnya di dorong	The bottle is being pushed
HIT	+	Kaka perem de pukul kaka laki-laki	The sister is hitting the brother
PULL	-	Kasi kencang tas Indonesian words, but sounds	Give a tightening to the bag strap

		wrong Kasi (give), e.g. for presents or information	
FOLLOW	+	Marah trus cuek	Being angry and then act indifferent
HUG	-	Peluk tiang lampu	Hugging the lamp post
CHASE	+	Dia tetap cuek sama perempuan nya	He still acts indifferent with the lady

LIST B-2

NAME: Echon

Scenario	Animacy	Response (Bahasa Indonesia)	Translation (English)
PUSH	-	Botolnya di sorong Sorong = papuan for 'push'	The bottle is being pushed
HIT	+	Ko pukul dia 'Ko' = you, derived from indonesian 'kau'	You hit him (accusation)

PULL	-	Tali tas di tarik	The bag strap being pulled
FOLLOW	+	“Kenapa ko pergi?”	“Why are you leaving?”
HUG	-	Tiang lampu dipolo	Lamp post being hugged
CHASE	+	“Kenapa ko pergi? Ada apa sampai ko pergi?”  Fluctuation in intonation (typical to east indonesia)	“Why are you leaving? What happened until you leave?”

LIST B-3

Name: Salomon

Scenario	Animacy	Response (Bahasa Indonesia)	Translation (English)
PUSH	-	Botolnya digeser. Bottle moved	The bottle is moved
HIT	+	Dia me-mukul si cowok. He/she Active-hitting	He/she is hitting the guy
PULL	-	Dia me-naik-kan tas-nya.	He/she is moving up her

		he/she moving up progressive bag- possessive	bag
FOLLOW	+	Dia me-ninggal-kan perempuan di belakangnya.  he/she leaving woman back/behind-possessive (formal)	He/she is leaving the woman behind his or her back.
HUG	-	Dipeluk.	Hugged (passive)
CHASE	+	Dikejar.	Chased (passive)

LIST B-4:

Name: Angel

Scenario	Animacy	Response (Bahasa Indonesia)	Translation (English)
PUSH	-	Meng-geser botol  Active-move	Move the bottle  (incomplete, like a question response, subject can be added)
HIT	+	Me-ninju temen-nya.  active-punch/box friend-	Punching her friend

		possessive	
PULL	-	Kasih kencang tas. Give tight (adj) bag	Tighten the bag (giving the bag a tight quality)
FOLLOW	+	Ikut ber-jalan di belakang temannya. Join(main verb) continuous-walk(activity) at back friend-possessive	Following the friend from behind
HUG	-	Peluk tiang lampu. Hug post lamp	Hug the lamppost.
CHASE	+	Kakak-nya bilang, "Tunggu saya ikut!" Older person-the said, wait I join	The older person said, wait I follow

LIST B-5

Name: Yabe

Scenario	Animacy	Response (Bahasa Indonesia)	Translation (English)
----------	---------	-----------------------------	-----------------------

PUSH	-	Meng-geser botol. Active- move bottle	Move the bottle
HIT	+	Dipukul.	Hit (passive)
PULL	-	Dia me-narik tali tasnya untuk meng-ecilkan. He/she active-pull string bag-possessive active-make small	he/she is pulling the strap of the bag to make it small.
FOLLOW	+	Cowok-nya berjalan ke depan dan cowoknya pergi. Guy-the walk and guy-the leave	The guy is walking to the front and the guy leaves.
HUG	-	Ia memeluk tiang lampunya tetapi tidak goyang. He/she hug the lamppost but not move	He/ She hug the lamppost but not moving
CHASE	+	Cowok-nya pergi, ceweknya pergi. Guy-the leave, girl-the leave	The guy leaves. The girl leaves.

## References

- Barik, A.M., Mahendra, R., and Adriani, M. (2019). Normalization of Indonesian- English. code-mixed Twitter data. *In Proceedings of the 5th Workshop on Noisy User-generated Text (W-NUT 2019)*, 417–424, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Cole, P., Hermon, G., & Yanti. (2008). Voice in Malay/Indonesian. *Lingua*, 118(10), 1500–1553. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2007.08.008>
- Cole, P., Hermon, G., & Yassir Tjung. (2006). Is There Pasif Semu in Jakarta Indonesian? *Oceanic Linguistics*, 45(1), 64–90. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4499947>
- De Vries, L. (2012). Speaking of clans: language in Awyu-Ndumut communities of Indonesian West Papua: Language use in Melanesia. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 214, 5–26.
- Durán, L. (1994). Toward a Better Understanding of Code-Switching and Interlanguage in. *Bilinguality: Implications for Bilingual Instruction*.
- Donohue, M., & Smith, J. C. (1998). What's Happened to Us? Some Developments in the Malay Pronoun System. *Oceanic Linguistics*, 37(1), 65–84. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3623280>
- Dwijatmoko, B. B. (2021). The Causative in Indonesian. *Journal of Language and Literature*, 21(1), 35–47. <https://doi.org/10.24071/joll.v21i1.2961>
- Givón, T. (1997). The Direct Object in Bi-transitive Clauses in Indonesian. In *Grammatical Relations (Vol. 35)*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.

- Karubaba, S. Y. (2017). The voice system of Papuan Malay: A typological study. *Melanesia*, 1(2), 57–64. <https://doi.org/10.30862/jm.v1i2.813>.
- Kluge, A. (2017). *A grammar of Papuan Malay*. Language Science Press.
- Kluge, A. (2023). Serial verb constructions in Papuan Malay: Forms, Functions and Indeterminacy. *Journal of the Southeast Asian Linguistics Society*, 16(1), 1–36.
- Makihara, M., & Schieffelin, B. B. (2007). Demon Language: The Otherness of Indonesian in a Papuan Community. In *Consequences of Contact*. Oxford University Press, Incorporated.
- Nguyen, A.-M.T. (2013). Code Frame Switching. In *The Encyclopedia of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, K.D. Keith (Ed.). <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118339893.wbeccp074>
- Paauw, S. H. (2008). *The Malay contact varieties of Eastern Indonesia: A typological comparison*. Proquest LLC, Ann Arbor, MI.
- Parker, L., & Sudiby, L. (2022). Why young people leave school early in Papua, Indonesia, and education policy options to address this problem. *Compare*, ahead-of-print(ahead-of-print), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03057925.2022.2084037>
- Pinkster, H., & Genee, I. (1990). Some remarks on direct quotation in Kombai. In *Unity in Diversity*. De Gruyter, Inc.
- Sawaki, Y. (2021). Reciprocity in Papuan Malay. *Wacana Journal of the Humanities of Indonesia*, 22(2), 365–388. [https://doi.org/https://www.researchgate.net/publication/351900943\\_Reciprocalit\\_y\\_in\\_Papuan\\_Malay\\_Reciprocalit\\_y\\_in\\_Papuan\\_Malay](https://doi.org/https://www.researchgate.net/publication/351900943_Reciprocalit_y_in_Papuan_Malay_Reciprocalit_y_in_Papuan_Malay)



- Sangster, C. (2002). Inter- and intra-speaker variation in Liverpool English : a sociophonetic study. Merton College, University of Oxford.
- Sumarsih., Siregar, M., Bahri, S., & Sanjaya, D. (2014). Code Switching and Code Mixing. in Indonesia: Study in Sociolinguistics? *English Language and Literature Studies*, 4(1), 77–92. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ells.v4n1p77>
- Sutrisno, B., & Ariesta, Y. (2019). Beyond the use of Code Mixing by Social Media. Influencers in Instagram. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 10(6), 143–. <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.all.v.10n.6p.143>
- Sitaram, S., Chandu, K. R., Rallabandi, S. K., & Black, A. W. (2019). *A Survey of Code-switched Speech and Language Processing*. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.1904.00784>
- Sneddon, J. N. (1996). Indonesian : a comprehensive grammar. Routledge.
- Stevens, A. M., Stevens, A. M., Schmidgall-Tellings, A. E., & Schmidgall-Tellings, A. E. (2004). A comprehensive Indonesian-English dictionary. Ohio University Press. Retrieved from <https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/hkuhk/detail.action?pq-origsite=primo&docID=3026857>
- Sumule, L., & Iheanyi-Igwe, A. (2020). The Potential Advantages Of Utilizing Venacular. Language In Early Education In Papua As A Bridge To The Indonesian National Educational System. *International Journal of Indonesian Philosophy & Theology*, 1(1), 14–26. <https://doi.org/10.47043/ijipth.v1i1.1>