10-31-2018

Investigating Indonesian conversation; Approach and rationale

Michael C. Ewing
Indonesian Studies at the University of Melbourne, mce@unimelb.edu.au

Investigating Indonesian conversation

Approach and rationale

Michael C. Ewing

Abstract

Colloquial Indonesian has often been described in terms of its differences from standard Indonesian, but with such an approach, aspects of informal language usage will go unexplored. This article proposes using the theoretical approach of Interactional Linguistics to more adequately describe the dynamic nature of Indonesian as actually used by its speakers. Interactional Linguistics emphasizes usage-based analysis of natural language data, especially conversation, in order to understand relationships between social actions and language structure. This article gives an overview of Interactional Linguistics, illustrated by two short English examples taken form the literature. It then presents an analysis of two aspects of Indonesian grammar – subject expression and clause structure – using an Interactional Linguistics approach to examine conversational data. By presenting an alternative analysis of two aspects of Indonesian grammar, this article aims to promote the use of Interactional Linguistics for examining the grammar of Indonesian and other languages of Indonesia.

Keywords

Interactional Linguistics; colloquial Indonesian; conversation; referent expression; predicates and clauses.

Michael C. Ewing is senior lecturer in Indonesian Studies at the University of Melbourne. His research areas include: Indonesian linguistics, grammar of conversation, youth language, language and identity. Major publications include *Style and intersubjectivity in youth interaction* (with Dwi Noverini Djenar and Howard Manns, Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter Mouton, 2018) and *Grammar and inference in conversation; Identifying clause structure in spoken Javanese* (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2005). Michael Ewing may be contacted at: mce@unimelb.edu.au.

1. Introduction[1]

The differences between, on the one hand, standard Indonesian as taught in schools and advocated for use in government and the media, and on the other hand, colloquial Indonesian as used every day in casual interactions, are very striking and have been recognized by scholars from the time Indonesian was established as the national language of the newly independent country until the present day (Abas 1987; Anwar 1990; Anderson 1990; Ewing 2005; Heryanto 1995; Sneddon 2003, 2006). Indeed, discussion of the relationship between colloquial varieties of Malay and relatively more standard "High" Malay goes back to at least the nineteenth century. Robson (2002) points out that in 1884 Lie Kim Hok predicted that Betawi Malay would eventually become more important than the standard Riau variety. In the early twenty-first century, Jakartan Indonesian (a contemporary development from Betawi Malay) may not yet be more important than standard Indonesian (officially viewed as derived from High Riau Malay) but it certainly continues to have an ever-increasing influence on the Indonesian language spoken throughout the nation.

Most research and analysis of Indonesian has been done using the standard language. This is understandable, given that promoting standard Indonesian has been an important part of nation-building since the beginning of the nationalist struggle in the early twentieth century. Even when researchers consider studying more colloquial varieties of the language, it may be thought too troublesome due to the difficulty of collecting data and due to what some people might consider the apparently unsystematic way in which informal language is organized. The purpose of this article is twofold. The first goal is to show that studying informal, conversation language is both methodologically possible and theoretically desirable. I do this by advocating Interactional Linguistics, an approach to linguistic research which puts the study of conversational interaction at the forefront of grammatical analysis. The second purpose is to demonstrate that valuable insights about language can be made by using an Interactional Linguistics approach. This is initially illustrated with two examples from English. The focus of the remainder of the article moves to examining examples for informal colloquial Indonesian conversational data in order to show that looking at conversation can also provide interesting insights for Indonesian. The article concludes by making the case for more research on the colloquial language, especially as used in conversational interaction.

2. INTERACTIONAL LINGUISTICS

Interactional Linguistics is an approach to studying language that has its roots in usage-based approaches developed in the last decades of the twentieth century, and which has now come to a greater prominence in the twenty-first century (Barth-Weingarten 2008; Couper-Kuhlen and Selting 2001; Lindström 2009). Two basic premises are central to this way of studying language. The first premise is that speakers use language in order to engage in social practices and social action. Often language is characterized as a way to encode and convey information. But in fact, people rarely, if ever, convey information simply for the purpose of conveying information. The information that is conveyed by language is always given for some social reason. That is, we say or write things in order to have some effect on other people: so that they will do something for us, so that they will understand and possibly agree with us, so that they will like us or not like someone we do not like, or any of an infinite number other things we hope to accomplish by using language. In fact, much language use is primarily about establishing and maintaining social relationships and has nothing to do with exchanging information. Greetings are an obvious example. In English when people say "How are you? – Fine" or in Indonesian "*Mau ke mana? – Mau pulang*", the questioner is not really interested in a detailed accurate response nor does the answerer generally give one. Everyone knows these are social routines or *basa basi*. This social use of language was noted in the early twentieth century by Malinowski (1994 [1923]), who described it with the term "phatic communion". At the time he also introduced the idea that language is action. The social role of language is also crucial to the thinking of pioneering researchers such as Bakhtin, Voloshinov, and their associates (see Dentith 1995) and it continues to inform contemporary linguistic study. The key point is that while only some language use is primarily indented to convey information, all language use (even the most utilitarian and informational) is socially oriented at its core. Using the idea of language as action, as introduced by Malinowski (1994 [1923]) and developed in Conversation Analysis (see discussion below), we can say that all language use is deployed in order to accomplish social actions.

The second major premise of Interactional Linguistics is that language structures (that is, morphology, syntax, and other structural aspects of language that make up grammar) are not completely arbitrary, but rather are adapted to their functions as means for accomplishing social actions. Such a functional approach can be contrasted with formal approaches taken by some linguists. A formal approach to the study of language analyses language structure independent from its contextualized use. This distinction was enshrined in Chomsky's (1965) early work on generative grammar by the concepts of competence and performance. Competence is understood as the mental ability people have to produce grammatical sentences in a given language, while performance refers to how those sentences are deployed in actual usage. A strictly formalist approach to the study of syntax and morphology is primarily interested in elucidating speaker competence,

independent of how the language is used in performance. As a result, the primary objects of study are hypothetical "well-formed" sentences that are believed to be the direct output of language competence. Such formal approaches have been described as "a priori grammar" (Hopper 1987) or "autonomist linguistics" (Barth-Weingarten 2008), because these approaches assume language structure exists prior to and separate from language use. Functional approaches, on the other hand, recognize that there are clear links between form and function, for example in the way referents are encoded. Referents that are given, identifiable, and therefore at the forefront of speakers' and hearers' consciousness tend to be represented with shorter more general forms such as pronouns (or are not expressed at all), while referents that are new and that need to be introduced into discourse are often represented by larger, more complex noun phrases which convey more explicit information so that a hearer can activate the new referent in consciousness (Chafe 1994). Thus, the relationship between pronouns and full noun phrases is not simply one of structural substitution, but rather is intrinsically tied to the contextualized cognitive, discourse, and interactional needs of language users. This basic relationship between the form and function of nominal reference has been shown to be consistent across languages (Givón 1984). To understand why nominal phrases exhibit this kind of structural variation, we need to analyse situated language use. This functional principle holds across all aspects of grammatical structure.

The practice of Interactional Linguistics has developed as a subfield of linguistics by applying insights from three complementary approaches to language study: Discourse Functional Linguistics, Conversation Analysis, and Linguistic Anthropology (Couper-Kuhlen and Selting 2001). In Discourse Functional Linguistics (Cumming, Ono, and Laurie 2011), grammar is studied in the context of natural usage and aspects of discourse, for example, information flow, discourse structure, and the foregrounding and backgrounding of information, are shown to be important motivations for the way languages are structured. Methods include using quantitative techniques to identify recurring patterns in the data and to establish links between form and function. In Conversation Analysis (Schegloff 2007), everyday conversation is studied as a way of understanding the organization of social activity. Methods are generally more qualitative, using micro-analysis and participant-oriented evidence to demonstrate how speech participants are able to engage interactively. Finally, Linguistic Anthropology (Duranti 1997) demonstrates the importance of cross-linguistic and cross-cultural perspectives for understanding all aspects of language in order to establish both similarities and differences that are possible among human languages.

Based on these two premises and applying these three sets of insights, Interactional Linguistics looks primarily to conversation in order to study how structure is adapted to its function as a tool for social action. Usage-based study is important because studying natural spoken language reveals aspects of language structure that cannot be observed in elicited, constructed

or idealized examples. If we think that the context of use has an important impact on language form, then the only way to understand how linguistic structures and meanings serve social goals is to observe them in naturally produced language. It is not appropriate to simply speculate about possible social contexts for constructed example sentences. We cannot know how language is actually used by speakers until we have looked at authentic example of language use in context. Even more importantly, usages and form-function correlations will emerge from authentic data, which we could never have intuited out of context. What we discover is that grammar is a dynamic, locally adjustable resource for communication rather than a self-contained, static, and abstract system. We also see that talk-in-interaction takes place in real time, thus production is incremental in nature and is influenced by the conduct of the recipient. The situated nature of language production has an important bearing on the structures of language and how they are deployed. Interactional Linguistics primarily focuses on conversation in order to understand relationships between the function of language as a means for social action and the form that language takes. This is because conversation is considered the most basic type of language use since it is what we learn to do first when we learn language, and it is also the type of language we use most during our entire lives (Schegloff 1996). In large part because conversation is so pervasive and because it takes place during face-to-face, real-time interaction, this is also the place where language change begins. It is for these reasons that the focus of Interactional Linguistics has been on conversation. But ultimately all language use is interactional and so the methods and insights of Interactional Linguistics are relevant for all types of language use. The Interactional Linguistics paradigm has been successfully used in research on not only English but also Korean, Finnish, German, Japanese, Mandarin, and many other languages along with many cross-linguistic studies (see Thompson 2017 for an extensive bibliography).

3. Insights from an Interactional Linguistics Approach; Two examples from English

Interactional linguists tend to take one of two perspectives in formulating research questions (Couper-Kuhlen and Selting 2001: 3). On the one hand, they may proceed by asking what interactional function or conversational structure is furthered by particular linguistic forms and ways of using them. Such research begins with a particular form and tries to understand what role it has in interaction. Other researchers will begin with a particular kind of social action and ask what linguistic resources are used to articulate those particular conversational structures and fulfil interactional functions. The following examples illustrate these approaches. In the first example, Ford (1993), in early work that helped shape the direction of Interactional Linguistics, examines the role of adverbial clauses in English conversation. In the second example, Thompson, Fox, and Couper-Kuhlen (2015) examine responsive actions in

conversation in order to understand what linguistic resources are used to accomplish them.

3.1 ADVERBIAL CLAUSES IN ENGLISH

Adverbial clauses are generally conceived in a priori approaches to syntax as the subordinate part of a complex sentence made up of a matrix clause and subordinate clause. Such an approach takes the larger sentence as the starting point and says the adverbial clause is contained within that larger sentence. The implication is that a complex sentence would be planned as a whole and then produced in its entirety. Ford (1993) has shown that if we look at how adverbial clauses are actually produced and used in conversational interaction we have to dramatically rethink how these structures are organized. She analyses several types of adverbial clauses in her detailed study. One example of a particular type of adverbial clause will be sufficient for our purposes to illustrate how we can understand these structures differently from the more traditional perspective. In example (1), the adverbial clause in line 4 is produced as an increment. An increment is a stretch of language produced after an utterance that can be heard as syntactically, prosodically, and ideationally complete, that is, potentially the end of a turn.

(1)   From Ford (1993), transcription conventions slightly modified
    1   S: Ya no when it- ... came from the= I think air conditioning system,
    2   it drips on the front of the cars?
    3   ...
    4   S: If you park in a certain place?
    5   R: Mm hmm.

In line 2, speaker S has come to a point of possible completion. At this point it would be appropriate for either S to continue with his turn or for there to be a change of speaker, in which case R would take a turn. In conversational interaction, the expectation is that one or the other of these options would take place in a fairly routine manner. In this case however, there is a pause, shown by the three dots in line 3. This pause indicates a potential problem in the interaction. Because S does not continue, he appears to expect R to respond, but because R does not take a turn, it appears he expects S to continue his turn. Note that the transcript line 2 ends with a question mark. This indicates that when S spoke the line, he ended with a slightly rising intonation, despite the fact that grammatically the utterance has the form of an indicative clause (a statement). In English, rising intonation on a statement often indicates an appeal for some sort of acknowledgement from the hearer. It is this appeal for acknowledgment that R has not responded to in a way that satisfies S. Once S realizes there is an interactional problem, he attempts to repair it by producing another indicative statement with rising intonation. This time R picks up on the cue and responds appropriately by saying "Mm-hmm", thus overtly acknowledging what S has just said.

There are three points to note from this example. The first point has to do with the incremental grammatical structure of what S says in lines 1-4 and what this tells us about the nature of the data we are analysing. If we try to construct a timeless edited version of his utterance that ignores the hesitations, restarts, and conversational intonation we might come up with something like this: "I think when it came from the air conditioning system it drips on the front of the cars if you park in a certain place." This suggests a complex sentence which has four clauses involving the embedding strategies of complementation and subordination.[2] From an Interactional Linguistics perspective, such an analysis is untenable. This is because the utterance was actually produced over time with pauses, which suggests that S did not have the entire "complete sentence" in his head when he started speaking in line 1. If such a "complete sentence" does not exist as such in the data, then it is not useful to try to analyse it as if it does. To do so would be to analyse language that is constructed by the analyst, rather than analysing the data as it actually is. The second point involves an interactional analysis of how this utterance actually was produced. The clause in line 4 was produced as an increment. This means that it was produced after the previous utterance was potentially complete and in this case, it was produced as a reaction to an interactional problem: the lack of uptake by R. When S began his utterance in line 1 he had no way of knowing that there would be an interactional problem nor what solution might be appropriate if there was one. This is further evidence that it is in fact impossible that S had this entire construction in his head as a single unit at the time he began to speak. It is also an example of the emergent nature of grammar: grammatical structures emerge through the process of interaction, and because they are designed based on the moment-to-moment contingencies of interaction, all grammatical structures can be understood to be in some way co-constructed and thus cognitively distributed across speakers, rather than being the product of a single speaker (Fox 1994; Hopper 1987). The third and final point has to do with an analysis of what adverbial clauses actually are. From an Interactional Linguistics perspective, adverbial clauses are not (necessarily) a structure by which one clause is embedded into another. Instead, based on naturally occurring conversational data, we can understand the adverbial clause structure as something that allows speakers to link clauses together in real time. On the one hand this can be for purposes of language production and comprehension: notice how the first adverbial clause in line 1 is produced to set up a situation in which the following information holds, thus allowing the speaker time to formulate what he is saying as he moves

---

[2]   An a priori grammatical analysis would say that the matrix clause is "I think" and the remainder is a complex compliment clause. That complement clause has three parts: its own main clause "it drips on the front of the cars" along with two adverbial clauses which provide contextual information, "when it came from the air conditioning system" and "if you park in a certain place". Several researchers have explored how phrases like *I think* are better understood as epistemic markers rather than matrix clauses (Englebretson 2003; Kärkkäinen 2003; Thompson and Mulac 1991). Further discussion of that point is beyond the scope of this paper. Our key focus here is the role of the last, incremental, adverbial clause.

forward in time and also allowing the hearer to incrementally receive and process the information. Additionally, and crucially, it also allows a speaker to react to interactional contingences and augment an already potentially complete utterance in response to those contingencies. This rich analysis of the adverbial clause structure would not be possible if our only data were sentences in isolation. It is only through looking at conversational data that we can get a more complete picture of the grammar of adverbial clauses.

3.2 RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS

Speakers of English are aware that questions can be answered in a number of different ways. In particular, answers to questions might be produced in "full" or "ellipted" forms. The two constructed examples of information question and response pairs in (2) illustrate this.

(2)   Constructed examples of "full" and "ellipted" responses
    1   A: What time does the workshop begin?
          B: It begins at ten thirty.

    2   A: What time does the workshop begin?
          B: Ten thirty.

Thompson, Fox, and Couper-Kuhlen (2015) present a detailed analysis of responses to different types of questions in conversational English and make several points about so-called ellipted answers. Here we will look at just one such case, in which they use a corpus of spoken conversational English to analyse responses to information questions, like those presented in (2). Close examination of conversational interaction shows that answers like 1B and 2B are not simply different "versions" of the same thing. We actually gain little insight into the grammar of responses if we simply say that 2B is a "reduced" form of 1B. Saying that 2B is a reduced form of 1B, suggests that 1B is the primary or basic form and that 2B is derived from it. However, because answers like 2B are the most common in conversational interaction, some researchers have considered these to be the basic form (for instance, Hopper 2011), while answers like 1B are more marked. Thompson, Fox, and Couper-Kuhlen (2015) go a step further and say that neither form is more basic, nor is one derived from the other. To highlight this, they call these forms "more-minimal" and "more-expanded" responsive actions and they show that these two different types of answers have very different interactional functions.

    Thompson, Fox, and Couper-Kuhlen (2015) show through their analysis that more minimal responses to information questions (which they call specifying questions) are used to answer questions when there is nothing problematic about the interaction. This is illustrated in (3).

(3)   From Thompson, Fox, and Couper-Kuhlen (2015: 23)
    1   J: but the odds of him,
    2   even having a body bag problem before his re-election occurred,
    3   would be slim
    4   ... (2.7)
    5   S: When's the next elections=.
    6   J: Two thousand [four].
    7   M: [Two] thousand four.

In this example J and M are boyfriend and girlfriend. They are both from the United States. S is a female friend of theirs who is from Canada. This conversation took place in 2002 during the US-Iraq war in George W. Bush's first term as president. J and S are arguing about whether Bush is likely to be re-elected. S thinks that if the war goes badly for the Americans, Bush might not be re-elected. J disagrees, believing that even if there are many causalities in the war Bush will still be re-elected. In lines 1-3 he ends his turn by saying that the chances of there actually being a problem of many casualties ("a body bag problem") are slim. There is a long pause of 2.7 seconds at which point S takes a turn by asking when the next election is. J and M both respond with the same minimal response "two thousand four". According to Thompson, Fox, and Couper-Kuhlen (2015), these minimal answers are exactly what would be expected when there are no interactional difficulties, which is the case here. Note that while J and M have been arguing with each other, there has been no disagreement with S. Also, remember that S is Canadian. If S had been from the US, then a question about when the next election is would probably sound odd, since almost every American knows that presidential elections are held every four years. But because she is not American, her question is heard as a legitimate and relevant request for information and so receives the appropriate minimal answer.

This raises the question, when are more expanded answers appropriate? According to Thompson, Fox, and Couper-Kuhlen's (2015) analysis, more expanded responses to specifying questions indicate that some kind of interactional problem has occurred. This is illustrated in (4).

(4)   (Thompson, Fox, and Couper-Kuhlen 2015: 30)
    1   F   Oh you know what?
    2   L   .. ba.
    3   F   when my dad got home too,
    4   hmm um .. he uh- his his his good friend,
    5   his old friend,
    6   L   .. Uh-huh
    7   F: Just got diagnosed with cancer.
    8   So it made him even more depressed,

9		like .. oh poor dad [you know].
10	L:	[Oh no].
11	F:	@@@
12	L:	Who'd you just call.
13	F:	... Oh uh I just called the store.
14	L:	Oh okay.
15	F:	... But I'm just thinking about you know,
16		(H) getting o=ld and,
17	L:	.. uh-huh.
18	F:	having all these health problems,

In this example three female friends are having dinner together. F has left the dining room and has been speaking on the phone in another room. When this expert begins, she has just returned to the dining room and she starts a new topic of conversation about a friend of her father's. L provides brief backchannelling responses in lines 2, 6, and 10. Then in line 12, L asks the question "Who did you just call". F gives a more elaborated response in line 12, "Oh uh I just called the store." Notice that she also begins this response with some minor disfluency in the form of "Oh uh". This disfluency indicates that there may be some interactional problem and Thompson, Fox, and Couper-Kuhlen (2015) contend that the use of a more elaborated response to an information questions is also an indication of this interactional difficulty. The problem seems to be that L is not sure of the relevance of F's new topic. It seems to come "out of the blue" and so L is trying to understand how F's story is "tellable", that is, how the story is a socially appropriate action within the context in which it occurs (see Ochs and Capp 2001 for "tellability" and other dimensions of narrative practices). L hypothesizes that there is a connection with the phone call and so asks the question in line 12. For F this question does not seem relevant and she does not know why F is asking. This interactional difficulty is registered by providing a more elaborated answer. Thompson, Fox, and Couper-Kuhlen's (2015) analysis of a large conversational database shows this pattern repeated consistently: when interaction is progressing smoothly more minimal responses are given to information questions but when there is some interactional problem with an information question, a more expanded response is given. A purely structural analysis of these two kinds of responses would only describe them as being alternative versions with the same meaning. This detailed Interactional Linguistic analysis has shown that there is much more to these structures and that their form and function can only be understood by looking a naturally occurring interaction.

The two English examples presented in this section are meant to provide a brief introduction to the interesting and insightful work that is being done in Interactional Linguistics and to show the value of this approach to linguistic analysis. As mentioned above, examining and comparing the interactional basis of grammar in many different languages is an important part of

Interactional Linguistics. Much work has been done on English, and also many other languages such as Finnish, Japanese, and Mandarin. However, little work has been done to examine the grammar of Indonesian (or other languages of Indonesia) from an interactional perspective. The following section will illustrate some interesting patterns in Indonesian usage that emerge from an interactional analysis of natural occurring conversational Indonesian.

4. Insights from an Interactional Linguistics Approach: two examples from Indonesian

The four sentences in example (5) are from an Indonesian reference grammar (Sneddon et al. 2010: 241; interlinear glossing has been added for the present publication). In the original text, these sentences are used to illustrate the role of subjects. For our purposes here, they are also useful to illustrate the structure of clauses.

(5) a. *Anak-anak   itu   bermain   di   pantai.*
         child-REDUP   that   MID-play   at   beach
         'The children were playing on that beach.'

     b. *Mereka   menyelenggarakan   penelitian   di   Aceh.*
         3PL   MEN-undertake-APLL   NOM-research   at   Aceh
         'They undertook research in Aceh.'

     c. *Mencari   pekerjaan   di   kota   tidak   begitu   mudah.*
         MEN-search   NOM-work   at   city   NEG   such   easy
         'Finding work in the city isn't very easy.'

     d. *Bahwa   dia   suka   pada   Siti   bukan   rahasia   lagi.*
         COMP   3SG   like   towards   Siti   NEG   secret   more
         'That he likes Siti isn't a secret anymore.'

These sentences are examples of standard Indonesian as it typically occurs in written texts. Sentence (5a) illustrates a full noun-phrase subject, (5b) a pronominal subject, (5c) a subordinated verbal predicate as subject and (5d) a complement clause as subject. Sentences like these are sometimes described as "well formed" (for example Sneddon 2006: 108), because they contain explicit subjects and predicates along with other arguments and adjuncts. Sentence (5b) is an example of a transitive clause (with explicit subject and direct object as well as a locative adjunct), while the other sentences are all intransitive clauses with different predicate types: (5a) has a verbal predicate, (5c) an adjectival predicate and (5d) a nominal predicate. Generally, speakers of Indonesian are aware (at least intuitively) that sentences like these are not commonly produced in casual conversation. In the remainder of this article,

I will outline how the two grammatical elements just mentioned – subjects and clause structure – differ in the language of conversation compared to the kind of standard language illustrated in (5). In doing so I hope to illustrate the usefulness of an Interactional Linguistic approach for the study of Indonesian grammar.

4.1 Subjects in conversational Indonesian

This section examines what subjects look like in a small corpus of spoken conversational Indonesian. The corpus comprises seven recordings and transcripts of conversations representing approximately two and half hours of language use. The recordings were made in Bandung in 2014 and the speakers are young adults whose ages range from eighteen to mid-twenties. Example (6) is typical of the language found in colloquial conversational Indonesian. Asmita is from Bandung and Fakri is from Sulawesi. During this recording, they meet for the first time when Fakri wants to charge his phone near the place where Asmita is working in a public space at a university.

(6) Just met: 1-7[3]

1   Asmita: *Boleh=.*
                     can
                     '(You) can'

2   Fakri: *Numpang   ngecas*
                     N-join   N-charge
                     '(I'll) join and charge (my phone).'

3   Asmita: ... *Iya=.*
                          yes
                     'OK.'

4   Fakri: *Oh   iya   gampang.*
                     oh   yes   easy
                     'Oh yes (it's) easy.'

---

[3]   For extended examples, transcript names and line numbers are given after each example number. The transcript names are simply a label based on a prominent topic in the recorded interaction. These are provided with transcript line numbers so that interested readers can see which examples are from the same speech event and how they relate to each other temporally. Transcription conventions and glossing terms are listed at the end of the article. Pseudonyms have been used to protect the privacy of participating speakers.

5   *Gampang.*
            easy
            '(It's) easy.'

    ... (8.6)

6   Fakri: *Dari   jurusan   mana?*
                from   department   which
                'What department (are you) from?'

7   Asmita: *E=h,   Desain   Interior.*
                Uh   design   interior.
                'Um, Interior Design.'

In this example, as these two young people are getting to know each other, we see a series of statements that consist of predicates with no overt subjects at all. In fact the only noun phrases that occur are within a prepositional phrase in line 6 and as predicate nominal[4] in line 7. As is well-known, lack of explicit subjects is very common in informal Indonesian. This phenomenon is often referred to as ellipsis and is conceived in terms of subjects being omitted (for example Sneddon 2006). Djenar, Ewing, and Manns (2018: 112-130) argue that such a description does not reflect the reality of what speakers do and they prefer the term allusive arguments. It is not clear that speakers necessarily have overt subject arguments in mind when they formulate subjectless sentences, only to delete the subject when the sentence is produced. There are a number of discourse and interactional reasons to think that such utterances are produced exactly as they need to be at that point, and that nothing is elipted. What is clear is that speakers are alluding to unsaid things which hearers will attend to, to the extent necessary for reasonable understanding of what has been said. It is because of such allusions that these structures are called allusive, following the practice that Cough (1990) and Kim (2001) have based on Goffman (1983).

Form of subject	N	%
Allusive subject (unexpressed subject)	509	66%
Explicit subject	265	34%
Total	774	100%

Table 1. Frequency of allusive and explicit referents in subject role.

To see how extensive allusive reference is in Indonesian conversation, a random selection of 250 intonation units from each of the seven transcripts

---

[4] The status of *desain interior* as a predicate nominal may be controversial. See further discussion of this issue in Section 4.2.

of conversation used here were analysed for the form of the subjects of main clauses. The results are presented in Table 1. The first row indicates independent predicates which have no overt subject. The second row indicates the number of independent predicates with explicit subjects, including nouns, pronouns and other nominal forms. We see that allusive reference (no explicit subject) is far more common than overt subjects. This is exemplified in example (7), where no pronouns or other explicit NPs are used, but it is clear that reference to second person and first person is intended in the lines presented.

(7) Rapidograph Saga: 107-108

1   Faizah: *Kok?   .. Bisa   sampai   tau   ke   situlah?*
                PART   able   until   know   to   there-EMPH
                'How did (you) know that?'

2   Puji: *Tau   la=h.*
                know   EMPH
                '(I) knew.'

The frequency of allusive reference raises the questions: What is the default? What is in need of explanation? If we take constructions without explicit subjects as the default, the question is not under what circumstances are subjects "deleted" but rather, under what circumstances are subjects explicit. This is the approach taken in analyses of other languages such as Japanese (Nariyama 2003), Korean (Oh 2007), and Javanese (Ewing 2014). I suggest that this approach is appropriate for Indonesian as well. If we look at the Indonesian conversational data, we can see that there are a number of specific instances when arguments tend to be explicit. These include the introduction of new referents and when there are contrasting referents, for example in a story that a speaker is telling. This makes sense, given that new referents would generally need to be explicitly identified and similarly, if two or more referents are interacting in the same context, explicit reference can be necessary to differentiate them. Explicit contrasting referents are illustrated in example (8).

(8) Rapidograph Saga: 755-767

1   Faizah: ... *Kan   gue   dateng.*
                     NEG   1SG   come
                'I arrive right.'

2   *Kucluk kucluk   kucluk   kucluk.*
                [expressive sound of walking as Faizah arrives]

3   .. *Dia   tuh   ada   di   itu=,*
                    3SG   that   EXIST   at   that
               'He was there,'

4   *depan=   kelas   apa   sih?*
               in.front   class   what   PART
               'in front of some class?'

       [5 lines describing the physical location]

10   Puji: ... *[Hm].*
                   hm
              'Hm.'

11   Faizah: [*Dia*] *pengen   nyapa,*
                   3SG   want   greet
                'He wanted to greet (me).'

12   *kelihatan   banget.*
             apparent   very
             '(it) was really obvious.'

13   .. <@ *Cuma   guanya   langsung   pergi* @>.
                 only   1SG-DEF   directly   go
             'Only I just left straight away.'

Faizah and Puji are close friends and Faizah is telling a story about an encounter she had with an ex-boyfriend. As exemplified in (7), they frequently use allusive reference to themselves, as is common practice in Indonesian conversation. We see on example (8), however, that Faizah uses explicit pronominal reference for all the clauses she produces. This is motivated by the fact that it is part of a narrative and more importantly that there are two characters involved in the same scene, so it becomes important to explicit keep track of who is doing what. We see that (7) and (8) are different, in that the content of (7) is highly interpersonal while that of (8) is removed in space and time. We can also see that the language used is very different in terms of grammatical organization and it is these differences, along with the differences in content, that help differentiate the two styles of language use.

Another point when referents tend to be explicit is when there is a discourse level change of topic, even if the referent in question is clearly identifiable from previous discourse. Explicitly mentioning an identifiable referent is one mechanism by which discourse structure can be established.

This same phenomenon has been noted for written English (Fox 1987), and appears to be common in conversation as well. Yet another interesting reason referents might be made explicit is in order to construct identity or establish stance. As we saw from Faizah and Puji in (7), first and second person referents are commonly not mentioned explicitly in Indonesian conversation and are generally very easily understood from context. At the same time, Indonesian speakers have access to several different pronouns for first and second person reference, including more or less formal Indonesian pronouns as well as using pronouns from regional languages, even when speaking Indonesian. In Indonesian, pronoun choice is often about presentation of identity or stance and in order to do this identity work, pronouns need to be stated explicitly. Thus, despite first or second person referents often being clear from the context, speakers will still use pronouns in order to exploit the social and interactional properties of pronoun choice (Ewing 2016). This is illustrated in example (9).

(9) Blackout: 189-198

1	Salma:	*Sebenarnya*	*kenapa*	*gitu,*		*marah-marah*	*ke*	*aku?*
		actually	why	like that		angry-REDUP	to	1SG
		'So why is it (you)'re all mad at me?'						

2	Sita:	*Soal-nya,*	*kamu-nya*		*nggak*	*main*	*teru=s.*
		problem-DEF	2SG-DEF		NEG	play	continue
		'The problem is you don't hang out at all.'					

3		.. *Main-nya*	*sama*	*Kang*		*Agoy*	*aja*	*terus.*
		play-DEF	with	older brother		Agoy	just	continue
		'(You)'re always just hanging out with Agoy.'						

4	Salma:	*Ya*	*udah,*	*hari*	*ini*	*main.*
		yes	already	day	this	play
		'Oh alright, (I)'ll hang out today.'				

5	Sita:	... *Yuk?*
		okay
		'Okay?'

6	Salma:	.. *Yuk.*
		okay
		'Okay.'

7   Sita: .. *Drama   ari   maneh.*
                      drama   if.Sun.   2sɢ.Sun.
               'You've got drama [club]?'

8   Salma: .. *Ya,   pulang   drama.*
                      yes   return.home   drama
               'Yes, (we'll hang out after I) come back from drama (club).'

9   Sita: .. *Yuk.*
                      okay
               Okay.'

10   Salma: .. *Yuk.*
                      okay
               Okay.'

In lines 1 and 2 we see that Salma and Sita are comfortable with reciprocal exchange of *aku* '1sɢ' and *kamu* '2sɢ', a practice which is very common among young Indonesian speakers. Yet in line 7, Sita switches to the familiar Sundanese pronoun *maneh* '2sɢ'. This occurs at a point in the conversation when the two friends have been having a slightly strained interaction because Sita has accused Salma of preferring to hang out with her new boyfriend, rather than with Salma like they used to do. They are in the process of repairing this difficulty when Sita uses the Sundanese pronoun. One motivation for this may be to assert a certain level of solidary through an ethnically indexed pronoun as part of this appeasement process. The point here is that despite the fact that the reference could easily be achieved allusively, it is only by using explicit reference that a shift from Indonesian to Sundanese pronoun can advance this stance-taking work.

     In this section we have seen that explicit expression of referents in conversation is relatively rare, while implicit or allusive referents are much more common. Previous explanations have generally said that in Indonesian nouns can be omitted if their referent is clear from context. The small corpus-based interactional study reported here illustrates there is much more that can be said. First the extremely high frequency of unexpressed referents suggests that allusive reference may be the default state and that explicitly expressing referents is done when there is some interactional need. This is in fact the reverse of the usual explanation, which takes full expression of referents to be the norm and then "explains" that they can be omitted when clear from context. The next step taken here is then to identify circumstances in which referents are explicitly expressed, which include referent introduction, contrasting referents, changes in discourse structure and construction of identity.

4.2 PREDICATES AND CLAUSES

Consider the standard Indonesian sentences given in example (5) again. If so few clauses in conversational Indonesian have explicit subjects, then this means that there will be few "fully formed" sentences or clauses of the sort presented as representative of standard Indonesian in (5). If much of informal conversational Indonesian is not constructed based on sentences of this sort, then what are the structures that organize it and how are they deployed? We will begin to explore these questions by looking at the kinds of structures which do occur.

Examples (10)-(21) all contain clauses that were produced during naturally occurring spoken interaction in the same corpus that was introduced in Section 4.1. Examples (10)-(13) are clauses with verbal predicates. Example (10) represents what is usually considered an active transitive clause. Its verb has the active prefix N- and transitivizing applicative suffix *-in*. Its subject and object are both explicitly expressed. Example (11) presents an intransitive clause with its single argument explicitly expressed. Examples (12) and (13) each show a verbal predicate that makes use of allusive reference and no explicit arguments. Taken out of context, (12) might be taken as either interactive or transitive, depending on whether one considers it referring to the act of reading in a generic sense and thus intransitive, or whether it is understood to have some identifiable referent as a patient argument (direct object), which has not been explicitly mentioned. In the context of the recording in which this occurred, the speaker is looking at the screen of her device and describing a particular post, so we can understand it has having a specific patient, albeit one that is only allusively referred to. Similarly, example (13) might be taken as intransitive or transitive. The verb in (13) is in the passive form and if the agent is considered to be generic, that is, the focus of the utterance is only on what happened to the patient argument, we might consider it intransitive. However, in context (13) is part of an evaluation of a story Asmita has heard Amru tell and the statement is clearly not just about the cigarettes, but crucially has to do with Amru giving them to his friends (see example (18) from the same interaction). Discussion of why the active or passive form of a transitive clause is chosen at any given point is beyond the scope of the present paper. But suffice to say that within its context this passive verb can be considered transitive, with both a patient and an agent implied, but with neither explicitly stated. The key point here is that it is possible, in fact common as we will see below, for verbal predicates, whether active, passive or intransitive, to occur without any explicit arguments.

(10) Bayu: *Soal-nya   orang   nge-hindar-in   rece=h.*
               issue-DEF   person   N-avoid-APPL   small.change
               'The thing is people avoid small change.'

(11) Ratna: *Aku   mau   bel-ajar   dulu   ya.*
              1SG   FUT   MID-study now   yeah
              'I'm going to study now okay.'

(12) Dinda: *Gimana   mau   baca?*
              how   FUT   read
              'How (am I) going to read (that)?'

(13) Asmita: *O   jadi   di-bagi-in   gitu?*
               oh   therefore PAS-divide-APPL like.that
               'Oh so (you) share (your cigarettes) is that it?

The utterances in examples (14)-(21) are all built around non-verbal predicates. These include a nominal predicate (14), a prepositional phrase (15), an adverb (16) and a modal (17). All four of these examples have explicit subjects. As is common for non-verbal predicate constructions in Indonesian, the subjects and the predicates are juxtaposed without copula. While Indonesian does have copula elements, such as *adalah* and *ialah*, these are rarely used in colloquial Indonesian. In the database used for the present study such copulas never occur. It is probably safe to say that juxtaposition without copula is the norm for colloquial Indonesian and any use of a copula in informal contexts could be seen as a case of style shifting.

(14) Dian: *Ini   ayam   bakar   biasa.*
             this   chicken roast   regular
             'This is regular fried chicken.'

(15) Aina: *Aina   nggak   ke   Teh   Irsa=.*
             Aina   NEG   to   sister Irsa
             'I'm not going to Teh Irsa's.'

(16) Euis: *Si   Dian   langsung   @.*
             TITTLE Dian   directly
             'Dian does it directly.'

(17) Rini: *Kangkung   bisa   lah.*
             water.spinach can   PART
             'Water spinach is ok' (Said while looking at a menu, namely 'You can order it.' or 'I can eat it.')

Examples (18)-(21) all contain non-verbal predicates that do not have explicit subjects at the lines marked with an arrow. These examples all have larger contexts which help to establish that the elements in question are in

fact predicates and not simply unattached elements that have some other, non-predicating function. Many researchers have noticed the prevalence of unattached elements in conversational interaction, in many different languages of the world (see for example, Couper-Kuhlen and Ono 2007; Helasvuo 2001a; Ono and Thompson 1994; Tao 1996). For Indonesian, when nouns, prepositional phrases, adverbs, or modals appear without arguments, this raises the question, are these in fact predicates without explicit subjects or are they unattached elements similar to those discussed for other languages. Given an element like *orang lain* 'other people', an a priori grammatical analysis could only classify it as a noun phrase. From an Interactional Linguistic point of view, we have to look at any instance of language in its context in order to make the best possible analysis of its structure and its meaning (understood broadly to include both semantic meaning and the social action that it helps achieve). We will now look at examples (18)-(21) with this in mind.

(18) Plush Toys: 1415-1417

1	Amru:	*Soalnya*	*bukan*	*aku*	*doa=ng*	*yang*	*ngerokok.*
		problem-DEF	NEG	1SG	only	REL	N-smoke
		'The thing is, the one who smokes is not only me.'					

2 →		*Orang*	*lain.*
		person	other
		'(It's) other people.'	

3 →		*Anak-anak*	*arsi.*
		child-REDUP	architecture
		'(It's) the guys from architecture.'	

In example (18), we can see that both *orang lain* 'other people' and *anak-anak arsi* 'the guys from architecture', as well as being noun phrases, each has a predicating function. We can understand that this is the case by examining the context in which they were produced. In line 1, Amur has said he is not the only one who smokes (he is talking about students and staff at his university). In this line the subject (that is, the given information) is the *yang*-nominalization *yang ngerokok* 'those who smoke' and the predicate (that is, the new information) is *bukan aku doang* 'not only me'. As well as the information structure pointing to this being the predicate, the use of the predicate nominal negator *bukan* is further evidence that this is the predicate of the clause. This information structure supports the analysis that lines 2 and 3 also have a predicating function. Each line adds further new information about the given topic "those who smoke". These two noun phrases – *orang lain* and *anak-anak asri* – can also be seen to stand in a paradigmatic relationship with *bukan aku doang* in so far as they are structurally "substitutable" for *bukan aku*

doang. Further evidence of this substitutability comes from the interactional intent of Amru's evidence. He first asserts that he is not the only one who smokes, and he then provides evidence for this by naming others who stand in the same relationship as himself with the topic "those who smoke". This convergence of evidence suggests that the noun phrases lines 2 and 3 of (18) have a predicating function. In their discussion of unattached NPs in English, Ono and Thompson (1994) make the distinction between the function of predicating and the structural role of predicate. They make a convincing case that for English, while most unattached NPs have a predicting function, they are not grammatical predicates. One reason for this is that in English the copula verb *to be* is an important component of the predicate structure. English unattached NPs do not have a copula and so, while predicating, are not actually predicates. The situation is quite different for colloquial Indonesian. In colloquial Indonesian, a clause with subject plus predicate nominal is formed by juxtaposition without a copula. Just as verbal predicates often do not have explicit subjects and are still predicates, so too nominal predicates also often do not have explicit subjects and by analogy can also be considered predicates. The same argument can be made for the other non-verbal elements that function as predicates in Indonesian, as exemplified in (19)-(21).

(19) K-Pop: 405-410

1	Ratna:	*Aku*	*mau*	*belajar*	*dulu*	*ya.*
		1SG	FUT	study	now	yeah

'I'm going to study now okay.'

2	Febri:	... *Iya.*	.. *Selamat*	[*ya*].
		yes	safe	yeah

'Okay. All the best.'

3 →	Dinda:		[*Ke Pak*] *Syahrial.*
			to Mr Syahrial

'(You're going) to Mr Syahrial('s class).'

4	Ratna:	*He-eh.*
		uh-huh

'Uh-huh.'

(20) Chicken Foot Soup 69-70

1	Aina:	*Kata-nya*	*emang*	*susah*	*di*	*UPI*	*ma=h.*
		word-DEF	indeed	difficult	at	UPI	PART

'They say (it is) indeed difficult at UPI [an Indonesian university].'

2 →   Ratih: *Emang   begitu.*
                     indeed   like.that
                     '(It is) indeed like that.'

(21) K-Pop 644-645

1   Febri: *... Kamu itu   tadi, yang Eksoka   ya?*
                     2SG   that PAST REL   Eksoka yeah
                     'You (had) Eksoka (a type of online music).'

2   Dinda: *... Hm-mh.*
                     uh-huh
                     'Uh-huh.'

3 →   *... Masih   bisa   kok?*
                     still   can   PART
                   '(You/one) can still actually (get it)?'

4 →   Febri: *Bisa.*
                     can
                     '(I/one) can.'

One final piece of evidence supporting the claim that unattached predicting elements (that is, those not juxtaposed with an explicit subject argument) function as predicates comes from example (22) and similar structures. Here the unattached NP *ArchiCAD* (the brand name of a type of design software) is modified with the aspect marker *udah* 'PERF', something that would be expected of predicates. To make a contrast with the English situation, if an English predicating NP were to be marked for aspect it would necessarily have an explicit copula verb since aspect can only be marked on verbs in English. Within the grammar of colloquial Indonesian on the other hand, aspect can be marked on any type of predicate and the occurrence of aspect marking with an unattached non-verbal element is further evidence that it is in fact a predicate.

(22) Plush Toys 1047-1048

1   Amru: *Kalau   udah   ArchiCAD,*
                  if   already   ArchiCAD
                  sampai   three D   gitu   gitu.
                  until   3D   like.that   like.that
                  'If (it is) already ArchiCAD, (it goes) as far 3D and so forth.' (In other words, if you have already moved on to ArchiCAD from a simpler graphics application, you'll then be able to do things like create 3D images)

The various examples discussed above show that conversational Indonesian is made up largely of two types of structures: predicates without any explicit arguments and predicates that do have one or more explicit arguments syntactically linked to form a clausal structure. A count of predicate structures was done with the same data used in Section 4.1. Results are presented in Table 2. We see that predicates alone with no arguments far outnumber predicates with some form of explicit argument. Following the same line of reasoning used in the discussion of subjects, I suggest that the basic structure of colloquial Indonesian is the predicate rather than the clause. Additional material may be added to these predicates in different ways, for example, subjects, objects, adjuncts or different types of modifying material. This additional material is produced on what we might call an as-needed basis. That is, more complex structures with a predicate plus additional material emerge out of language use and are fine tuned to the needs of speakers and hearers in the context of interaction. This approach is very different from the metaphor of ellipsis that is commonly used to describe more minimal structures; that is, a metaphor that sees "fully formed sentences" initially produced in a speaker's mind with material omitted at the time of speaking. The remainder of this section will examine in more detail some extended examples from the data. We will see that speakers regularly move between the more minimal, predicate-only structures and the more elaborated predicate-plus (something else) structures. Some explanations for why they do this will be suggested.

Predicate construction type	N	%
Predicate only	477	62%
Predicate plus (some) argument(s)	297	38%
Total	774	100%

Table 2. Frequency of the two major predicate format types.

The following discussion provides a few examples of how more elaborate structures appear in the conversational data analysed here. This is a preliminary discussion and is not meant to be definitive. More detailed research will be needed to make more definitive statements. However, a preliminary overview of the data suggests a general pattern in which language that expresses states and events that are more removed from context of speaking tend to be sites where more elaborate clause structures occur. In contrast, language that expresses states and events that are more intimately connected to the here and now of the interaction is precisely where more minimal structures tend to occur more frequently. This might seem self-evident and in some ways it is: states and events that are more removed in time and space will need more explicit elaboration because less inferencing is possible. Nonetheless, it is interesting to see how this distinction plays out in actually interaction.

One of the most common places where elaborated structures occur is in narratives. Again, as mentioned above, this has to do with the fact that

narratives are removed in time and space. This means that not only subjects are more likely to be explicit, as mentioned in the discussion of subjects in Section 4.1, but other aspects of the clause structure tend to be more elaborated. These include the appearance of explicit objects (which would be a result of both the greater likelihood of referents being expressed explicitly and the higher number of transitive clauses occurring in narrative segments of discourse) and more elaborate predicates (including greater use of verb morphology and additional modifying material). Example (23) is an excerpt from the same conversation we saw earlier between Puji and Faizah. They are now talking about an incident that occurred between Puji and Abang. Abang is the ex-boyfriend of Faizah. In the story, Abang thinks Faizah is interested in getting back together because she had contacted him about a Rapidograph pen of hers that he had borrowed. Puji is now narrating her encounter with Abang to Faizah. Puji is trying to get Faizah's side of the story, while Faizah is trying to find out what Abang thinks is going on.

(23) Rapidograph Saga: 928-935

1   Puji: *Tapi   dia   gak   cerita   deh,*
              but   3SG   NEG   tell.story   PART
              'but he didn't say you know,'

2   *Kayanya   kalau=   kamu   minta   rapido=.*
              like-DEF   if   2SG   request rapidograph.pen
              'that you'd asked for the rapidograph pen.'

3   Faizah: .. <@ *Dia   gak   cerita   @>?*
                         3SG   NEG   tell.story
              'He didn't say?'

4   *Dia   cuman,*
              3SG   only
              'He only,'

5   [*cuman   bilang*],
              only   said
              'only said,'

6   [*Dia   ceritanya*]   *apa?*
              3SG   tell.story-DEF   what
              'What did he say?'

7   Puji: *Dia   kok   pasti   cuman   bilang sampai sini*
                3SG   PART   certainly   only   say   until   here

                doang   nih.
                only   this
                'He really only said just this much.'

8   *... Dia   sms   Aba=ng   langsu=ng.*
                  3SG   sms   Abang   directly
                'She texted Abang directly.'

Note Puji's utterances in lines 1-2: The first line is a clause conjoined by *tapi* 'but' and it is a transitive clause with both A (subject) and P (object) arguments explicitly expressed. This is followed by a clause marked with *kalau*, which in this case indicates reported speech. This is also a transitive clause with both explicit A and P arguments. Transitive clauses with both A and P arguments explicitly expressed are actually quite rare in the data. Among the 774 predicates reported in Tables 1 and 2, only 97 or 13% can be classified as transitive. The vast majority of predicates produced in casual Indonesian conversation are intransitive. This is not unique to Indonesian and has been shown to be the case in conversational interaction in other languages (Ewing 2009; Helasvuo 2001b; Ono and Sadler 2001; Thompson and Hopper 2001; Turk 2000). It is thus noteworthy that two such elaborated clauses occur together at this point in the interaction. Recurring patterns throughout the data suggest that such elaborated clause structures tend to occur more frequently during narrative segments of interaction, such as we see here.

The tendency for more elaborate clauses to occur in narrative-like segments is also illustrated in (24) where we see a contrast with more minimal clause structures occurring in a non-narrative segment. Here Hally is telling about an episode in which she is trying to organize to vote in the upcoming election while she is away at university and not in her home district. In lines 1 through 3 she is relating what she was told she must do in order to vote. Hally produces transitive clauses with explicit P arguments in lines 1 and 3, while line 2 has an intransitive clause (prepositional phrase predicate) and explicit subject with a time phrase. Noteworthy too is the fact that these clauses are all explicitly linked, creating a complex structure. The clauses in lines 1 and 2 are conjoined with *tapi* 'but', while the clause in line 2 is a temporal adverbial cause marked by *pas* 'when', which links it to the following clause in line 3. Salma responds with a request for clarification in line 4. The request, and the explanation Hally gives in line 5 both occur as part of the here-and-now interaction between Salma and Hally and the shift from the narrative world to the current interaction corresponds with the use of shorter, less elaborated structures. Similarly, as Unun and Sita interactionally react to the story, their statements in lines 6 and 7 use less elaborated structures.

(24) Blackout: 294-300

1	Hally:	.. *Katanya*	*boleh*	*bawa*	*KTP*	*doang,*
		say-DEF	can	bring	identity.card	only

'They said (I) only needed to bring (my) identity card,'

2		… *tapi*	*pas*	*kemarin*	*aku*	*ke*	*TPS,*
		but	when	yesterday	1SG	to	polling. booth

'but when I went to the polling booth yesterday,'

3		*harus*	*ng-ambil*	*A-lima.*
		must	N-take	A-five

'(I) had to get an A-5.'

4	Salma:	*Apa*	*A-lima?*
		what	A-five

'What's an A-5?'

5	Hally:	… *Kaya=k*	*formulir*	*pemindahan*	*gitu.*
		like	form	transfer	like.that

'(It's) a kind of transfer form.'

6	Unun:	… *Mau*	*ke*	*Cirebon*	*ih=.*
		FUT	to	Cirebon	EXCL.

'Gosh (you)'ll (go) to Cirebon.'

7	Sita:	… *Emang*	*di*	*sini*	*nggak*	*bisa?*
		indeed	at	here	NEG	can

'(You) really can't (vote) here?'

The example in (25) involves the same speakers and same speech event as that in (6). In (6) we saw the use of minimal structures while the interlocutors were getting to know each other – a very interactionally intense interpersonal activity. In the segment in (25), Fakri is now talking about the research that he does in connection with urban water resources. This topic is removed in time and space from the face-to-face interaction. The first utterance in lines 1 and 2 is presented as a hypothetical generalization, making it even more abstract and removed from the context of the immediate interaction, while during the utterance in lines 4 through 8 he is trying to formulate a general description of how he goes about his research. In contrast to the minimal structures displayed in example (6), here Faizal is utilizing much more elaborate language with explicit arguments, morphologically complex verbs, abstract nouns and clause combining strategies.

(25) Just Meet: 247-255

1   Faizal: *Kalau   misalnya   kita   konsumsi   itu,*
                   if   example-DEF 1INCL   consume   that
                   'If for example we consume that,'

2   *bisa   menyebabkan kanker*=.
                can   cause   cancer
                '(it) can cause cancer.'

3   Asmita: .. *Oh*=.
                    oh
                'Oh.'

4   Fakri: *Na*=*h.*
                PART
                'So.'

5   .. *Kemudian,*
                   then
                'Then,'

6   *saya*= *buat   penelitian,*
                1SG   make   research
                'I do reseach,'

7   *pake alat   apa*=,
                use   tool   what
                'using some instruments,'

8   *gitu   kan.*
                like.that   PART
                'like that you know.'

9   Asmita: *Ya.*
                  yeah
                'Yeah.'

In this section we have seen that clauses like those illustrated in (5) are in fact exceedingly rare in conversational interaction. This phenomenon is related to the fact that conversational language is highly intransitive and is also linked to the infrequent use of explicit referents noted in Section 4.1. The result is

that conversational interaction is largely built out of predicate structures that do not have explicit arguments. Following the same line of reasoning used in Section 4.2, we can posit that such predicate-only structures form a kind of default structure and that more complex structures are built up from these. Like the discussion of referents, this is the reverse of the usual way of conceptualizing this phenomenon. That is, rather than thinking that minimal structures are reduced from more elaborate structures, I am suggesting that more elaborate structures are built up from more minimal structures. This means that the complex structures emerge through interaction and are not produced a priori. Again, as with explicit reference, we can now ask, under what circumstances do these more complex structures appear? The discussion in this section suggests that elaborated structures are largely associated with contexts that are removed in space and time from the present here-and-now context. Narrative is an especially rich area for this, but other contexts such as generic or abstract discussions are also conducive to more elaborate structures.

The examples and discussion in Sections 4.1 and 4.2 have illustrated points about Indonesian grammar that can only be seen when conversational data is given a close, interactional analysis. Such an analysis can include quantitative examination of the frequency of occurrence of certain structures. At the same time, it is important to also do qualitative microanalysis of examples of the phenomena under examination in order to understand the discourse and interactional motivations that might help explain why such structures occur as they do. This Interactional Linguistic study of referents and predicate structures has revealed patterns of usage that are not normally discussed and, more importantly, has also opened up avenues for fruitful research that would not be evident without an interactional approach.

5. Concluding remarks

Indonesian speakers and academics who do research on the Indonesian language have long recognized that there is a divide between the grammar of standard Indonesian and the grammar of colloquial language used on an everyday basis. From an a priori grammar perspective, these seem like two different systems with different sets of rules. Attempts to unify the two systems conceptually usually involve describing colloquial Indonesian in terms of how it is different from standard Indonesian. In this article I have used the theoretical approach of Interactional Linguistics in order to find a way to move beyond such a rigid analysis, which cannot adequately describe the dynamic nature of how Indonesian is actually used by its speakers. Interactional Linguistics emphasizes using natural language data, especially conversation, in order to understand the discourse and interpersonal motivations for why language is used as it is and why it has the structures that it has. Interactional Linguistics also embraces diversity in language and looks at the social ramifications of different ways of using language. These aspects of Interactional Linguistics make it a useful way to approach the question of how Indonesian grammar is organized in all its different styles.

After introducing Interactional Linguistics, I illustrated this approach with two brief examples from English grammar. I then moved on to discussion results from an Interactional Linguistic analysis of two aspects of Indonesian grammar. These included how referents are realized linguistically and how predicate and clause structures are produced. The findings challenge the way a priori grammatical approaches tend to view these phenomena. It was shown that analysing unexpressed referents in terms of ellipses and discussing predicate-only structures as reduced clauses do not reflect the way speakers actually use language. When a close Interactional Linguistic analysis is undertaken, it is clear that unexpressed referents and minimal predicate structures are fundamental to the grammatical organization of colloquial Indonesian. From there we can begin to investigate the interactional motivations for why speakers sometimes build up more explicit and more complex structures, such as full noun phrases and complex clauses.

It is hoped that this introduction to Interactional Linguistics and discussion of some examples from Indonesian will encourage other linguists to take a similar approach in looking at the grammar of Indonesian and other languages of Indonesia. This should open up previously unexplored avenues of research and help us better understand how languages are actually used by speakers in social context.

Glosses

1INCL	first person plural inclusive pronoun
1SG	first person singular pronoun
2SG	second person singular pronoun
3SG	third person singular pronoun
APPL	applicative
COMP	complementizer
DEF	definite
EMPH	emphasis
EXCL	exclamation
FUT	future
MEN-	standard nasal prefix
MID	middle voice
N-	colloquial nasal prefix
NEG	negative
NOM	nominalizer
PART	discourse particle
PASS	passive
PAST	past tense
PERF	perfect aspect

REDUP	reduplication
REL	relative
TITTLE	title added before name

TRANSCRIPTION CONVENTIONS

.	final intonation contour
,	continuing intonation contour
?	appeal intonation contour
-	truncated word
@	one pulse of laughter
<@ @>	enclosed words are spoken while laughing
=	prosodic lengthening
..	short pause
…	long pause
… (2.7)	timed pause (timed in seconds)
(H)	in-breath
(…)	text added to free translation that represents referents or other material not explicit in the original, but necessary in the English free translation
[uh-huh]	brackets for overlapping speech

REFERENCES

Abas, Husen. 1987. *Indonesian as a unifying language of wider communication; A historical and sociolinguistic perspective*. Canberra: Pacific Studies.

Anderson, Benedict R. O'G. 1990. *Language and power; Exploring political cultures in Indonesia*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Anwar, Khaidir. 1990. *Indonesian; The development and use of a national language*. Yogyakarta: Gadjah Mada University Press.

Barth-Weingarten, Dagmar. 2008. "Interactional linguistics", in: Gerd Antos, Eija Ventola, and Tilo Weber (eds), *Handbook of interpersonal communication*, pp. 77-105. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Chafe, Wallace L. 1994. *Discourse, consciousness, and time; The flow and displacement of conscious experience in speaking and writing*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Chomsky, Noam. 1965. *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Cough, Patricia Ticineto. 1990. "Reading Goffman; Toward the deconstruction of sociology", in: Stephen H. Riggins (ed.), *Beyond Goffman*, pp. 187-202. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Couper-Kuhlen, Elizabeth and Tsuyoshi Ono. 2007. "'Incrementing' in conversation; A comparison of practices in English, German, and Japanese", *Pragmatics* 17(4): 513-552.

Couper-Kuhlen, Elizabeth and Margret Selting. 2001. "Introducing interactional linguistics", in: Margret Selting and Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen (eds), *Studies in interactional linguistics*, pp. 1-22. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Cumming, Susanna, Tsuyoshi Ono, and Ritva Laurie. 2011. "Discourse, grammar, and interaction", in: Teun A. van Dijk (ed.), *Discourse studies; A multidisciplinary introduction*, pp. 8-36. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Dentith, Simon. 1995. *Bakhtinian thought; An introductory reader*. London: Routledge.

Djenar, Dwi Noverini, Michael C. Ewing, and Howard Manns. 2018. *Style and intersubjectivity in youth interaction*. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.

Duranti, Alessandro. 1997. *Linguistic anthropology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Englebretson, Robert. 2003. *Searching for structure; The problem of complementation in colloquial Indonesian conversation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Ewing, Michael C. 2005. "Colloquial Indonesian", in: Alexander Adelaar and Niklaus P. Himmelmann (eds), *The Austronesian languages of Asia and Madagascar*, pp. 227-258. London: Routledge.

Ewing, Michael C. 2009. "Low transitivity in Javanese conversation". [Paper The Languages of Southeast Asia Conference, UCLA, 30 January.]

Ewing, Michael C. 2014. "Motivations for first and second person subject expression and ellipsis in Javanese conversation", *Journal of Pragmatics* 63: 48-62.

Ewing, Michael C. 2016. "Localising person reference among Indonesian youth", in: Zane Goebel, Deborah Cole, and Howard Manns (eds), *Margins, hubs, and peripheries in a decentralizing Indonesia,* pp 26-41. [Special Issue, *Tilburg Papers in Culture Studies* 162.]

Ford, Cecilia E. 1993. *Grammar in interaction; Adverbial clauses in American English conversations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fox, Barbara A. 1987. *Discourse structures and anaphora*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fox, Barbara A. 1994. "Contextualization, indexicality, and the distributed nature of grammar", *Language Sciences* 16(1): 1-37.

Givón, Talmy (ed.). 1984. *Topic continuity in discourse; A quantitative cross-language study*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Goffman, Erving. 1983. "Felicity's condition", *American Journal of Sociology* 89(1): 1-53.

Helasvuo, Marja-Liisa. 2001a. "Emerging syntax for interaction; Noun phrases and clauses as a syntactic resource for interaction", in: Margret Selting and Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen (eds), *Studies in interactional linguistics*, pp. 25-50. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Helasvuo, Marja-Liisa. 2001b. *Syntax in the making; The emergence of syntactic units in Finnish*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Heryanto, Ariel. 1995. *Language of development and development of language; The case of Indonesia*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.

Hopper, Paul. 1987. "Emergent grammar", *Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society* 13: 139-157.

Hopper, Paul. 2011. "Emergent grammar and temporality in interactional linguistics", in: Peter Auer and Stefan Pfänder (eds), *Constructions; Emerging and emergent*, pp. 22-44. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Kärkkäinen, Elise. 2003. *Epistemic stance in English conversation; A description of its interactional functions, with a focus on "I think"*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Kim, Kyu-hyun. 2001. "Confirming intersubjectivity through retroactive elaboration; Organization of phrasal units in other-initiated repair sequences in Korean conversation", in: Margret Selting and Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen (eds), *Studies in interactional linguistics*, pp. 345-372. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Lindström, Jan. 2009. "Interactional linguistics", in: Sigurd Dhondt, Jan-Ola Östman, and Jef Verschueren (eds), *Pragmatics of interaction*, pp. 96-103. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Malinowski, Bronislaw. 1994 [1923]. "The problem of meaning in primitive languages", in: Janet Maybin (ed.), *Language and literacy in social practice; A reader*, pp. 1-10. Philadelphia, PA: Multilingual Matters.

Nariyama, Shigeko. 2003. *Ellipsis and referent tracking in Japanese*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Ochs, Elinor and Lisa Capps. 2001. *Living narrative; Creating lives in everyday storytelling*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Oh, Sun-Young. 2007. "Overt reference to speaker and recipient in Korean", *Discourse Studies* 9: 462-492.

Ono, Tsuyoshi and Sandra A. Thompson. 1994. "Unattached NPs in English conversation", *Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society* 20: 402-419.

Ono, Tsuyoshi and Misumi Sadler. 2001. "The status of 'canonical' transitive clauses in Japanese conversation". [Paper, The 11th Japanese Korean Linguistics Conference, Santa Barbara.]

Robson, Stuart O. 2002. *From Malay to Indonesian; The genesis of a national language.* Clayton, VIC: Monash Asia Institute.

Schegloff, Emanuel A. 1996. "Turn organization; One intersection of grammar and interaction", in: Elinor Ochs, Emanuel A. Schegloff, and Sandra A. Thompson (eds), *Interaction and grammar*, pp. 52-113. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schegloff, Emanuel A. 2007. *Sequence organization in interaction; A primer in conversation analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sneddon, James N. 2003. *The Indonesian language; Its history and role in modern society*. Sydney: University of New South Wales Press,

Sneddon, James N. 2006. *Colloquial Jakartan Indonesian*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.

Sneddon, James N. et al. 2010. *Indonesian; A comprehensive grammar*. Second Edition. London: Routledge.

Tao, Hongyin. 1996. *Units in Mandarin conversation; Prosody, discourse, and grammar*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Thompson, Sandra A. 2017. "Interactional Linguistics Bibliography". [Retrieved from: http://www.linguistics.ucsb.edu/faculty/sathomps/ ILbib.html accessed on 9-3-2018.]

Thompson, Sandra A., Barbara A. Fox, and Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen. 2015. *Grammar in everyday talk; Building responsive actions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Thompson, Sandra A. and Paul J. Hopper. 2001. "Transitivity, clause structure, and argument structure; Evidence from conversation", in: Joan Bybee and Paul Hopper (eds), *Frequency and the emergence of linguistic structure*, pp. 27-60. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Thompson, Sandra A. and Anthony Mulac. 1991. "The discourse conditions for the use of the complementizer *that* in conversational English", *Journal of Pragmatics* 15: 237-251.

Turk, Monica. 2000. "Word order in Russian conversation; A quantitative study". MA thesis, University of California.