

**The interpretation of discourse markers *ya* ‘yes’  
and *nggak* ‘no’ in Indonesian**



**Syarif Hidayat Nasir**

**s4642732**

**Master of General Linguistics  
Radboud University Nijmegen**

**2017**

**Prof. dr. Helen de Hoop**

**Dr. Sander Lestrade**

## Acknowledgments

### *In the name of Allah, The Most Beneficent, and The Most Merciful*

For the completion of this thesis, first I would like to dedicate my sincere gratitude to my supervisor, Helen de Hoop, for her support, assistance, friendly talks, and ideas that aided the completion of this thesis. I also wish to dedicate my thanks to Sander Lestrade for his willingness to be the second reviewer of my thesis.

To my family in Indonesia, I want to thank you for your love, prayers, and advice during my study at Radboud University Nijmegen. You have always been by my side whenever I needed advice and motivation to keep fighting until the end of pursuing my degree. I have to admit that it is not easy to complete my study here, where the academic environment is highly challenging and so competitive. Yet, I undeniably feel so fortunate having met people of different cultures and backgrounds. The multicultural environment is truly here.

I am also so grateful to LPDP (*Indonesia Endowment Fund for Education*), for their financial support, to make my dream of studying in the Netherlands become a reality. This gratitude extends to my colleagues in the Indonesian Student Association (PPI) Nijmegen. My special thanks to Jusuf, Mirsa, and Aida, for their assistance of having pointed out some possible interpretations in my data. I would also like to thank Peter, Elena, and Kaiya for their help and patience to check my writing in both English and Dutch. Finally, but importantly, I am indebted to all my lecturers of General Linguistics Faculty of Art, for their knowledge and inspiration. They have changed my linguistic perspective to some extent.

## Abstract

*Ya* and *nggak* are considered two of the most frequently used discourse markers in Indonesian conversation. Their meaning may seem straightforward, namely to express agreement and disagreement respectively, but in everyday conversations, several other functions are possible. Nevertheless, the two discourse markers have not received much attention in Indonesian literature in recent years, especially *nggak*. This thesis fills the gap by examining and exploring the uses of *ya* and *nggak* in Indonesian, and comparing them with *yes* and *no* in English, and *ja* and *nee* in Dutch. By analyzing the contexts in which *ya* and *nggak* are used in eight YouTube videos, numerous categories of interpretations can be found. The data reveals that beyond their core meanings, *ya* and *nggak*, just like *yes* and *no* in English and *ja* and *nee* in Dutch, appear to have some special uses. These uses, however, can be regarded to have certain common features. The proper interpretation of *ya* and *nggak* highly depends on the utterances preceding or following them. *Ya* and *nggak* have the same major function to establish coherence relations between utterances. They have many similarities as *yes* and *no* in English, and *ja* and *nee* in Dutch although few differences exist. Ultimately, the findings of this study expand the discussion on discourse markers in Indonesian literature.

## Symbols and Abbreviations used in the transcriptions

A: / B:/ X:/ Y:	Speaker labels
(1)	Conversation sequence of number
[ ]	Encloses talk produced in overlapping situation
/	An indication that speaker interrupts the on-going talk
(description)	Description of what participants do while speaking, or information which cannot be transcribed.
GEN	Genitive
PASS	Passive verb
PRT	Particle
3SG	Singular of the third person
Falling.away	Multiple words needed to translate a single Indonesian word into English are joined by “.” in the glossing.

## Table of Contents

<b>Acknowledgments</b>	1
<b>Abstract</b>	2
<b>Symbols and abbreviations used in the transcriptions</b>	3
<b>Table of contents</b>	4
<b>1 Introduction</b>	6
<b>2 Literature review</b>	10
2.1. Discourse markers	10
2.2. Previous literature on <i>ya</i> , <i>yes</i> , and <i>ja</i>	16
2.2.1. Wouk (1999)	16
2.2.2. Fung & Carter (2007)	20
2.2.3. Chapeton (2009)	22
2.2.4. Hoek (2013)	23
2.3. Previous literature on <i>nggak</i> , <i>no</i> , and <i>nee</i>	24
2.3.1. Burrige & Florey (2002)	25
2.3.2. Lee-Goldman (2010)	28
2.3.3. Goodhue & Wagner (2015)	30
2.3.4. Tian & Ginzburg (2016)	31
2.3.5. Hoek (2013)	33
2.4. <i>Ya</i> ‘yes’ and <i>nggak</i> ‘no’ as discourse markers	35
2.5. Conclusion	36
<b>3 <i>Ya</i> in Indonesian</b>	37
3.1. Methodology	37
3.2. <i>Ya</i> in Indonesian	39
3.3. The uses of <i>ya</i> ‘yes’	39
3.3.1. To express an affirmative reaction to a question	40
3.3.2. To express an affirmative reaction to a statement	42
3.3.3. To comply with a request	44
3.3.4. Continuer	45
3.3.5. To question or to offer a turn	47
3.3.6. To express delay and filler marker	50
3.3.7. To interrupt	52
3.3.8. To emphasize or underline own statement	54

3.3.9.	To show responses	55
3.3.10.	To express emotion	56
3.4.	Conclusion	57
4	<b><i>Nggak</i> in Indonesian</b>	58
4.1.	The uses of <i>nggak</i> ‘no’	58
4.1.1.	Negative reaction to a statement (disagreement)	58
4.1.2.	Negative answer to a question (closed or leading)	63
4.1.3.	To respond to a question (affirmative and negative meaning)	64
4.1.4.	To offer a turn	67
4.1.5.	To interrupt	68
4.1.6.	To express emotion	69
4.1.7.	To underline or emphasize own statement	70
4.1.8.	Continuer when preceding discourse contains a negation	71
4.1.9.	To reject a request	72
4.2.	Conclusion	74
5	<b>Conclusion</b>	75
	<b>References</b>	77
	<b>Appendices</b>	80

## 1. Introduction

In recent years, discourse markers (henceforth DMs) have gained much attention in linguistics. They have been investigated across languages, such as English (Schourup, 1985; Schiffrin, 1986; Schiffrin et al. 2003), German (Hogeweg et al. 2016), Dutch (Foolen et al. 2006; van Bergen et al. 2013; Hoek, 2013), Modern Greek (Archakis, 2001), Chinese (Chen & He, 2001), Italian (Bazzanella, 1990), and Spanish (Duran & Unamuno, 2001).

In Indonesian, two of the most frequently uttered discourse markers in the spoken conversation are *ya* and *nggak*. Their meaning may seem straightforward, but in daily conversations other functions, apart from their basic meaning of agreement and disagreement respectively, are possible as well. However, they have not gained much attention in Indonesian literature in the recent years. It is because there is little research available on the uses of *ya*, and even no research on *nggak* in Indonesian conversation. This thesis aims to fill the gap by examining and exploring the uses of *ya* and *nggak* in Indonesian, and comparing them with *yes* and *no* in English, and *ja* and *nee* in Dutch.

The basic meaning of *yes* or *yeah* in English (which corresponds to *ya* in Indonesian) is “to express agreement with an earlier statement, or to say that statement is true” (Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary). However, example (1) below demonstrates that *yes* can deviate from its basic meaning of agreement.

- (1) A: Don't say that!  
B: *Yes*, I will.

(Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary, 2016)

In (1) above, *yes* is used by speaker B not to express agreement with an earlier statement, but rather to disagree with it. This function rather surprisingly seems to correspond to the basic function of *no*, which is used to express denial or negation. Like *yes* in English, *ja* in Dutch can also obtain other functions than its basic meaning of agreement. It can for instance indicate surprise on the part of the speaker, as in example (2) below:

- (2) A: *Wat doen ze dat snel zeg!*  
what do they that quick say  
'They are really fast!'

B: *Ja maar met vier man.*  
yes but with four man  
'Yeah, but they are with four people.'

A: *Oh vier man.*  
oh four people  
'Oh, four people.'

B: *Jaa joh?*  
yeah PRT  
'Yeah! What did you think?'

(Hoek, 2013: 32)

Speaker B in example (2) immediately utters “*Jaa joh?*” as speaker A indicates that she did not realize there are four workers hired to renovate B’s house. At first, speaker A thinks that the workers are working really fast. Speaker B then tells her that even though the renovations are running quickly, there are no less than four people renovating his house. This implies that speaker B is not as impressed as speaker A seems to be. By uttering “*Jaa joh?*” speaker B does not express his agreement with speaker A’s utterance. Instead, he just expresses his surprise (or possibly disbelief) about the fact that speaker A thought there are less than four people working in the house. Hoek (2013: 32) claims that speaker B’s *jaa* in the above example does not only express his emotion of surprise, but also affirms speaker A’s statement. In this case, it should be underlined that emotion-*ja* can overlap with other functions of *ja*.

As I previously mentioned, *ya* and *nggak*, respectively, are basically used to express agreement and disagreement, but they can also have other functions. Consider examples (3) and (4) below:

(3) A: *Presiden anda di-hina, tidak ada undang-undang yang*  
president you PASS-humiliate not there rules which  
*melindungi-nya, apakah anda setuju?*  
protect-3SG.obj what you agree.with



‘Your president is being humiliated, and there is no rule protecting him,  
Would you agree with that?’

B: *Itu beda lagi bung Hendri.*  
that different more brother Hendri  
‘That is a different topic, brother Hendri.’

A: *Nggak! loh ini ril.*  
no PRT this real  
‘No! wow this can happen.’

(4) X: *Boleh di-ingatkan lagi nggak?*  
can PASS-mention more no  
‘Can it be mentioned once more?’

Y: *Itu bukan keputusan DPRD.*  
that not decision DPRD (the regional representative council)  
‘It cannot be decided by DPRD.’

The interpretations of *nggak* uttered by speaker A and speaker X in (3) and (4) above seem to differ from each other. On the one hand, *nggak* in (3) indicates that speaker A disagrees with speaker B’s statement. In this case, *nggak* is considered to convey its basic meaning of disagreement. *Nggak* in (4), on the other hand, is not meant to object to, or to disagree with the other speaker. Instead, it is used by speaker X to ask speaker Y a question. Here, *nggak* appears to express another function than its basic meaning. As *nggak* in (4) has indicated that it can bring another interpretation other than its basic meaning, much like *no* in English and *nee* in Dutch, is there any other interpretation?

If *yes* in English and *ja* in Dutch are not usually used to express their basic meaning of agreement such as in (1) and (2) respectively, what about *ya* in Indonesian? Can it also have other functions? Do *ya* and *nggak* have the same functions as *yes* and *no* in English, and *ja* and *nee* in Dutch respectively? And finally, can *ya* have or share the same function as *nggak* in the discourse, like English *yes* in example (1) above?

This present thesis aims to answer these questions. The uses of both *ya* and *nggak* will be closely examined in eight YouTube videos, most of which talk about controversial or debatable topics. These debates are chosen because speakers are expected to express more

uses of agreement (i.e. *ya*) and disagreement (i.e. *nggak*) than other topics in their conversation. Within debatable topics, it is also interesting to see whether or not we can find other uses of *ya* and *nggak* deviating from their basic meaning. The results of this study are particularly expected to find some categories with regard to numerous possible interpretations of *ya* and *nggak* in Indonesian discourse. In general, this thesis can enrich the study of DMs in Indonesian literature.

The next chapter will provide a brief discussion of discourse markers in general, plus an overview of the literature on DMs *ya*, *yes*, and *ja*, and *no* and *nee*. Chapter 3 will present the data from eight YouTube videos. The discussion on the different uses of *ya* and its comparison with *yes* and *ja* will be presented in this chapter as well. Chapter 4, meanwhile, will present the discussion on the different uses of *nggak* in the data compared with English *no* and Dutch *nee* respectively. Finally, chapter 5 will present the conclusion of this study.

## 2. Literature Review

This chapter presents a brief overview of the literature on discourse markers, in particular *yes* and *no*, and their cognates in Dutch and Indonesian. *Ya* and *nggak* in Indonesian, just like *yes* and *no* in English or *ja* and *nee* in Dutch respectively, are not usually listed as discourse markers. In this chapter, I will discuss about their discourse functions, and then conclude whether *ya* and *nggak* can be considered discourse markers or not. Section 2.1 will discuss some definitions of DMs proposed by various scholars, and then formulate a working definition which will be used in the rest of the study. Section 2.2 and 2.3 will present an overview of existing literature on Indonesian DMs *ya* and *nggak* respectively. Then it will compare them with the interpretations of DMs *yes* and *no* in English, and *ja* and *nee* in Dutch. Section 2.4 will briefly discuss *ya* and *nggak* as discourse markers in Indonesian. Section 2.5 will present a conclusion of this chapter.

### 2.1. Discourse markers

Although the interest towards DMs has increased considerably in linguistics, there is still no consensus on the definition of DMs among researchers. This includes how they should be appropriately labeled (e.g. discourse particles, discourse connectives, or pragmatic expressions), and how they should be categorized, either as words or not. Schourup (1999) notes that the wide range of definitions and terminologies makes DMs problematic to characterize. In the rest of this study I will refer to “discourse markers” since this term turns out to be the most popular one among other labels. I will not be concerned with the possible question of whether or not “discourse markers” is indeed the most fitting label. This section will present a discussion on numerous definitions of discourse markers formulated by various scholars, in order to arrive at a working definition which will be used in the rest of this thesis.

Discourse markers can be defined “as intra-sentential and supra-sentential linguistic units which evolve process of the conversation, index the relation of an utterance to the preceding context, and indicate an interactive relationship between a speaker, hearer, and message” (Fung & Carter, 2007: 410). In line with this, Padmi & Dianita (2014) define DMs as a phrase or word which is relatively syntax-independent. That is to say, DMs do not change the meaning of the sentence, and they can even be characterized as semantically empty. Guo (2015: 70) defines DMs as “a complex phenomenon which involves among other things, textual, pragmatic and cognitive factors that interact with each other.”

Schiffrin (1987), one of pioneering and well-known scholars working on DMs, analyses DMs within ‘discourse coherence theory’. She defines DMs as “sequentially dependent elements which bracket units of talk” (p. 31). They sequentially depend on the structure of the discourse, but are independent from individual clauses. Schiffrin (1987) describes 11 types of DMs, such as *I mean, so, then, you know, etc.* These discourse markers, according to Schiffrin (1987) and Fung & Carter (2007), are regarded as contextual coordinates for utterances, since they are being located in the four planes of talk of coherence model, namely action structure, exchange structure, ideational structure, and participant framework and information state.

Schiffrin (1987) elaborates these four planes: *action structure*, including adjacency-pair like question and answer; *exchange structure* where speech acts are situated; *ideational structure* which is viewed from semantics as an idea exchange; and *participation framework* is, for example, the interaction between the speaker and the listener. Similar to Schiffrin (1987), Aijmer (2002) argues that DMs are highly context specific, whose meaning can be properly understood by looking at the speaker’s attitudes or the condition in which DMs are used. Schiffrin’s (1987) definition is later paraphrased by Lee-Goldman (2011: 2628), saying that a discourse marker is “some linguistic unit the primary function of which is not to contribute to the descriptive or propositional meaning of an utterance, but rather to indicate to the reader how they should understand what follows or what came before with respect to each other and to the discourse as a whole.”

Further influential research has been conducted by Fraser (1999), who defines DMs as metalinguistic items that provide information about the operation and segmentation of a discourse. They consist of the syntactic classes of conjunctions, adverbs, and prepositional phrases. Compared with Schiffrin’s (1987) coherence model, Fraser (1999), in my point of view, contributes to a more complete generalization and a pragmatic view towards different markers within his “grammatical-pragmatic perspective” approach (p. 396). In this respect, Fraser postulates that DMs are not just functioning as textual coherence like what coherence model suggests, but are also signaling the speakers’ intention to the next turn in the preceding utterance. Within Fraser’s (1999) “grammatical-pragmatic perspective”, DMs can be thus seen from a wider context rather than just structural organization. Like Fraser (1999), Aijmer (2002: 2) points out that discourse markers should be studied pragmatically rather than only grammatically, since they are “a class of words with unique formal, functional, and pragmatic properties.”

Slightly different from Schiffrin's (1987) definition which includes vocalization such as *oh*, Fraser limits DMs to linguistic expressions which signal a certain relationship that the speaker intends between the preceding and the following utterance. This definition suggests that DMs have a procedural rather than a conceptual meaning. This Fraser's (1999) view has been proposed earlier by Blakemore (1992: 936), who adopts 'relevance theory' from pragmatic perspective. He claims that 'discourse connectives' (the term he prefers to 'discourse markers') merely have a procedural meaning and are limited to a specific context. Their meaning can be understood by looking at the context presentation of when they are uttered in the discourse. Much like Fraser (1999), Blakemore (1992) suggests that discourse connectives do not contribute to a representational meaning, but rather to a procedural and pragmatic meaning, which encodes instructions for processing propositional representations of the utterances. Blakemore, furthermore, argues that discourse connectives are used to indicate the dependent relevance of one discourse on another. Within this procedural meaning, it seems to suggest that unlike Schiffrin (1987), both Fraser (1999) and Blakemore (1992) agree that discourse markers mainly focus on the way communication is negotiated between the speaker and listener in the discourse, rather than on its content.

Referring to Schiffrin's (1987) definition "unit of talk" mentioned earlier, it seems still vague on what units of talk DMs refer to in the discourse. The size and the type of units of talk connected to discourse markers in Schiffrin's definition thereby remain a bit unclear. Redeker (1991), to fill the gap, criticizes Schiffrin's (1987) definition, and suggests a broader framework embracing all connective expression which has not been adequately addressed in Schiffrin (1987). Within the so-called label 'discourse operator' instead of 'discourse markers', she then proposes a more sufficient definition as given below; this definition is shared by that of 'discourse connectives' in relevance theory (Blakemore, 1987) which I have mentioned earlier.

"A *discourse operator* is any expression –a word or phrase- that is used with the primary function of bringing to the listener's attention to a particular kind of relation between the discourse unit it introduces and the immediate discourse context. An utterance in this definition is an intonationally and structurally bounded, usually clausal unit." (p. 1168)

Like Redeker's (1990) definition above, Van Bergen & Degand (2013) state that the primary function of discourse markers is pragmatic in nature; they relate their host utterance

to the surrounding discourse situation. Their linguistic expressions may include syntactic types, such as conjunctions, prepositions, verbs, adverbs, verbal and nominal phrases, etc. When correlating to Schiffrin's (1987) definition, it seems to suggest that Redeker's (1990) specific definition of "intonationally" and "structurally bounded" rules out words or expressions made by Schiffrin (1987). She provides some examples of what cannot be considered DMs, such as clausal indicators of discourse structure (e.g. *as I said before*), and deictic expressions as far as they are not used anaphorically (e.g. *now, here*). In addition to this, Redeker's definition appears to rule out Schiffrin's (1987) proposal that non-verbal expressions, such as speakers' gestures, can be classified as discourse markers. Another critical point made by Redeker (1990: 935) is that she revises Schiffrin's four planes of discourse coherence based on only three components: "ideational structure, rhetorical structure, and sequential structure."

Despite these slight differences, it can be plausibly concluded from Redeker's (1990) definition, Fraser's (1999) 'discourse connective', and Van Bergen & Degand's (2013) claim, that DMs can have more variety when they are seen from broader characteristics. In this case, discourse markers can have both textual coherence –*conjunctions, adverbials, etc*- and pragmatic function, which relates their host utterance to the preceding or following utterance. They, according to Van Bergen & Degand (2013), can appear turn-initially, turn-medially, and turn-finally. They can have their origin in distinct syntactic categories and their referent does not have to be a linguistic unit. Like Schiffrin (1987) and van Bergen & Degand (2013), Redeker (1990) and Fraser (1999) argue that discourse markers tend to precede the utterance they link to the previous utterance or discourse, though they can appear turn-finally in the discourse, a so-called 'closing brackets' in Schiffrin's (1987) analysis. In (5) below, Fraser (1999) illustrates the use of DMs as 'discourse connectives' which appears in the initial position:

- (5) A: I like him.  
B: **So**, you think you will ask him out then.

(Fraser, 1999: 931)

Without a discourse marker *so*, the sentence uttered by speaker B in (5) above might trigger ambiguous interpretations with regard to the relation between A's statement and B's response. Without *so*, it is not obvious whether speaker B's utterance is meant to establish a causal or resultative relation with speaker A's, or rather other types of discourse relation,

such as topic shift. When discourse marker *so* is present, it then indicates that speaker B concludes from speaker A's utterance, from which he encourages speaker A to ask him out (the one she likes) for a date. Using other discourse markers, such as *but* (i.e. but you think you will ask him out then), would result in a contrast interpretation. For instance, speaker B is rather doubtful whether speaker A dares enough to ask the man she likes for a date or not. In this case, even though the use of DMs *so* and *but* can have different interpretations, they do not change the propositional value of either "speaker B encourages speaker A" or "he doubts speaker A." Instead, both DMs *so* and *but* help interlocutors to interpret the relation between the current and the previous utterance in the discourse. As such, they also make a complex discourse easier to comprehend. Hence, it can be said that DMs play an important role in discourse since they make discourse relations explicit.

DM *so* in (5) above corresponds to Heeman et al's (1998: 44) statement that, although there is one problem with lexical *so* (whether lexical items are functional as discourse markers or not), *so* can be considered discourse marker as it introduces and links one sentence (S1) to the following sentence (S2). Fraser (1999) explicitly elaborates the relationship between some aspect of the discourse segment they are a part (a so-called S2), and some aspect of a prior discourse segment (henceforth S1). Although he schematically frames the position of DMs as (S1 + DM + S2), Fraser (1999) acknowledges that DMs do not always link S2 to the immediately S1, but they can also link to several previous sentences which came earlier. Additionally, he claims that S2 can include multiple following sentences and does not have to be limited to one single sentence. In accordance with Heeman et al. (1998) and Fraser (1999), any lexicon or phrase can be classified as DMs as long as they relate the discourse segment between S1 and S2. Like Redeker (1990), Fraser (1999) argues that some of those words can be in addition function as words from another category.

Though the terminology of discourse markers may be various, Schiffrin (1987), Redeker (1990), Fraser (1999), Schourup (1999), and Van Bergand & Degand (2013) generally agree that discourse markers are multifunctional and multicategorical in the discourse. They have one core meaning even though they can express specific meaning depending on the context of the utterance. Regarding their characteristics, Hulker (1991) proposes four basic features of characterizing DMs in the discourse: 1) they do not add anything to the propositional content of an utterance; 2) they relate to the speech situation and not to the situation talked about; 3) they have no impact on the truth conditions of an utterance; and 4) they have an expressive, emotive function rather than a referential function.

Brinton (1996), Jucker & Ziv (1998), & van Bergen and Degand (2013) provide a more detailed characterization of linguistic features of DMs, as in table 1 below:

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Phonological and lexical features <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) They are short and phonologically reduced.</li> <li>b) They are marginal forms and hence difficult to place with a traditional word class.</li> <li>c) They form a separate tone group.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ Semantic features <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) They have little or no propositional meaning.</li> <li>b) They are multifunctional: referential, structural, interpersonal, etc.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ Syntactic features <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) They can appear in the utterance-final, utterance-initial, and utterance medial-position.</li> <li>b) They occur outside the syntactic clause.</li> <li>c) They are optional in use.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ Sociolinguistic features <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) They are context dependent.</li> <li>b) They are used more in oral rather than in written discourse.</li> <li>c) They are more associated with informal context.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ Stylistic features <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) They appear repeatedly and with high frequency.</li> <li>b) They are gender specific.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
---

Table 1. Characteristics of DMs

All in all, DMs in this study are defined as words, phrases, or expressions which functionally link one utterance to the surrounding utterances. They provide information for interlocutors on how to interpret the relation between the current utterance and the previous utterance, or the other way around. DMs have one core meaning, which is procedural rather than conceptual, although their specific meaning can vary depending on the context (thus, pragmatic meaning). They are multifunctional, context dependent, short and phonologically reduced, and do not change the propositional contents of the sentence. They are multicategorical since words functioning as discourse markers can also function as words from another category. They have no impact on the truth of the utterance. They belong to different word classes, such as conjunctions, adverbs, etc. They usually precede the immediately



following utterance (turn-initial position), but can also be adjoined in the middle (turn-medial position), or at the end of that utterance (turn-final position). Moreover, they can link either to the immediately prior sentence or to several previous sentences.

## 2.2. Previous literature on *ya*, *yes*, and *ja*

This section discusses the literature on discourse marker *ya*, and its equivalent *yes* in English, and *ja* in Dutch.

### 2.2.1. Wouk (1999)

Wouk (1999) examines two Indonesian allomorphs *ya* and *iya* that are equal in meaning to English words *yes* or *yeah*. Both are considered discourse markers which can be used to show agreement. Wouk does not make a distinction between the two. In Bahasa Indonesia, *iya* sounds more formal than *ya*, since *ya* is a shortened or simplified form of affirmative *iya*. In everyday communication discourse marker *ya* is likely to be used more often than *iya*, especially when it comes to non-formal interaction. Wouk (1999) argues that Indonesian discourse marker *ya* has a similar function as a question tag in English. She claims that discourse marker *ya* is more frequently used in Indonesian than question tags in European languages. Like English ‘oh yes/yeah,’ *ya* in Indonesian can co-occur with other discourse markers, such as *o* ‘oh’, *gitu* ‘like that’, *kan* (for sharing information), *gimana* ‘how’, *sih* (for contrast), *deh* (for emphasis), *em* (a hesitation particle), *ni* ‘this’, and a name or title (usually combined with a reduplication, for instance, *ya Pak ya* ‘yes sir yes’). Just like repeated *ja-ja* in Dutch (2013), Indonesian *ya* can be single or double (*ya ya*, *iya iya*). It can also co-occur with the negative marker *nggak*, just like *yeah no* in English, and *jaaa nee* in Dutch (cf. Hoek, 2013). Slightly different from Wouk (1999), it seems to me that *kan* co-occurring with *ya* is not only used to share information, but also to request for information or agreement (e.g. *ya kan?* ‘what do you think?’).

Wouk (1999) divides functions of *iya/ya* into two subgroups, responsive and initiatory. In the responsive function, DM *ya* is literally used to express agreement with interlocutors, or to express acceptance of the previous utterance. Hence, the use of *ya* is equal to ‘yeah’, ‘yes’, ‘uh-huh’ and other terms of agreement in English. As a responsive marker, *ya* or *iya* in this case mostly appears in the initial position of the utterance. Wouk (1999) provides the following example where *iya* is used to show agreement with the previous utterance:

(6) N: *Tanggal empat Desember, sekalian memperingati*  
at four December at.the.same.time commemorate  
'December four at the same time (we'll) commemorate'

B: *Empat Januari N (Name) / laugh/*  
four January  
'January fourth N / laugh/'

N: / *iya empat Januari.*  
yes four January  
'Yes January fourth.'

(Wouk, 1999: 78)

In (6) DM *iya* spoken by speaker N is intended to express agreement with speaker B. Speaker N initially thinks that the commemoration will be held on December fourth. Then speaker B corrects N's statement, by saying it is not 4<sup>th</sup> of December but 4<sup>th</sup> of January instead. This correction is then acknowledged by speaker N, by uttering *iya* which indicates agreement between the two speakers.

Wouk (1999) notes that DM *iya* or *ya* in Indonesian conversation is not merely used to express agreement. It can also fulfill a responsive function, for instance, to accept offers or to comply with requests. She provides one example from her corpus where *iya* is used by the speaker to respond to his interlocutor, as in (7) below:

(7) S: *Itu pernah nggak ngadain anak Karang Taruna?*  
that ever not organize child (name of organization)  
*Karang Taruna itu sendiri yang mengadakan itu.*  
(name of organization) that self which organize that

'Did you ever organize the members of *Karang Taruna*? or did *Karang Taruna* itself ever organize anything like that?'

N: *Iya, pernah, waktu itu ngadain lomba pop song, ya.*  
yes ever time that organize competition pop song yeah  
'Yes, once, one time we organized a pop song competition, yeah.'

(Wouk, 1999: 178)

In (7), speaker S asks speaker N a question, to which speaker N first responds to the question, using the affirmative term *iya*. She again utters *ya* at the end of her utterance, which underlines that “we did organize a pop song competition”. *Ya* here functions to emphasize N’s own statement. The position of turn-initial *iya* in N’s utterance corresponds to Fraser’s (1999), Redeker’s (1990), and van Bergen & Degand’s (2013) claim, that DMs tend to precede the utterance although they can also occur at the end of the sentence, just like the turn-final *ya* above.

Wouk (1999:178) claims that pre-disagreements, disagreement, delayed, and dispreferred SPPs (Second Pair Part) often begin with *iya* or *ya*, just like in English conversation such moves often begin with a pro-forma agreement because of the preference of agreement in conversation. She supports this statement by providing an example, as in (8):

(8) E: *Motor juga nama-nye bebek lah, asal jalan aja.*  
 motorcycle also name-GEN duck PART so.long.as go just  
 ‘My motorcycle is just a piece of junk, just for getting around.’

R: *Ya tapi bisa dinaikin kan?*  
 yes but can ride you know  
 ‘Yes, but you can still ride it, can’t you?’

(Wouk, 1999: 178)

In example (8), speaker E has been accused of being better than his friends, because he has a motorcycle while the others have to take a bus. He then counters with the argument that his motorcycle might be a piece of junk. Speaker R acknowledges this fact by using *ya*, but rejects the relevance of speaker E’s argument. In other words, *ya* uttered by speaker R acknowledges the statement made by speaker E, suggesting that he agrees with speaker E’s argument. However, the usage of the contrastive conjunction *tapi* ‘but’ following *ya* suggests that speaker R disagrees with E’s argument. It should be noted in this context that it is not the use of *ya*, in my point of view, which indicates disagreement, but rather the use of *tapi* ‘but’.

Furthermore, Wouk (1999) notes that *ya/iya* can be used as an initiatory marker. Unlike responsive marker-*ya* which occurs turn-initially, initiatory marker-*ya* typically occurs in the final part of the sentence. It makes a suggestion, requests agreement with, or acceptance of the listeners. As it occurs turn-finally, Wouk (1999) following Sack et al. (1987) argues that *ya/iya* here functions as a question (tag-*ya*), in which it is used to request

for answer, verification, or information by the listener in order to ensure speaker's understanding, or it is used to request agreement with the other speaker. The tag-*ya* here might seem to be requesting listener's recognition for information which might be helpful to understand the utterances that follow. The use of *ya* or *iya* in this case, according to Wouk, does not correspond to *yes*, but rather to the use of question tags in English. See example (9) below:

(9) D: *Waktu nikah umur berapa mba?*  
when marry age how.much older.sister  
'How old were you when you got married?'

T: *Waktu nikah, saya umur dua puluh-dua tahun.*  
when marry I age twenty.two year  
'When I got married, I was 22 years old.'

D: *Iya.*  
yes  
'Yes, I see.'

T: *Tingkat tiga /laugh/*  
level three  
'Third year (at the university).'

D: */se-gede saya dong ya?*  
as-big I PRT yes  
'Then you are as old as I am, aren't you?'

T: *Iya. (laughing)*  
yes  
'Yes.'

(Wouk, 1999: 182)

Wouk (1999) claims that *ya*, which is used by speaker D as a tag marker, has a meaning of requesting for information or verification from speaker T. Here, D's request for information, agreement, or verification is indeed responded by speaker T by saying *iya* 'yes',

which confirms that she already got married when her age was as old as speaker D's age, or when she was in her third year at the university. In other words, speaker D requests for information with a *ya*-tag, to which T responds by using an agreement marker *iya*.

In conclusion, Wouk (1999) postulates that although *ya* is more likely to be used as discourse markers than *iya*, the two cannot be clearly separated in the discourse, since their functions overlap. *Ya/iya* can occur in the initial, internal, and final position depending on what functions they have. The characteristic of *ya/iya*'s position fits one characteristic of DMs proposed by Van Bergen & Degand (2013), saying DMs are flexible because they can appear either turn-initially, turn-medially, or turn-finally. In Indonesian discourse, *ya* and *iya* can be used as a token of agreement. They can be used as information requests or initiatory markers. This function does not hold for English *yes* and Dutch *ja*. It appears to me that the tag-*ya* can be seen as increasing solidarity in the discourse, since it induces cooperation on the part of listener, and increases the perception of degree of shared knowledge between the speaker and the listener.

#### 2.2.2. Fung & Carter (2007)

In their study about spoken English DMs in the classroom interaction, Fung & Carter (2007) argue that DM *yeah* has the same function as DM *yes*, since *yeah* is considered the non-formal form of *yes*. DM *yeah* is known as an interpersonal marker (showing the attitudes of the speaker to the listener). It is frequently used to show responses, such as acknowledgment, or to mark continuation of the current topic. Fung & Carter (2007) identify *yes* and *yeah* as tokens of agreement, acknowledgement, confirmation, and continuation that are primarily used in structural and interpersonal categories. In the structural category, on the one hand, *yeah* and *yes* signal links and transitions between topics, for instance closing topics. DMs *yeah* and *yes* in this category seem to correspond to the textual coherence in Schiffrin (1987). On the other hand, *yes* and *yeah* in the interpersonal category serve to mark continuation, and to mark shared knowledge between speakers (a rather so-called initiatory marker-*ya* in Wouk, 1999).

After observing 49 intermediate-advance learners of English in a secondary school in Hong Kong, Fung & Carter (2007) found that DMs used by participants vary. They are used, for instance, to denote exclamation, engagement, and a sense of victory. Fung & Carter also found that DM *yeah* occurs more frequently than *yes*, suggesting that the non-formal form *yeah* is used more often than the formal one *yes*. This notion has been proposed earlier by Wouk (1999), saying the non-standard *ya* is more uttered than the standard form *iya*. Fung &

Carter (2007) argue that *yes* or *yeah* can be said to “indicate participation and positive listenership”, which makes the communication between the speaker and the listener more interactive (p.420). Consider the following example in which *yeah* is uttered to mark acknowledgment:

(10) S: We can make the very small one and very thick one just for the people choose. That means different size have different price.

C: Yeah

M: Em I think we should manufacture them in China.

C : **Yeah** yeah I think so.

S : **Yeah** I think so.

Cheap labour.

(Fung & Carter, 2007: 432)

In (10) above, the use of *yeah*, which is spoken by both speaker S and speaker C, indicates their agreement with M. Here, *yeah* functions as a token of agreement, indicating an affirmative position of both speaker C and S towards the argument of speaker M in the prior utterance. In other words, *yeah* uttered by speaker C marks his positive response to speaker M, as speaker S agrees with both speaker C and M. Here, speaker S’s affirmative-*yeah* to M’s argument appears to be in line with Fraser’s (1999) notion that DM does not always link S2 to just the immediately prior sentence, but also to the prior sentence which came earlier. Additionally, it seems to suggest, which is not apparently mentioned in Fraser (1999), that DMs *yeah* does not only refer to multiple following sentences, but also to multiple preceeding sentences (e.g. S’s *yeah* to C and M).

Much like Wouk (1999), Fung & Carter (2007) argue that *yeah* can appear either in the turn-initial, medial, or final position. In the turn-initial position, *yeah* is used in responding to the immediately preceding utterance. In the turn-medial use, it is used to emphasize the propositions made in the previous utterance, and in the turn-final position it is uttered to primarily build a solidarity device in marking agreement that a listener would be expected to recognize. This solidarity device, as discussed in Wouk (1999), is established by tag-*ya*. This is also used as a continuation which indicates coherence relations between the previous and the current utterance.

To sum up, Fung & Carter (2007), like Wouk (1999), argue that *yeah* is primarily used to build solidarity between the current utterance and the prior utterance. It is mainly uttered for marking agreement and response to signal coherence between turns.

### 2.2.3 Chapeton (2009)

Chapeton (2009) conducted a study on the uses and functions of DMs in English foreign language (EFL) classroom interaction. She found *yeah* to be one of the most frequently used DMs in the classroom conversation. Paraphrasing Fung & Carter (2007), Chapeton (2009) classifies *yeah* as a non-formal variation of *yes*. Therefore, it is plausible to claim that *yeah* parallels the literal meaning of *ya* in Bahasa Indonesia since *yeah* is the non-formal form of *yes*, just like *ya* driven from the formal word *iya*. Chapeton (2009), following Wouk (1999) and Fung & Carter (2007), argues that *yeah* has the same functions as *yes*, which is mainly used to express cooperation, agreement, confirmation, and response marker. See example (11) below:

- (11) A: You went to visit your family?  
B: *Yes*, to visit, *yes* and no more.  
A: Uh cool, and what about your Ester?  
B: e ..well I sleep a lot.

(Chapeton, 2009: 71)

In (11), speaker A (the teacher) asks speaker B (the student) a question. Here, *yes* occurs twice. The first occurrence of *yes* is uttered by B in order to respond to the question made by A, suggesting that B affirmatively answers speaker A's question. The second occurrence of *yes*, nevertheless, is not likely to be interpreted as a confirmation. It is rather interpreted as a repetition which underlines B's own response. Turn-initial *yes* and turn-medial *yes* in (11) above seem to underpin Fung & Carter's (2007) argument that *yeah* which occurs turn-initially is used to immediately respond to the prior utterance whilst that in the turn-medial position is used to emphasize or underline speaker's own statement.

Slightly different from Fung & Carter (2007), Chapeton rather argues *yes* or *yeah* which occurs turn-medially as a filler marker instead of as an emphasize marker. Here, *yeah* or *yes* is used by a speaker to manage attention, to retain the floor, to organize the flow of the speaker's speech, and mostly to fill the gaps in utterances. However, Fung & Carter (2007)

and Chapeton (2009) all agree that *yes* and *yeah* as filler markers in English can be replaced by fillers *mm*, *um*, or *mhm*, which are slightly different from Indonesian filler markers, *em*, *e-e*, and *he-eh* (cf. Wouk, 1999: 174). In (11), filler-*yes* seems to be used by B to retain the floor before closing his turn, saying *no more*. It seems to me, and I will argue in this study that whether *yes* in English or *ya* in Indonesian, which occurs turn-medially can be regarded as a filler marker or an emphasize marker, should refer to the context because both functions can be expressed by *ya* or *yes* in the conversation.

Chapeton (2009) also provides one example where *yeah* can be used as an interrupter (or also-called a frame marker), in which speaker interrupts the other speaker in order to immediately claim the floor. See example (12) below:

- (12) TT: To your island?  
 S2: yeah.I'm from.. Sardegna.  
 TT: Oh really? Oh I thought you were from the main land, from Italy.  
 S2: ..... **yeah**, no, no. I stayed in my island. It is in the  
 Mediterranean.  
 TT: yeah, I know.

(Chapeton, 2009: 72)

In (12) S2 utters *yeah* to interrupt TT, which suggests that S2 intends to immediately take the floor. Here, the interpretation of *yeah* seems to be overlapping for it has two functions. Not only is it used by S2 to interrupt TT, but *yeah* is also used to express that S2 confirms that TT had a misunderstanding on his nationality. In this case, it is the use of negation *no no* following *yeah* which corrects TT that he comes from Mediterranean, not Italy.

#### 2.2.4 Hoek (2013)

Hoek (2013) conducted research on the interpretation of *ja* 'yes' and *nee* 'no' in Dutch as discourse markers. Especially for *ja*, Hoek argues it has a similar meaning to *yeah* in English, and thus parallel *ya* and *iya* in Indonesian. Much like *yes* discussed in Fung & Carter (2007) and Chapeton (2009), Hoek found that *ja* has numerous functions in discourse, such as to give an affirmative answer to a question, an affirmative reaction to a statement, as continuer, to indicate a topic shift, to conclude a topic, to underline a statement, or to express emotion. *Ja* can also be used to indicate that speaker is thinking about something to say



‘thinking/contemplative-*ja*’ (or called a filler marker in Chapeton’s 2009 analysis). However, unlike *yes* discussed in Chapeton (2009), Hoek claims that *ja* in Dutch can be used as a quotative marker.

Hoek (2013) found that *ja*, which is used for an affirmative reaction to a statement, occurs more often (77 occurrences) in her data than other functions, such as thinking/contemplative *ja* (only 20 occurrences). Much like *ya* in Wouk (1999), *ja* is found to occur more frequently in the sentence-initial position especially when it functions as a responsive marker. Consider one example below in which *ja* is used as a responsive marker to answer a question:

(13) A: *Morgen moet je toch werken zeker?*

tomorrow have.to you PRT work right

‘Tomorrow you have to work, right?’

B: *Ja.*

yeah

‘Yeah.’

(Hoek, 2013: 22)

In (13) speaker B utters *ja* as a response to the question given by speaker A. According to Hoek (2013), the most basic use of *ja* is an affirmative marker in responding to either questions or statements. Finally, Hoek (2013) concludes that *ja* is multifunctional, much like *ya* in Wouk (1999), and *yes* in Chapeton (2009). The usage of *ja* as an answer to a question occurs with lower frequency than *ja* in response to a statement. Her conclusion on *ya* as a multifunctional discourse marker corresponds to one characteristic of DMs proposed in Redeker (1990) and Fraser (1990) above.

### 2.3. Previous literature on *nggak*, *no*, and *nee*

The Indonesian DM *nggak* is a shortened form of *tidak*, which is the equivalent of English *no*. Both *nggak* and *tidak* have the same basic function in Bahasa Indonesia. That is, to express a negation. Since I did not find any studies particularly addressing the Indonesian discourse marker *nggak*, I will discuss some studies which investigated *no* in English and *nee* in Dutch that are considered to be the equivalent of *nggak* in Indonesian.

### 2.3.1. Burrige & Florey (2002)

Burrige & Florey (2002) analyze the functions of *yeah-no* as a discourse marker in Australian English. Here I included the discussion on English *yeah-no* instead of just *no* since the cognate of *yeah-no* can also be found in Indonesian discourse, just like *ja nee* in Dutch (Hoek, 2013). Wouk (1999), for example, has mentioned earlier but not detail, that *ya* can co-occur with particle *nggak* (e.g. *ya nggak*) just like English *yeah-no*. It is used to express a negation, although it seems to me that the co-occurrence of *yak nggak* can also be used to request for confirmation (e.g. *ya nggak?*). The combination of *ya nggak* can be either a token of disagreement or to request for confirmation, depending on the context. Here, it is interesting to see whether the same case can be found in my data.

Burrige & Florey (2002) argue that *yeah-no* as a discourse marker can occur relatively unpredictably in a conversation. It is mainly used to create cohesive discourse. Burrige & Florey (2002) classify three main functions of *yeah-no* in Australian English: 1) propositional *yeah-no*, to indicate both dissent and assent, 2) textual *yeah-no*, to fulfill discourse function, and 3) expressive or personal *yeah-no*, such as hedging and face-saving.

As a propositional marker *yeah-no* links to the propositional component of the utterance. According to Burrige & Florey (2002), the expression of *yeah-no* in this context has grounded a referential meaning. In other words, they relate the uses of *yeah* and *no* as simple interjections. Consider the following example:

- (14) Andrew Urban : It's not a [mansion]  
Judy : [ it's my] palace, or our place.  
Andrew Urban : Yeah?  
Judy : **Yeah, no** it's not a mansion.

(Burrige & Florey, 2002: 155)

*Yeah-no* can also be used in situation to involve potential misunderstanding. That is, where there is general agreement but the response is negative, as in (15) below:

- (15) Melanie: Would you object to that?  
Kylie : **Yeah-nuh.**

(Burrige & Florey, 2002: 157)

Earlier in the discourse Melanie has uttered a statement, in which she asks Kylie's opinion, saying 'would you object to that (statement)?' The intention of Kylie's response *yeah-no* is to show agreement with Melanie, which suggests that 'No, I wouldn't object your statement'. But with the presence of only *no*, there would be a potential misunderstanding as it could suggest disagreement. To reply with *yeah-no* here, according to Burrige & Florey (2002), minimizes the impression of disagreement.

With the reversed ordering of *yeah* and *no*, it can have a meaning of agreement. In this case, *no* reinforces the agreement of *yeah*, as in (16):

- (16) Andrew Urban : And it is right in the middle there; it's not a short film and not a feature.  
Lachlan : **No**, yeah it's just in the middle.  
Andrew Urban : Yeah, so what's the theme? Is there one-liner you can describe the movie to us?

(Burrige & Florey, 2002: 160)

In (16), Lachlan's response conveys agreement with Andrew's comment. Here, *no* relates to the second part while *yeah* relates to the first part. That is, 'no, it is not a short film', and 'yeah I agree with you that it's right in the middle there'. In this sense, the function of *no* is to express agreement (or a positive response). It should be underlined that whether *no* has a positive or negative interpretation truly depends on what question types (positive or negative questions) they refer to. I will elaborate this in more detail in subsection 2.3.4. below.

*Yeah-no* can be used to fulfill the discourse function. That is, to link the discourse. This function, according to Burrige & Florey (2002), appears to be the most usual function of *yeah-no*. It creates the relevance between the turns of conversation, or acknowledges the contribution of the previous speaker. By marking the connection, it thus provides coherence between utterances. This claim is line with Schiffrin's (1987) 'coherence model' mentioned earlier. See example (17) below:

- (17) Kylie : Have you ever met Jenny Cheshire?  
Sally : I know her work. **Yes, no**, I have never met her.

(Burrige & Florey, 2002: 160)

Sally's first comment "I know her work" does not straightly answer Kylie's question. By uttering *yes* combined with *no* afterwards, it indicates a topic shift in which she comes to her answer after speculating a bit, by saying "Yes, no I have never met her". Here, *yes-no* establishes the coherence between Sally's previous and the following sentence.

*Yeah-no* as a personal marker can also be used to convey personal attitudes and feelings of the speaker. In this case, *yeah-no* is used to express apologies, compliments, and refusals. Consider how *yeah-no* is used to respond to someone who apologizes, as in (18):

- (18) James : Sorry! I wimped out.  
Kylie : ***Yeah-no***, that's fine.

(Burrige & Florey, 2002: 164)

In (18) James apologizes to Kylie for having missed their early morning run. The response of Kylie "Yeah-no, that's fine" indicates that she forgives James. In accordance with Burrige & Florey (2002), Kylie accepts the apology in order to save the face of James. In this case, *yeah* indicates that Kylie indeed feels inconvenience, but she does not want to create a face-threatening condition with James, and therefore she forgives him, by saying "no, that's fine." *Yeah-no* can also be used to express weak or hedged disagreement. In the context of disagreement, *yeah-no* is straightforward. Since the speaker does not want to seem to contradict and create a hurtful situation, he tries minimizing the effects by making a positive evaluation first, and then following it with a negative one. Here, Burrige & Florey (2002) claims that *yeah-no* functions to reduce the force of disagreement.

When looking at *yes-no* in (17) and *yeah-no* in (18) respectively, it seems to raise an issue with analyzing *yeah-no* as a single unit, since it doesn't really have a single-unit function, but rather a combined function. That is, it creates the relevance between the sentences, while at the same time it agrees or disagrees with the contribution of the previous speaker. This concern is also acknowledged by Burrige & Florey (2002), saying *yeah-no* can be used in a number of distinct functions simultaneously. Lee-Goldman (2010) proposes that it might be less confusing, and may be more productive to analyse *yeah-no* not as a single unit, but rather as a combination of *yeah* and *no*. In this thesis, following Hoek (2013), when analyzing *yeah-no* as a combination of *yeah* and *no*, it appears to contain merely a simple *yeah*, or a so-called answer-*yes*, agreement-*yes*, reaction-*yes*, or filler marker-*yes* in Fung & Carter (2007) & Chapeton (2009), or a responsive marker-*ya* in Wouk (1999). Much like Lee-Goldman (2010) below, *no* in Burrige & Florey (2002) can functions as topic shift-

*no* (such as in example 17 above), turn-taking-*no*, and misunderstanding-*no*. In Dutch, Hoek (2013) recognizes some similarities between *ja-nee* and *yeah-no* in English, for example, *ja-nee* can have two different functions simultaneously.

### 2.3.2. Lee-Goldman (2010)

Lee-Goldman (2010) investigates English *no*. He argues that not all *no* which is used in discourse can automatically be regarded as a discourse marker, since *no* can function as an independent word which has its own meaning of negation. In this thesis, just like the case of *so* discussed earlier in Heeman et al. (1998), I argue that the independent word-*no* can function as a discourse marker as it establishes the coherence relations between utterances, or because it can link between S1 and S2 (Fraser, 1999). Lee-Goldman (2010) attempts to propose a more coherence and complete analysis of *no* in English. He proposes three main discourse functions of *no*, which are: 1) topic shift, 2) misunderstanding management, and 3) turn-taking conflict resolution.

DM *no* functions as a marker of topic shift. It is used by the speaker to indicate a shift back to an earlier topic, or it makes a transition from a serious talk to a non-serious talk (i.e. joking) or the other way around. Consider the following example:

- (19) A: Hhh. Damn this headset!  
      hhh. When you this uh, eh  
      B: (laugh)  
      C: (laugh)  
          Metacomment (laugh)  
      A: Yeah.  
      B: (laugh)  
      A: That's all recorded. (laugh) um  
      C: Damn this project. *No* just kidding. (laugh)

(Lee-Goldman, 2010:8)

In (19), DM *no* uttered by speaker C indicates the transition from a joke to a serious talk. After speaker A states that “that’s all recorded”, speaker C immediately responds, by saying “damn this project”, after which he says “*no* just kidding”. In other words, the utterance of “no just kidding” implies that the utterance “damn this project” is just a joke. Lee-Goldman (2010) argues that the utterance after “no just kidding” will be assumed to be a

serious talk again. Joke-to-serious *no* in this case indicates a shift back to an earlier topic after the conversation has temporarily trailed off on a joking path.

*No* can also be used to express disagreement and misunderstanding. This type of *no* is used when a speaker wants to clarify some point made by the other speaker in the prior utterance. Hoek (2013: 17), following Lee-Goldman, discusses that “misunderstanding in conversation can be addressed and repaired by people other than the original speaker on the basis of whose turn the misunderstanding has arisen.” The speaker’s misunderstanding here is not corrected by the speaker himself, but rather by the other speaker in the next turn. In this case, Lee-Goldman seems to suggest that misunderstanding-*no* indeed rejects something, or disagrees with the contribution made by the other speaker on the basis of preceding discourse. It seems to me that *no* in this context has an overlapping function. That is, to correct the other speaker’s misunderstanding while to disagree with him simulatenously.

Finally, Lee-Goldman discusses *no* as a turn-taking conflict resolution. It is a situation in which two speakers produce speech simultaneously (or also called an overlapping speech), after which they negotiate who can grab the floor. According to Lee-Goldman, one speaker here will let the other to have the floor either by saying “no go ahead” after the other speaker has said “go ahead”, or by uttering “no go ahead” immediately after the overlapping speech happened. See the following example:

- (20) A: And then it’s up for us to decide what to do with it.  
B: Ok.  
A: [So]  
B: [So]  
    **No**, go ahead.  
A: So, we may think if you say um hhh where is the theater.

(Lee-Goldman, 2010:9)

Example (20) above illustrates a situation in which speaker A and speaker B talk simultaneously, indicated by the brackets [ ]. Before speaker A has finished his utterance, speaker B starts talking. When speaker B realizes that speaker A still has something more to say, he says “no, go ahead”. *No* here is used to encourage speaker A to take the floor again.

After establishing three main discourse functions of *no*, Lee-Goldman correlates the main functions of *no* to other uses of *no*, for instance disbelief, answer, and imperative. Much like what has been proposed earlier by Schiffrin (1987) and Fraser (1999), Lee-Goldman

generally argues that *no* as a discourse marker links the current utterance to the preceding utterance (and sometimes to the following one). He claims that *no* has a basic function of negation, like Dutch *nee* in Hoek (2013) below. However, it should be noted that what *no* negates in the discourse is dependent on its function. That is, either it negates a statement or a question straightforwardly, or indicates the topic shift-*no* (also discussed in Burrige & Florey, 2002). Although Lee-Goldman claims that all uses of *no* have a meaning of negation (which is identical to a negative interpretation), it seems to me that negation-*no* can convey a positive interpretation, depending on what question or statement it refers to. To arrive at the intended interpretation on what *no* negates and refers to, it is always important to see what information supplements it from the surrounding utterances. Finally, Lee-Goldman concludes that it is not common for all uses of *no* mentioned above to mark the entire turn (or occurs in isolation) because it can be supplemented by the surrounding utterances.

### 2.3.3. Goodhue & Wagner (2015)

In their study about the interpretation of *yes* and *no*, Goodhue & Wagner (2015) briefly discuss polar marker *yes* and *no*. They define it as propositional discourse referent since the meaning of *yes* and *no* can be understood from their referents. Just like Lee-Goldman (2010) and Krifka (2013), Goodhue & Wagner argue that a simple *no* in response to a positive statement or question will be most naturally interpreted as a negative response. Here, its meaning is straightforward, i.e. a negation. In response to a negative *yes-no* question (e.g. are you not a friend of Jenny's?), however, polar marker-*no* seems to be interchangeable since the interpretation can be either positive or negative. Much like Hoek (2013) who says that an affirmative response to a question containing a negation can be done by giving a reaction containing a negation as well, Goodhue & Wagner (2015) argue that the answer *no* to a negative question will be interpreted positive. However, it appears to me that Goodhue & Wagner's (2015) argument at this point remains unclear. It is because of the fact that *no* in responding to a negative question can be still interpreted negative, especially when *no* occurs alone. Therefore, *no* can be ambiguous. Consider the following example:

- (21) A: You are not a friend of Jenny's.  
B: **No**. I am a friend of Jenny's.

(Goodhue & Wagner, 2015:3)

Since the previous utterance is a negative statement, the interpretation of *no* in speaker B would be positive (a so-called ‘positive disagreeing’ in Hoek’s 2103 analysis), meaning: “no, I am a friend of Jenny’s”. But, it can also be agreeing (e.g. no, that’s true that I am not a friend of Jenny’s). It seems to me that the correct interpretation of *no* here would not be enough by only looking at the preceding statement. In other words, to properly interpret *yes-no* polar questions, not only is preceding information important to take into account but also the following utterance.

Finally, Goodhue & Wagner (2015) agree that the only way to unambiguously interpret a negatively framed utterance *no* is to refer to what information precedes or follows it.

#### 2.3.4. Tian & Ginzburg (2016)

Tian & Ginzburg (2016) investigated *no* in English. They found that English *no* can have several interpretations: 1) to confirm a negation, 2) to disconfirm a positive polar question, 3) to disconfirm a negative assertion, and 4) to address misinterpretation. Much identical to Hoek (2013) and Lee-Goldman (2010), they argue that *no* in responding to a positive polar question is basically intended to show a negation. Here, *no* conveys its basic meaning. Take a look at the given example (22) below:

- (22) A: Do you like chocolate?  
B: **No**, I don’t.

(Tian & Ginzburg, 2016: 1)

In (22) the question of A to B is a positive question, to which speaker B answers, by saying *no*. The marker *no* indicates that B dislikes chocolate. In accordance with Goodhue & Wagner (2015) above, the answer-*no* here is clear, to express a negation. Additionally, Tian & Ginzburg (2016) argue that *no* is possible to express a negation in response to a negative question, as in (23) below:

- (23) A: Don’t you like chocolate?  
B: **No**, I don’t.

(Tian & Ginzburg, 2016: 1)

Although both negation-*nos* in (21) and (23) refer to a negative statement and question respectively, they differ in interpretation. *No* in earlier (21) indicates disagreement



while that in (23) indicates agreement. In this case, B affirmatively answers A's question that he doesn't like chocolate. Like Goodhue & Wagner (2015), *no* in (23) is in line with Hoek's (2013) established paradigm in 2.3.5 below that a negative utterance *nee* in response to a negative question yields an agreeing response. Also, example (23) above seems to support my previous claim that both preceding and following utterances determine the exact interpretation of *no*.

Following Roelofsen & Farkas (2014), Tian & Ginzburg (2016) discuss the *absolute* and the *relative* use of *no*. Whilst the absolute notion refers to a clause of a negative or positive response, the relative one refers to a response of disagreeing or agreeing with the prior utterance. Tian & Ginzburg argue that, when *no* is used to answer a negative polar question, the absolute feature confirms the negative proposition, like the answer "no, I don't". The relative feature, by contrast, can reject the negative proposition, as in the answer "no, I do". Similar to Hoek (2013) and Goodhue & Wagner (2015), they argue that *no* here, in response to a negative polar question, can convey either an agreeing or disagreeing meaning depending on the surrounding utterances. Consider example (24):

(24) A: You don't use any credit cards. I don't imagine.

B: **No**, of course I use them.

(Tian & Ginzburg, 2016: 1)

Just like example (21) above, but unlike (23), the interpretation of *no* in (24) will be vague without referring to the following utterance, whether it expresses an agreeing or disagreeing response. The intention of *no* in speaker B suggests disagreement "no, I have credit cards and I use them". Unlike Dutch *jawel* which straightforwardly and consistently expresses 'positive disagreement' (Hoek, 2013), English *no* here is tricky, and that's way it is rather ambiguous.

Although *no* conveys a basic meaning of negation, Tian & Ginzburg (2016) provide an example of *no* which can be used to express agreement with the previous utterance, as in (25):

(25) A: I think they should also respect the sanctity of the American home, whether it be in a house or in an apartment.

B: Yeah, yeah, **no**, I agree with you there.

(Tian & Ginzburg, 2016 :1)

Although both *nos* in (24) and (25) are similarly followed by positive utterances, *no* in (24) responds to a negative statement while *no* here reacts to a positive statement. *No* in (25) is considered to be less ambiguous compared to that in (24). In this case, B's *no* indicates an agreeing response with A. This suggests, regarding the combination of *yeah no* here, that it appears to contrast with *yeah-no* in Burrige & Florey (2002) above, saying *yeah-no* can minimize the impression of disagreement. In fact, *yeah-no* in (25) appears not to have any impression of disagreement.

Lastly, Tian & Ginzburg (2016) argue that *no* can be used as an interjection to address an event, or to express the speaker's attitude. For instance, when a child is about to touch the socket, then an adult says "No!" to him. Corresponding to Burrige & Florey (2002), *no* here appears to express the adult's personal marker (or attitude) of prohibiting the child to touch the socket.

Finally, just like Goodhue & Wagner (2015), Tian & Ginzburg (2016) propose that it is important to refer to what information precedes *no* in order to arrive at a proper interpretation in the sentence.

### 2.3.5. Hoek (2013)

Hoek (2013) investigates the interpretation of *nee* 'no' in Dutch. She found that *nee* in Dutch has several functions, such as to show negative answer to a closed question or to a statement, as preface to self-correct, to return to a topic, to express emotion. Additionally, Hoek states that *nee* can underline speaker's own statement. This function has not been mentioned by Tian & Ginzburg (2006). Just like English *no* discussed in Goodhue & Wagner (2015) and Tian & Ginzburg (2016), *nee* can express an affirmative answer to a question and a statement which contain a negation, although it still has a basic function of negation or disagreement, much like the equivalent *no* in many other languages. In (26) *nee* is used to negate a question:

(26) A: *Moestie ook war- moestie ook op een warm plekje liggen of*  
 did.he.have.to also did.he.have.to also on a warm spot lie or  
*niet?*  
 not

'Did he also have to lie in a warm spot?'

B: *Nee maar hij.hh hij ligt helema- ja hij ligt nu wel maar hij wilde*  
 no but he he lies yeah he lies now PRT but he wanted  
  
*ook direct al weer lopen.*  
 also immediately already again walk

‘No, he is lying down now, but immediately afterwards he wanted to walk again.’

(Hoek, 2013: 35)

In (26), Hoek (2013) argues that the functions of *nee* uttered by speaker B are for negation, dissent, denial, and refusal. It is used to answer a closed question in which speaker B supplements *nee*, by saying “that her dog did not have to lie down at all”.

Hoek (2013) provides further explanation by establishing the ‘agreement-disagreement answering’ system. She briefly discusses that Dutch, unlike other languages such as German, English, or French, has a special phrase “*jawel*” to express ‘positive disagreement’ (disagreeing with a negative to arrive at a positive interpretation). The agreeing response to a negative utterance is still negative (*nee*), but the disagreeing response is no longer a simple positive (*ja*). According to her, the most appropriate answer to a negative utterance in Dutch is not *ja*, but rather *jawel*: *ja* means *yes* and *wel* means a denial (Hoogeweg, 2009 as cited in Hoek, 2013: 40). One of her most important contributions is that she establishes a working paradigm, as below:

Positive utterance – agreeing response: *ja*  
 Positive utterance – disagreeing response: *nee*  
 Negative utterance- agreeing response: *nee*  
 Negative utterance- disagreeing response: *jawel*

(Hoek, 2013: 41)

As I have mentioned that *nee* can convey an affirmative answer when it is used to respond to a question containing a negation, such as in (27) below:

(27) A: *Oh heb je dan al geen zon meer?*  
 oh have you then already no sun anymore  
 ‘Oh is there already no more sun?’

B: *Nee*.

no

‘Yeah.no.’

(Hoek, 2013: 42)

Hoek (2013) argues that *nee*, as an affirmative answer to a leading question, is used when the question suggests an answer which is actually expected by the person asking the question. In (27), speaker A asks speaker B if there is no more sun in the back yard of speaker B. Speaker B then answers, by saying *nee* to indicate that indeed there is no more sun. *Nee* here does not deny or refuse anything, but rather affirms speaker A’s assumption that there is no more sun. In accordance with Hoek’s (2013) established paradigm above, *nee* in this case indicates that speaker B agrees with A’s negative utterance.

#### 2.4. *Ya* and *nggak* as discourse markers

In the literature discussed above, *yes* and *no* can be said to have multifunctions in the discourse. That’s way, *yes* and *no* are mostly considered to be discourse markers. However, *yes* and *no*, according to Lee-Goldman (2010), cannot be considered discourse markers when they are used to negate or reject a prior question, since both *yes* and *no* operate mainly on the propositional level. Another reason Lee-Goldman (2010) does not classify *yes* and *no* as DMs is that they carry too much lexical content, just like the case of *so* discussed in Heeman et al. (1998). They have an independent meaning, and they can even occur in isolation without being a part of a full utterance.

In this thesis, in accordance with the characteristics of discourse markers proposed in Fraser’s (1999) ‘grammatical-pragmatic approach’ and Schiffrin’s (1987)’s ‘coherence model’ in section 2.1 above, I argue that *ya* and *nggak*, just like *yes* and *no* in English and *ja* and *nee* in Dutch, are classified as discourse markers since their functions can be both textual and pragmatic coherence. They link between S1 and S2 or between utterances, they provide information on how to interpret the utterance which contains discourse markers in relation to the previous discourse, they do not change the propositional value of an utterance, and they can either precede or follow the sentence they are adjoined to. Another reason which makes *yes* and *no* fairly enough to be categorized as DMs is that they are multifunctional. Here, *yes* and *no* represent one core function, but they can have special functions depending on the

context of their appearance, as I have elaborated in section 2.2 and 2.3. Finally, following Dutch *ja* and *nee* in Hoek (2013), Indonesian *ya* and *nggak* adjoined in a full sentence will be considered DMs in this thesis as long as they correlate the meaning between utterances, or they establish coherence relations between utterances. In chapter 3, the core meaning of the discourse marker uses of *ya* and *nggak* is the same as that of non-discourse ones, that is to express agreement and disagreement respectively. The variation in the interpretation of *ya* and *nggak* is primarily caused by what *ya* and *nggak* exactly respond to.

## 2.5. Conclusion

The discussion on discourse markers and a working definition of ‘discourse markers’ have been presented in this chapter. It has summarized the existing literature on *yes* and *no* in English, *ja* and *nee* in Dutch, and one study of *ya* in Bahasa Indonesia. This chapter briefly explains why *yes* and *no*, *ja* and *nee*, and *ya* and *nggak* can be classified as DMs. It includes some discussion on various functions which can be represented by *yes* and *no* in English, *ja* and *nee* in Dutch, and *ya* in Indonesian. Since *yes* and *no* in English, just like *ja* and *nee* in Dutch, have the same basic meaning of agreement and disagreement respectively but they can also have other functions, will it be the case for *ya* and *nggak* in Bahasa Indonesia? Even though Wouk’s studies (1999) on *ya* showed this possibility, are there any other functions of *ya* which have not been investigated yet? And how about *nggak*? Can it also have other functions? These questions are interesting to see because I assume that *ya* and *nggak* as discourse markers, just like *ja* and *nee* and *yes* and *no*, can have various functions in the discourse beyond their basic meaning. The next chapter will investigate these questions, by presenting and analyzing the data in eight YouTube videos, and then establishing a categorization of the uses of *ya* and *nggak* respectively in the data.

### 3. *Ya* in Indonesian

This chapter presents information about how the data was collected, analyzed, and described in this study. Section 3.1 presents the research methodology, followed by an overview of the uses of *ya* in section 3.2. Section 3.3 will present the conclusion of this chapter.

#### 3.1. Methodology

All of the data for this study was taken from eight YouTube videos (see appendix 1). The videos mostly contained political debates on TV talk shows. The use of videos as a source of data is increasingly common with videos which are already established rather than videos made by a researcher himself (Jewitt, 2012). Some videos which can be used for research data are, for instance, broadcast media, home-made domestic videos, automated CCTV recordings (Goodwin, 1994), and YouTube videos (Adami, 2010). According to Jewitt (2012), using videos offers some advantages for researchers since they can be rewatched for later analysis. However, there are a few issues such as they are taking much time to watch and review.

As I have previously mentioned, videos for this study were downloaded from YouTube. YouTube consists of a wide number of materials which are uploaded by individuals or media corporations ([en.wikipedia.org/wiki/YouTube](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/YouTube)). Burgess & Green (2009) argue that YouTube is used as a broadcast medium, an archive, a platform, a system of circulation, an advertising medium, and a distribution system for amateurs, for music sharing, for video-logging tool, for mash-ups, for sharing funny videos, etc. Using YouTube enabled me to find relevant videos which contained debatable topics that I used in this study.

Most of the videos which I observed for this study were about political debates and controversial issues. The main reason for choosing these topics was that I expected to find more uses of both *ya* and *nggak* representing their basic meaning of agreement and disagreement rather than in other subjects of discussion. I expected speakers to frequently express both agreement and disagreement when talking about or reacting to controversial topics, rather than in other topics. In these videos I also expected to find functions of *ya* and *nggak* beyond their basic meanings.

Since speakers were able to be observed on the videos, their conversations included visual cues, such as eye contact, facial expression, hand movement, eye gaze, and other

gestural behaviors. These non-verbal cues were all very informative to take into account in order to arrive at the intended interpretation of *ya* and *nggak*. Meadow (2000) poses that to accurately characterize what people convey, it is often essential to look beyond what they utter, that is, their gestures. Gesture is believed to reveal more information to the listener about the intention of the speaker.

In the process of categorizing and counting the occurrences, I listened to the videos very carefully using headphones. Sometimes I watched them several times to ensure my analysis was correct because some functions of *nggak*, for instance, to express self-defense and self-correct were very similar to each other, and sometimes difficult to distinguish. Hence, to ensure I have arrived at the intended interpretation, I had to pay close attention to what information preceded and followed it. The gestures of the speakers were also helpful to take into account, since gestures provided me additional information on the intended meanings of *ya* and *nggak* in the utterance. For example, the speakers' facial gestures when uttering *nggak* to express their emotion, or when they simultaneously shook their head while saying *nggak* to express disagreement. The same observation was also applied when analyzing *ya*.

For this study eight videos were analyzed. The duration of each video, on average, was 30- 90 minutes. In these eight videos, I found 498 occurrences of *ya* in total, but only 136 occurrences of *nggak*. This significant difference between *ya* and *nggak* is in line with the frequency distribution between the uses *ja* 'yes' and *nee* 'no' in Dutch. Hoek (2013), after analyzing a 500-minute phone dialogue, found that the number of times that *ja* was uttered was significantly higher than *nee*. This seems to suggest that the speakers, both in Indonesian and Dutch, tend to use more positive markers than negative ones. For an overview, the total distribution of *ja* and *nee* (cited from Hoek, 2013: 20), and *ya* and *nggak* in my data is given in table 2 below:

Number of hints (Dutch)	<b><i>Ja</i></b>	<b><i>Nee</i></b>
	6257 (85, 20 %)	1087 (14,80 %)
Number of hints (Indonesian)	<b><i>Ya</i></b>	<b><i>Nggak</i></b>
	498 (78, 54 %)	136 (21,46 %)

Table 2. The number of times *ja* and *nee* in Dutch (cited from Hoek, 2013) compared with the uses of *ya* and *nggak* in Indonesian.

In the data, all occurrences of *ya* and *nggak* were noted, together with the speech topics, the time code of appearance, and the video links (see appendix 3 for *ya* and 4 for *nggak* respectively). Each utterance of *ya* and *nggak* was closely examined and analyzed, and then categorized according to their different uses. This was initially done on the basis of analyzing the data itself. After the occurrences *ya* were categorized, they were compared with the uses of *yes* in English and *ja* in Dutch, which I have discussed in chapter 2 above. The same process was done for *nggak* which I will explain later in chapter 4. The following section 3.2 presents the established categories and the discussion of *ya* in the data.

### 3.2. *Ya* in Indonesian

All occurrences of *ya* in the data were analyzed and categorized according to their different interpretation. Although Lee-Goldman (2010) claims that *yes* (the equivalent of *ya*) cannot be classified as DM when it stands alone, all occurrences of *ya* in this study which established coherence relations between utterances will be regarded as DMs. An overview of the established categories and the number of occurrences of each type of *ya* in the data is presented in table 3 below.

Uses of <i>ya</i>	Number of occurrences
To emphasize or underline own statement	113 (22,70 %)
Continuer	112 (22,48 %)
To express delay or as a filler marker	111 (22, 29 %)
To express affirmative reaction to a statement	57 (11, 46 %)
To show responses	33 (6, 62 %)
To interrupt	23 (4, 61 %)
To question or offer a turn	19 (3, 83 %)
To express affirmative reaction to a question	15 (3, 01 %)
To comply with request	11 (2, 20 %)
To express emotion	4 (0, 80 %)
<b>Total</b>	498

Table 3. The uses of *ya* and the number of occurrences of each use in the data.

### 3.3. The uses of *ya* ‘yes’

After establishing the categories, few instances of *ya* from each category are discussed and compared with *yes* in English, and *ja* in Dutch.



### 3.3.1. To express an affirmative reaction to a question

Much like *yes* and *ja* in English and Dutch respectively, the most basic use of *iya/ya* is to express agreement, either in response to a statement or a question. Additionally, *ya* can be used as an affirmative answer either for a closed or leading question (or a so-called polar question in Tian & Ginzburg's 2016 analysis). A closed question is where the questioner does not know the answer. It usually receives a straightforward answer from the respondent. A leading question, by contrast, tries to lead the respondent to the questioner's way of thinking. Here, the questioner already knows the answer and just asks for conformation of it. In examples (28) and (29), respectively, *iya* is uttered to express an affirmative answer in response to a closed question:

(28) Ahok: *Jadi busway-nya 2014 mulai-nya?*  
so busway-it 2014 begin-it  
'So, did the busway begin to operate in 2014?'

Fauzi: *Iya, ta tahu yang bikin-kan saya ama pak Zuke bukan ente.*  
yes I know which make-right I with sir Zuke not you  
'Yes, I know! since the ones who did it were me and mr Zuke not you.'

In (28), Ahok asks Fauzi a question to which Fauzi responds with an affirmative marker *iya*. It suggests that Fauzi affirmatively answers Ahok's question that the busway's operation indeed started in 2014. Another example of *ya* used as an affirmative answer to a closed question is given in (29) below:

(29) A : *Jessica tidak pernah beranjak-kan kecuali mengambil air minum?*  
Jessica not ever move-right except take water drink  
'Jessica never moved to another seat except when she took mineral water, right?'

B : *Ya.*  
yes  
'Yes, she never moved.'

A : *Itu kan cerita yang kita dapat dari fakta persidangan?*  
that right story which we get from fact court  
'That is the fact we got from the court, didn't we?'

B : *Iya ya.*

yes yeah

‘Yes, sure.’

In (29) there is a debate between two lawyers on a TV show. Jessica, the client of speaker A (lawyer), is the defendant who has been accused of having murdered her victim by putting poison called cyanide into her victim’s mineral water. In (28) and (29), there are only two possible answers, either affirmative *ya/iya* for agreement or negative *nggak* for disagreement. Here, *ya* in B’s response to the first question indicates his affirmative response to A’s question. In responding to the second question, speaker B repeats *iya ya*, which suggests that he indeed affirms (or agrees with) A’s follow-up question. Much like the repeated *jaaa ja* in Dutch (Hoek, 2013), when Indonesian *ya* is repeated such as the one above, it often has a special interpretation. Here, repeated *iya-ya* receives an interpretation along the line of “yeah sure” in English (strong agreement). It should be underlined, however, that not all repeated *iya-ya*, just like Dutch *ja-ja*, constitutes a complex discourse marker. In other cases, following Hoek (2013), Indonesian repeated *yas* are intonationally neutral and can be treated as a single *ya*.

In addition to answering a closed question, *ya* can be uttered to answer a leading question, as in (30) below:

(30) A: *Di peraturan itu kan sudah jelas, larangan berpacaran di bawah 17 tahun, iya kan?*  
in rule      the right have clear ban      courtship      in below 17 year      yes right  
‘As mentioned in the rule, it has been clear about the ban of courtship under 17 years old, right?’

B: *Ya.*

yes

‘Yes.’

In the data, the uses of *ya* as an affirmative reaction to a question occurred less frequently (15 occurrences) than those of *ya* in response to a statement (57 occurrences) which I will discuss in more detail in subsection 3.3.2 below. This distribution goes in line with the uses of *ja* in Dutch, where *ja* used in response to a question occurs with a lower frequency than *ja* in response to a statement (Hoek, 2013: 22). It seems to suggest that

Indonesian *ya* and Dutch *ja* are mostly used in affirmatively responding to a statement. Here, speakers in both languages, just like in other languages, deal with more statements than questions in their interaction.

### 3.3.2. To express an affirmative reaction to a statement

*Ya* or *iya* can be used to express agreement, or to confirm a statement uttered by the previous speakers. See examples (31), (32), and (33) below:

- (31) Tamrin: *Judul-nya itu kan sebenarnya pembentukan penegakan*  
theme-GEN that PART actually formulation maintenance  
*pengokohan desa berbudaya.*  
strong village culture

‘Its theme is actually about formulating and supporting cultural village.’

Dedi: ***Iya!***  
yes  
‘Yes, that’s right!’

- (32) Hotman : *Ketting bewijs artinya adalah kejadian berantai yang di-saksikan*  
ketting bewijs mean is case chain which PASS-witness  
*saksi fakta.*  
witness fact

‘Ketting bewijs refers to some continual cases which are witnessed by someone who knows the facts.’

Jaya : ***Ya.***  
yes  
‘Yes.’

- (33) A: *Kalau-lah kita bicara kekerasan, siapapun, dimanapun, dengan*  
if-PART we talk violence whoever whenever with

*cara apapun, itu tidak di-benarkan.*

way whatever that not PASS-right

‘If we talk about violence, it should be noted that whoever, whenever, and no matter the way, it is never allowed.’

B: *Ya.*

yes

‘Yes, I agree.’

In (31), (32), and (33) respectively, the uses of *iya/ya* as agreement with the previous statement make up the entire turn since they appear in isolation. However, this is not always the case, since *ya* can be modified, for instance, by supplementing additional information in order to create a stronger sense of agreement. See examples (34) and (35):

(34) Herman : *Soal waktu, ya benar yang di-bilang Hotman.*

matter time yes right which PASS-say Hotman

‘This is only a matter of time, yes as Hotman has correctly said.’

Hotman: *Ya, benar.*

yes right

‘Yes, that’s right.’

(35) Pauzi: *Iya ta tahu yang bikin kan saya ama pak Zuke, bukan ente.*

yeah I know which make right I with mr. Zuke not you

‘Yes I know! since the ones who did it were mr. Zuke and me, not you.’

Ahok: *Iya ya makanya.*

yes yes therefore

‘Yes, sure as I just said.’

*Yas* in both (34) and (35) above are modified in order to express a stronger meaning. By adding *benar* ‘that’s right’ after *ya* in (34), Hotman enforces his affirmative reaction, a reaction which is less strong if *ya* just stands alone. The modification of *ya* can also be done by simply repeating it twice or even more, and then supplementing it by a further utterance *makanya* such as in (35) above. Unlike the repetition of *iya-ya* in (29) which is not

supplemented, that in (35) is supplemented by a short utterance *makanya* ‘as I just said’ which creates even much stronger agreement. Both repeated *iya-ya* in (29) and (35), however, receive the same complex discourse marker for they get a special interpretation of strong agreement “yeah/yes sure”.

### 3.3.3. To comply with a request

Wouk (1999) argues there is one function of *ya* which is used to comply with a request. Some uses of *ya* within this function are found in the data, as in examples (36) and (37) below:

(36) A: *Silahkan di-tanggapi bapak Basuki!*  
please PASS-respond sir Basuki  
‘Mr Basuki, it’s time for you to respond, please!’

B: *Ya, kita bicara transportasi.*  
yes we speak transportation  
‘Yes, let’s talk about transportation.’

(37) A: *Pak Nachrowi dulu tanya jawab dulu dengan pak Nachrowi 3 menit!*  
sir Nachrowi first ask answer first with sir Nachrowi 3 minute  
‘You have now 3 minutes to ask Mr. Nachrowi a question!’

B: *Iya, untuk pak Nachrowi saya ingin koreksi.*  
yes for sir Nachrowi I want criticize  
‘Yes, I want to criticize Mr Nachrowi.’

In (36) speaker A requests speaker B to give his comment to the previous speaker. To comply with this request, speaker B utters *ya* at the beginning of his statement, which implies that speaker B accepts to say something about his opponent’s utterance. The same case can be seen in (37), where *iya* is used by B to comply with A’s request. Here, *iya* suggests that speaker B will ask Mr. Nachrowi a question, based on the request made by speaker A in the prior utterance.

The function of *ya* and *iya* to comply with a request is categorized as a responsive function. It establishes the sequence structure between the speaker and the listener. The responsive function derives directly from the basic meaning of *iya* and *ya*, which is used to express acceptance of the previous utterance, or to express agreement with other speakers.

These functions also hold for *yes* in English and *ja* in Dutch. Although both *ya* and *iya* can be used to comply with a request, Wouk (1999) claims that *ya* is used less often than *iya*.

Wouk (1999) argues that a sequence of an adjacency pair consists of a first pair part (FPP) and a second pair part (SPP). The FPP sets up certain expectations for a particular kind of responses while the SPP fulfills those expectations. *Ya* and *iya* in (36) and (37), respectively, are categorized as the SPP. They fulfill the expectation or the request made in the previous utterance. *Ya/iya* in this function mostly occurs turn-initially, and they are mostly supplemented by some relevant information on the basis of that request.

#### 3.3.4. Continuer

Much like English *yes* (Fung & Carter, 2007), Indonesian *ya* or *iya* can function as a token of continuer. It is used when one speaker gives sort of minimal feedback that cedes the floor to another speaker engaged in the on-going talk. In this case, the listener intends to indicate that he is still listening to, cooperating with, and paying attention to the other speaker. It marks that the speaker understands and follows what is being said by the other speaker. Consider example examples (38) and (39):

(38) A: *Nah di kampung saya,*  
PRT in village my.GEN  
'In my village,'

B: ***Iya.***  
yes  
'Yes.'

A: *Di kampung saya kalau di-cek di Bangka Belitung,*  
in village I if PASS-check in Bangka Belitung  
*Ahok ini di-anggap pahlawan.*  
Ahok this PASS-consider hero.

'In my village, if you check by yourself in Bangka Belitung, Ahok is considered a hero.'

B: *Oh...*

PRT

‘Oh...like that’

- (39) A: *Pas di nasional-nya tidak ada pemain yang baik,*  
once in national-GEN not there player who excellent  
‘Once there are no excellent players in its national level,’

B: *Ya.*

yes

‘Yes.’

A: *Mau tidak mau klub bola-nya cari pindahan dari kampung.*

will not will club football-the look.for hero from village

‘The football club then has to look for some excellent players from villages.’

Speaker B in (38) and (39), respectively, utter *iya* and *ya* to indicate they are following or paying attention to what their interlocutors are saying. *Ya* and *iya* here mostly make up the entire turn. They are considered a responsive function which typically occurs at the beginning of the turn, very close to the utterance prompting them (Wouk, 1999). They correspond to *yes* or *yeah* in English (Fung & Carter, 2007), which are used to indicate participation and positive listenership in order to establish more interactive communication between the speaker and the listener. Just like continuer-*yes* in English (Drummond and Hopper, 1993 as cited in Hoek, 2013) *ya/iya* can be used to encourage the other speaker to continue talking.

Although there does not seem to be a word which can be used to encourage someone to keep talking which, at the same times, also expresses disagreement, the uses of continuer-*ya* in (38) and (39) could not be simply interpreted either as a cue of agreement or acknowledgement, since *ya* in this function can express both, one of them, or even none of them. Whether or not the interlocutors agree with what the other speaker is just saying, according to Hoek (2013), will most likely become obvious when they hold the turn themselves. Much like *ja* in Dutch (Hoek, 2013), continuer-*ya* in both examples above should be regarded to predominantly acknowledge the on-going turn.

Wouk (1999) claims that determining which tokens of *ya/iya* function to express agreement and which function as continuers is sometimes confusing, especially for isolated

tokens constituting full turns. Some tokens intended for agreement can be treated as continuers, while some intended for continuers can be treated as agreement. Therefore, its meaning, either as agreement or continuer, is “largely based on the information status of the previous utterance (or partially previous, partially terminally overlapping) turn” (Wouk, 1999: 174). Wouk (1999) argues that if it is the privileged information of speaker about which the listener has no independent knowledge, the token can be categorized as a continuer, whether or not the previous speaker chooses to continue.

Identical to Dutch (Hoek, 2013) and English (Wouk, 1999), *continuer-ya* can be easily replaced by non-verbal communication, such as nodding or non-lexical items ‘*hm mm*’ and ‘*uh-huh*’, although Indonesian provides other options, such as *em* and *he-eh*. These options seem to be more neutral and less opinionated than *continuer-ya* or *iya*. Unlike Hoek (2013) who observed telephone conversations, by observing videos in the present study the use of nodding is productive, since it can be seen from speakers’ gesture expression. Even though Hoek (2013) argues the use of nodding is mostly replaced by sound in a phone conversation since speakers are unable to see their gestures with each other, it cannot be simply concluded that gestures cannot be used with the sound at the same time. In fact, nodding while uttering *ya* can happen simultaneously in response to the previous utterance, at least what has been shown in my YouTube data.

It is noteworthy that *ya*, just like *ja* in Dutch (Hoek, 2013) and *yes* in English (Drummond and Hopper, 1991), does not seem to necessarily indicate high speakership incipency on the part of the listener, as in most cases continuer *ya* is preceded or followed by more continuers. In line with this, Wouk (1999) claims that *ya/iya* in BI, just like *yes* in English, provides a choice of continuers. In this case, some continuers indicate greater desire to take the floor, while others indicate greater readiness to yield the floor.

### 3.3.5. To question or to offer a turn

*Ya* can be used to encourage the other speaker to take the floor, for instance, by offering a question to the other speakers, the so-called questioner-*ya*. Unlike *ya* in 3.3.3 above, *ya* here can be classified as an initiatory response which consists of a first pair part (FPP). It is mainly used to set up an expectation upon a response from the listener. Consider examples (40), (41), and (42) respectively:

- (40) M : *Jadi antara pahlawan ama pengkhianat kira-kira beda tipis ya gitu ya?*  
 so between hero and betrayer about-about differ slight yes that yes



‘So, does it mean that a hero and a betrayer slightly differ from each other, right?’

N : Haha (laughing)

(41) A : *Kayak SP di perusahaan ya?*  
like SP (advisory letter) in company yes  
‘It is like an advisory letter from the company, right?’

B : *Artinya kami ingin mengatakan betapa lemahnya UUD ini.*  
mean we want say how weak UUD (national law) this  
‘Then, we want to say how weak the application of this national law is.’

(42) X : *Yang pertama, saya kira peraturan bupati no 70 kalau gak salah ya?*  
which first I think rule governor number 70 if not mistake yes  
‘Firstly, I think it is based on the governor’s rule number 70 if I am not mistaken, right?’

Y : *Ya, 70 tahun 2015.*  
yes 70 year 2015  
‘Yes, it is number 70 written in 2015.’

In (40), (41), and (42), the uses of *ya* uttered by speakers M, A, and X respectively are questioner-*ya*. *Ya* here occurs turn-finally, and it mostly requires an immediate response from the other speaker. Here, the speakers initiate to give the floor to their interlocutors. They encourage their listeners to immediately respond to the question, right after *ya* is uttered. After the question is answered, according to Wouk (1999), the speakers who used questioner-*ya* in the previous utterance will usually take back the floor. Slightly different from Wouk (1999) who names this as ‘questioner/tag-*ya*’, Sacks et al. (1974) rather label this as ‘next turn initiator’. They argue that the next turn initiator is used by someone to request an answer, a repair of some problem of hearing, or understanding of a turn completed by the other speaker. These uses basically encourage the other speaker to take the turn.

I found the use of *ya* here is rather unique, since it does not hold for *ja* in Dutch and *yes/yeah* in English. For example, it is strange to use *yes* to ask for a confirmation (e.g. this letter is from the company, *yes?*) because English provides question tags to do so (e.g. this letter is from the company, *isn’t it?*), or by using the questioner ‘right?’ (e.g. this letter is

from the company, *right?*). This suggests that *ya* in this respect differs from English *yes* and Dutch *ja*. This supports Wouk's (1999) argument mentioned in chapter 2 above.

Like English tag questions, *ya/iya* is used to request for agreement. In this case, *ya* is used to obtain agreement with an opinion or value judgment where the agreement does not perhaps exist. Wouk (1999) poses that the FPP of *ya/iya* typically has functions of requesting verification and agreement. It parallels 'OK' and 'right' in English.

Examples (40), (41), and (42) above are all tagged with a final *ya*, which seems to be functioning as a request for agreement or for specific information from the listener. However, a final-tag position is not always the case, since tag-*ya* can occur turn-medially as a sort of preparatory statement. It is used to request listener's recognition which might be necessary for understanding the utterance that follows it. See example (43):

(43) A : *Ini abang ee.. kedua kali ya bang ya kita berbincang di sini*  
this elder.brother PRT second time yes brother yes we talk in here

*kita bicara malam ini?*  
we talk night this

'Brother, this is hm... the second time we talk here in this place just like tonight, right?'

B : *Ya.*  
yes  
'Yes.'

In (43), speaker A utters *ya* in order to know whether or not speaker B agrees with, or accepts this information "this is the second time we talk here" before going further to the next information. Here, speaker A expects B to integrate this information to whatever follows. According to Wouk (1999) and Fung & Carter (2007), the speaker in this case treats the information which the listener may have already known, or which he is sensibly expected to recognize and to confirm this recognition. In conversation, this preparatory tag-*ya* can be seen as increasing solidarity between the speaker and the listener by inducing cooperation on the part of the listener, and by increasing the perception of degree of shared knowledge among the interlocutors. The more information shared by the conversants, the greater the level of solidarity between them in the conversation. It appears to me that the interpretation of

what function *ya* reacts to in (43) is a bit ambiguous, since it can also be interpreted as a filler marker. To arrive at a proper interpretation, the context of the utterance and the vocal gesture of the speaker must be taken into account during the analysis.

In conclusion, *ya* has more alternative functions than *yes* in English and *ja* in Dutch. It is used to offer the floor to the listener, or to elicit responses from the listener. As a question tag, *ya* mostly occurs in the turn-final position and sometimes in the turn-middle position, but it never occurs in the turn-initial position.

### 3.3.6. To express delay and filler marker

Slightly different from English *yes*, *ya/iya* can be used as a delaying tactic or a filler marker to sustain the on-going discourse. This is labeled as contemplative-*ya* in Hoek's (2013) analysis. It is used by a speaker while quickly thinking about what to say next before handing over the turn to the other speaker. Consider examples (44) and (45) below:

(44) A: *Upaya pemerosesan seperti penghinaan terhadap presiden lah.*  
 effort process like humiliation upon president it  
 'There has been an on-going effort to humiliating the president.'

B: *Begini bahwa eh presiden SBY itu saya kira apa... sudah apa ya*  
 like that eh president SBY that I think what have what yeah  
*sudah cukup sering dan sudah cukup bersabar.*  
 have sufficient often and have enough patient  
 'I think president SBY (Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono)... hmm...you know has been so patient so far.'

(45) A: *Nilai traumatis itu jangan sampai... eh apa ya jangan sampai*  
 value traumatic that not ever.. PRT what yeah never until

*membunuh demokrasi yang sudah kita bangun ya.*  
 kill democracy which have we establish yeah

'Do not ever let the traumatic experiences... hmm...you know to degrade democracy which we have already established.'

B: *Baik.*  
alright  
'Alright.'

In (44) and (45), speakers utter *ya* in order to think for a moment of what following information they are about to say. Here, speaker B in (44) and A in (45) might use delaying tactic due to several reasons: 1) they suddenly forget what to say next, 2) they have no idea, or 3) they try to be careful in supplementing the next information. In reference to the context of the utterance, speakers in (44) and (45) are talking about sensitive issues with regard to the president's attitude and the country's current democracy on a live TV show. It indeed attracts public attention. Looking at their gesture at the time of the utterance, it seems to suggest that *ya* here functions as a delaying tactic or a filler marker, since the speakers carefully think of the next information they are going to say. This claim is supported by the utterances *apa ya* in (44) and *eh apa ya* in (45), which parallel "uh.hmm" and "you know" in English.

Just like the thinking-*ja* in Dutch (Hoek, 2013), the thinking-*ya* in Indonesian can make up the entire turn, as in (46):

(46) A: *Daripada kita naturalisasi dari Eropa Belanda ke sini main bola.*  
than we naturalize from Europe the.Netherlands to here play soccer  
'It is better than importing a soccer player from the Netherlands, Europe.'

B: *Ya.*  
yeah  
'yeah well.'

A: *Kan malu-malu-in?*  
right shy.shy-PART  
'This could be a shame, right?'

B: *Ya.*  
yes  
'Yes.'

In responding to speaker A, speaker B uses *ya*. It indicates that he is thinking about, or considering speaker A's argument. Here, thinking-*ya* can be said as a 'dispreferred

response.’ The only non-committing answer in this case would be an acknowledgment-*ya* although it could be interpreted as agreement-*ya*. Following Hoek (2013), thinking-*ya* as a response here is not a neutral reaction.

Speaker A responds *ini kan malui-maluin?* to B’s *ya* in the following utterance in order to strengthen his suggestion mentioned in the prior statement. After this information is provided, speaker B seems to have already agreed with speaker A, by saying *ya*. *Ya* in (46) occurs twice but brings different functions. While the former *ya* indicates thinking process or delaying tactic: a condition where the speaker is still considering A’s argument, the latter *ya* has implied A’s agreement with B’s suggestion.

### 3.3.7. To interrupt

Unlike *ya* in 3.2.5 which is used to offer a turn, *ya/iya* here is used to interrupt the on-going talk. It is also called a frame marker in Chapeton’s (2009) analysis. *Ya* in this function is mainly used to immediately grab the floor and claim the attention of the listener. According to Chapeton (2009), the interrupter-*yes* (just like *ya*) suggests the desire of the listener to immediately take the turn. Here, someone interrupts a speaker while that speaker is still holding the floor. In this study, I prefer the term interrupter-*ya* to frame marker-*ya* as its meaning is more obvious to understand than frame marker. Look at examples (47) and (48) below:

(47) A: *Sampai partai PDI perjuangan dan Gerindra/*  
until party PDI struggle and Gerindra  
‘It also involves political party PDI and Gerindra/’

B: */iya tapi jangan jualan gambar dong!*  
yeah but not sell picture please  
‘/yeah but don’t mention any brands please!’

In (47), speaker A mentions the name of two parties (i.e. PDI and Gerindra) to strengthen his argument made in the previous utterance. As speaker B thinks it is not ethical to mention such identity, he immediately interrupts while A is still holding the floor. Here, B interrupts since he does not want A to mention the names of the parties.

*Ya* in (47) typically has an initial position, and it does not make up the entire turn. Since it mainly interrupts an on-going talk, *ya* can be overlapping with the previous or the following utterance, as in (48):

(48) A: *Keburu di-bunuh orangnya, jadi kita harus tangkap tangan serahkan*  
soon PASS-kill person so we must catch hand deliver  
*kepada kepolisian.*  
to police

‘The crime actor is soon to be killed, we thus have to catch him and deliver him to the police department.’

B: [ya, tetapi] *begini pak Habib*  
yeah but like.this sir Habib  
‘Yeah, but I think mr Habib’

A : [itu boleh]  
that possible  
‘It’s possible to do so.’

Much like in (47), speaker B in (48) interrupts while speaker A is actually still holding the floor. Here, speaker B disagrees with the current statement of speaker A, by saying “but I think...” At the same time speaker A is interrupting, speaker B still continues speaking. Therefore, speaker B’s interruption and A’s on-going utterance overlap, indicated by the brackets [ ]. The function of interrupter-*ya* here co-occurs with another function beyond its basic meaning. It should be underlined, however, it is actually not *ya* here, just like *ya* in (8) earlier, which straightforwardly expresses disagreement, but rather the contrastive conjunction *tetapi* ‘but’ following it.

*Ya* can be used to close a discourse, or a so-called closing frame marker (cf. Chapeton, 2009), such as in (49):

(49) A: *Di semua institusi, termasuk di pemerintahan ada yang baik dan buruk ya.*  
in all institution include di government there which good and bad yeah

‘There are good and bad services in all institutions, including governmental offices, ok.’

In (49), speaker A ends his turn, saying *ya*. It seems to parallel the function of ‘OK’ in English in a sense of ending a topic statement, for instance “I will not be going to the theater tomorrow, ok.” *Ya* as a closing marker has a textual function (Brinton, 1996), and it always occurs in the turn-final position.

### 3.3.8. To emphasize or underline own statement

Just like the function of *ja*-underlining statement in Dutch (Hoek, 2013), *ya* in BI can be used to emphasize or underline the speaker’s own statements. It indicates that the speaker is essentially agreeing and underlining his own immediately preceding statement. *Ya* in this function generally appears in the turn-initial position, though it can appear in the turn-medial and in the sentence-final position, such as in (50) and (51) respectively.

(50) A: *Jangan sampe ..ee apa ya membunuh demokrasi yang sudah kita*  
not ever PRT what yeah kill democracy which have we  
*bangun ya untuk reformasi ini juga.*  
established yeah for reformation this too

‘Don’t ever degrade hmm...you know democratic values which we have already established ok. It is important for this reformation era.’

B: Baik, kita akan kembali sesaat lagi.  
alright we will back soon again  
‘Alright, we will be right back soon.’

(51) A: *Tentu karena di-sesuaikan dengan cash flow yang terus berkembang*  
of.course because PASS-suit with cash flow which continue improve  
*setiap hari, gitu ya.*  
every day that yeah

‘Of course, it is updated based on the cash flow which continually increases every day. That’s the point ok.’

B: *Baik.*  
alright

‘Alright, I understand.’

A: *Jadi itu sesuatu yang wajar.*

so that something which reasonable

‘So, that amount of money is still reasonable.’

In (50), speaker A underlines his statement ‘...*membunuh demokrasi yang sudah kita bangun ya*’. Speaker B seems to agree with his statement, by uttering *baik* ‘alright’. The same function of *ya* can be found in (51), in which speaker A underlines his immediately prior statement, saying *gitu ya* ‘that’s the point’.

*Ya* in (50) occurs in the sentence-internal position as there is some more information following it within the same utterance whilst *ya* in (51) appears in the sentence-final position. Hoek (2013) in her discussion on *ja*-final-turn claims that although *ja* appears in sentence-final position, it still refers to the preceding utterance rather than to the utterance adjoined to. Hoek’s (2013) notion corresponds to (51) above where *gitu ya* refers to speaker A’s preceding statement. However, which preceding statement *ya*-final position refers to might be ambiguous, whether it refers to the immediately preceding statement by the same speaker, or to the preceding turn of the other speaker. This is because of the fact that in both conditions, the speakers are essentially affirming the same thing or agreeing with their own statement, or with the preceding statement of the other speakers.

Just like emphasizing-*ja* in Dutch (Hoek, 2013), *ya* in BI can only be considered an example of emphasizing-*ya* if there is a pause between *ya* and the sentence preceding it. *Ya* in this situation is not ambiguous. It is used to emphasize the speaker’s own statement. It agrees with or affirms the preceding statement of the other speaker.

### 3.3.9. To show responses

Wouk (1999) and Chapeton (2009) argue that there is one frequent function of *ya* in BI and *yeah* in English respectively, namely to show responses. Here, they are used to show a response or a reaction to the preceding discourse. Response-*ya*, just like *yes* and *ja*, can be general and interpreted in numerous ways, such as agreement, acknowledgement, confirmation, cooperation, or turn taker. In (52) and (53), *ya* is used to indicate speakers’ response to their interlocutors:

(52) Alfito: *Apa yang ingin anda sampaikan?*

what which would you tell



‘Do you have something to say?’

Hanta: *Ya, saya sangat terhibur sangat terhibur. Mungkin teman –teman dan*  
yeah I very console very console perhaps audiences and  
*di penonton dan pemirsa juga sangat terhibur.*  
in audience and viewers also very console

‘Well, I am personally so entertained by this debate, and perhaps all of the audiences here and viewers at home.’

Alfito: *Ya.*

yeah

‘Yeah.’

(53) Alfito: *Anda, mau ada ada follow up question, mas Hanta?*

you will any any follow up question sir Hanta

‘Do you have any follow up question, sir Hanta?’

Hanta: *Ya, saya pikir sama ya. Tadinya saya berharap memberi sisi lain begitu.*  
yeah I think same yeah just.now I hope give side other that

‘Well, I thought just the same. I just wondered to give something from another perspective.’

In (52) and (53) respectively, Hanta utters *ya* to immediately respond to Alfito’s questions. *Yas* in (52) and (53) have nothing specifically to do with agreement, acknowledgement, or confirmation to the previous utterance, but rather to respond to the previous utterance. Therefore, they occur turn-initially, immediately after the previous utterance. This function of *ya* seems to parallel the turn starters ‘well’ or ‘alright’ in English.

### 3.3.10 To express emotion

Just like *ja* in Dutch, *ya* can be used to express emotions, for example, happiness, surprise, disbelief, indignation, or enthusiasm. Which emotion *ya* refers to heavily relies on the context of the utterance and the intonation of the speakers itself. In a conversation when the speaker uses *ya* with high intonation, it can create high tension (or conflict) between the speaker and the listener. Here, *ya* can be interpreted to express indignation, as in (54) below:

(54) Sepati: *Saudara Ruhut, saya mengingatkan saja. Kesombongan berarti kejatuhan*

brother Ruhut I warn just arrogance mean falling away

*sudah dekat. Anda lihat saja itu.*

have close you see just that

‘Brother Ruhut, I am just warning you that your arrogance can trigger you soon to the end of your career.’

Ruhut: *Pak! Saya pegang Tuhan pak ya! Saya selalu berjalan di jalan Tuhan*

Sir I hold God sir yeah I always walk in track God

*Yaa professor!*

yeah professor

‘Sir, I have God! I keep doing things based on God’s track yeah professor!’

In (54), professor Sepati feels that he is personally being attacked by Ruhut’s earlier statement. Therefore, he is warning Ruhut to consider his politeness, and advising him that his arrogance can lead him to the end of his career as a politician. Apparently, Ruhut cannot accept this advice which can be seen from his reaction of defending himself. By uttering *yaa professor!* with high intonation, it can be implied that Ruhut expresses his emotion of indignation (i.e. negative emotion) to professor Sepati.

### 3.4. Conclusion

This chapter has presented the methodology applied in this study. All uses of *ya* in the data were interpreted, categorized, described. An overview of all uses of *ya* in the data has also been given in table 3. From the data, it is plausible to conclude that *ya* or *iya* has various functions, and some of those functions are beyond its basic meaning of agreement. It should be noted that some functions of *ya* were quite obvious to be interpreted while others were not. Many uses of *ya* were found to correspond to the uses of *yes* in English and *ja* in Dutch. Nevertheless, there was one difference. That is, *ya* in Indonesian appears to be commonly used for question tags while English *yes* does not. The next chapter will present the study of *nggak* ‘no’ in the same data.

## 4. *Nggak* in Indonesian

This chapter discusses *nggak* in the data. In section 4.1 I will present the uses of *nggak*, after closely examining in which function it was intended by the speakers in the conversation. An overview of the established categories and the number of occurrences of each type of *nggak* will be given, just like for *ya* above. Section 4.2 will present the conclusion of this chapter.

### 4.1. The uses of *nggak* ‘no’

Like *ya*, all occurrences of *nggak* in the data were analyzed and categorized according to their interpretation. An overview of the established categories and the number of occurrences of each type of *nggak* in the data is presented in table 4. Some examples of each category of *nggak* are discussed and compared with *no* in English, and *nee* in Dutch.

Uses of <i>nggak</i>	Number of occurrences
Negative reaction to a statement (disagreement)	35 (25, 74 %)
To underline or emphasize own statement	35 (25, 74 %)
To interrupt	23 (16, 20 %)
To respond to a question (affirmative and negative interpretation)	15 (11, 03 %)
To offer a turn	12 (8, 82 %)
Negative answer to a question (closed or leading)	7 (5, 15 %)
Continuer when preceding discourse contains a negation	6 (4, 41 %)
To express emotion	2 (1, 47 %)
To reject a request	1 (0, 73 %)
<b>Total</b>	136

Table 4. The distinct uses of *nggak* and the number of occurrences of each use in the data.

#### 4.1.1. Negative reaction to a statement (disagreement)

Very much like English *no* (Lee-Goldman, 2010) and Dutch *nee* (Hoek, 2013), *nggak* has one basic meaning, that is to express disagreement or denial. Here, *nggak* is uttered when the speaker wants to file an objection, or disagreement with his interlocutor. In the data, the uses of *nggak* in expressing denial can be found in various contexts. It is used when the speaker defends himself from accusation of the other speaker, or when he corrects himself from the misconception he has made in the previous utterance.

*Nggak* is used by the speakers to indicate disagreement in responding to the positive statement, as in (55) and (56):

(55) A: *Itu sudah di-batalkan bung.*

it has PASS-cancel friend

‘It has been already cancelled friend.’

B: *Nggak, yang mana? Kalau dalam 25 seperti itu yang di-katakan pak Margarito.*

no which one if in 25 like that which PASS-say sir Margarito

‘No, which one do you mean? It has been said in verse 25 by Mr. Margarito.’

(56) A: *Unsur-nya berbeda, rumusan delik-nya berbeda.*

component-GEN different formula rule-GEN different

‘The component is different, its rule must be also different.’

B: *Nggak bang!*

no brother

‘I don’t think so brother!’

A: *Jangan karena di-lihat penghinaan terhadap presiden.*

no because PASS-see humiliation upon president

‘Even if it is seen as a humiliation to the president.’

In (55) and (56), speakers utter *nggak* to disagree with their interlocutors. Just like discourse marker *no* (Burrige & Florey, 2002), *nggak* here is used to express the speakers’ attitude and opinion, that is to deny the other speakers’ argument. As *nggak* files disagreement with the immediately preceding utterance, it typically occurs in the initial-position. It can be supplemented by other words, or it occurs in isolation in which case it makes up the entire turn. See example (57):

(57) Ruhut: *Tapi ini pengusaha terus yang kalian ketemu.*

but this businessman always which you meet

‘But you always schedule a meeting with businessmen.’

Fadli: *Nggak ada!*

no there

‘Of course no!’

Ruhut: *Itu!* (pointing to the screen)  
that  
'That's is the evidence!'

Fadli: *Yang mana?*  
which where  
'Which evidence did you mean?'

In (57) Ruhut accuses Fadli of having attended a meeting with some businessmen, where Fadli is supposed to be neutral, considering his public authority as a politician. Fadli immediately disagrees with Ruhut, by saying *nggak*. It implies that he defends himself that 'it's not true'. To strengthen his accusation made earlier, Ruhut says *itu* 'that's the evidence' while pointing to the screen where the video was just played. Fadli still could not bear being accused. He then challenges Ruhut to show the evidence. Here, just like *no* (Burrige & Florey, 2002), *nggak* is uttered by Fadli to save his face.

Much like *nee* in Dutch (Hoek, 2013) and *no* in English (Goodhue & Wagner, 2015), *nggak* in BI can be used to negatively respond to a statement. In this case, *nggak* carries its basic meaning. It can be used in isolation although it is frequently part of a longer turn, as in (58) below:

(58) A: *Ruwetlah pokoknya ya.*  
complicated problem yeah  
'Yeah it is a complicated problem.'

B: *Nggak!*  
no  
'No!'

In (58), speaker A considers that the problem caused by some social communities is complicated to solve. Speaker B negatively responds to A's statement, by uttering *nggak*. Here, *nggak* indicates that speaker B disagrees with speaker A.

In Dutch, Hoek (2013) claims that both answer-*nee* and reaction-*nee* have 'late varieties', in which *nee* is not used to respond to the immediately preceding turn. Rather, it is used to respond to something earlier in the preceding discourse. The answer-*nggak* and reaction-*nggak* in Indonesian, by contrast, are slightly different from those in Dutch, since

reaction-*nggak* in (58), for instance, refers to the immediately preceding turn. However, the reaction-*nggak*, just like the reaction-*nee* (Hoek, 2013), cannot make up the entire turn because it requires supplemented information to indicate what exactly *nee* or *nggak* is referring to.

Much like the disagreement *nggak* in (57), *nggaks* in (59) and (60) below are used by speakers as defensive markers.

(59) Ruhut: *Dalam rekaman itu, kau ada nggak?*

on      recoding that you there no  
'Were you on the recording as well?'

Fadli: *Nggak ada.*

no      there  
'No, I was no there.'

Ruhut: *Kau nggak ada?*

you no      there  
'Are you sure that you were not there?'

Fadli: *Nggak ada.*

no      there  
'No, I was not there.'

Ruhut: *Tapi kayaknya ada tiga suara, siapa yang satu lagi?*

but seem      there three voice who which one else  
'It seems there were three voices, who else was there?'

Fadli: *Nggak ada saya.*

no      there I  
'No, I was not there.'

Ruhut: *Siapa yang satu lagi? aku tanya Gunimar, siapa ayo?*

who which one else I ask      Gunimar who come.on  
'Come on! who else was there? or I ask Gunimar.'

Fadli & Ruhut: haha (laughing)

‘haha’

(60) Ruhut: *Rekam jejak Novanto yang selalu dia (pointing Fadli) bela itu.*  
record track Novanto which always he protect it  
‘It is important to see the track record of Novanto whom you always protect.’

Fadli : *Nggak! Saya tidak membela itu. Saya membela soal lain.*  
no I no protect it I protect something else  
‘No, I don’t protect him. Rather, I do it for something else.’

Ruhut : *Iya.*  
yeah  
‘Yeah.’

Fadli : *Soal UUD.*  
about UUD (national laws)  
‘Instead, I do it for UUD.’

In (59), Ruhut accuses Fadli of having been involved in the recorded conversation. An accusation which is immediately rejected by Fadli *nggak ada saya* ‘No, I was not there’. *Nggak* indicates that Fadli defends himself. Here, Fadli strongly rejects (or disagrees with) Ruhut’s statement. The same interpretation can be found in (60). Here, defensive marker-*nggak* extends its basic meaning of disagreement. It typically occurs in the turn-initial position, immediately after the accusation is made.

Another function in which *nggak* represents its basic meaning is when the speaker corrects himself or other speakers. Like *nee* (Hoek, 2013), *nggak* here is used either to correct the immediately preceding utterance, or the earlier utterance. Consider example (61) below:

(61) A: *Kan sedih saya melihat sebuah organisasi seperti teman Ahok (organization)*  
PRT sad I see one organization like friend Ahok  
*dan saudara ini, cara mengambil kesimpulannya begitu.*  
and brother this way take conclusion like.that

‘It’s sad to listen to an organization like *Teman Ahok* and also this man (pointing to the man) that takes a conclusion that way.’

B: *Nggak*.

no

‘No, I didn’t mean to conclude that way.’

In (61), speaker A states that speaker B’s conclusion is poorly said. Speaker B reacts with *nggak*. In this case, *nggak* is used to deny A’s conclusion. It suggests that speaker B disagrees with the concluding point made by speaker A. Within this denial, speaker B corrects what he meant in the previous utterance ‘no, I didn’t mean to conclude that way’.

#### 4.1.2. Negative answer to a question (closed or leading)

Very similar to negation-*nee* in Dutch which is prototypically used as a negative answer (Hoek, 2013), *nggak* can be used to respond to either a closed or leading question. It indicates negation, denial, dissent, or refusal to a question raised by the other speakers. Here, it captures its basic meaning in conversation. Consider example (62) where *nggak* is used to answer a closed question.

(62) Nita : *Apa perlu di-revisi atau bagaimana pak Herman?*  
what need PASS-revise or how mr Herman  
‘Does it need to be revised, or what do you think Mr. Herman?’

Herman: *Oh nggak. Itu kan sudah di-bacakan.*  
oh no it right have PASS-read  
‘Oh no. It has been announced.’

Nita : *Ya.*  
yeah  
‘I understand.’

In (62), Nita asks Herman, whether or not it is necessary to revise the draft. Here, Herman’s answer might be either positive *ya* to indicate that the draft needs to be revised, or negative *nggak* which marks the opposite, i.e. no revision. As Herman utters *nggak*, it negatively answers the question that the draft does not need to be revised. It should be noted



that *nggak* in (62) is modified by additional information. However, it also can occur in isolation where *nggak* makes up the entire turn, such as in (63).

(63) Herman: *Mungkin dalam reflik jaksa, ee bisa di apa ya.*  
perhaps in claim judge PRT can in what yeah  
'I think the judge can hm... you know.'

Nita : *Bisa di-perbaiki ya?*  
can PASS-fix yeah  
'It can be fixed, right?'

Herman: *Nggak.*  
no  
'No.'

Within the same conversation as in (62), Nita in (63) asks Herman whether the draft can be revised or not. Herman's response *nggak* conveys a denial, suggesting the draft cannot be revised any more. Unlike *nggak* in (62) above which is supplemented, *nggak* in (63) occurs in isolation, and thus it makes up the entire turn. It appears to me that although *nggak* in (63) appears in isolation, it would still have been sufficient to answer the question of Nita. Whether or not *nggak* in responding to a question is necessarily modified by additional information depends on the context of the conversation. In other words, whether or not the speaker thinks to supplement his *nggak*-response depends on the flow of the conversation.

#### 4.1.3. To respond to a question (affirmative and negative meaning)

Much similar to *no* and *nee*, *nggak* in BI is mainly used to express a negative answer, either to a positive or a negative polar question. However, it is worth noting that the negation-*nggak* does not always represent a negative interpretation, especially when it responds to a negative question. My impression is that, to interpret *nggak* in responding to a question containing a negation is trickier than doing so when it responds to a positive question. Like *nee* and *no*, the interpretation of *nggak* in responding to a positive question is straightforward. It negates the question. In other words, if *nggak* answers a positive question, it always disconfirms the question because it expresses disagreement, as in (64):

(64) Yusril: *Anda mengambil kebijakan yang peraturan-nya belum ada.*  
you make policy which rule-GEN not exist  
'You make a policy which is not based on the existing rule.'

Rika : *Betul seperti itu pak Deny?*  
right like that sir Deny  
'Is that right Mr. Deny?'

Deny : *Nggak.*  
no  
'No.'

In (64), Yusril and Deny are debating with respect to the policy Deny has made. The debate is mediated by Rika, the host of the TV show. Here, Yusril accuses Deny of having made a policy which is not properly based on the rules. Rika checks this with Deny, by uttering a positive question *betul seperti itu Pak Deny?* Deny's response *nggak* disconfirms (or negatively answers) the question. It automatically negates the accusation made by Yusril earlier in the discourse. The interpretation of *nggak* in (64) above is obvious, that is, to disconfirm a positive question: "I did not create an inappropriate policy".

However, when *nggak* is uttered to respond to a negative question, it can have a positive interpretation. It might be ambiguous since it depends on the positive or negative meaning of the question preceding it. Tian & Ginzburg (2016) note that there is a corresponding semantic distinction between positive and negative propositions of English-*no* in responding to negative or positive questions. Hoek (2013) also notes that when a question in Dutch contains a negation, the way to affirmatively respond to it is that by giving a reaction containing a negation as well. Hoek (2013) claims that *nee* is actually used more often in affirmative than in a negative way. In the data, the preceding and the following utterance are really important to consider. Compare *nggak* in (65) and (66) below:

(65) A: *PKB sama Nasdem datang nggak?*

PKB and Nasdem come no  
'Didn't PKB and Nasdem (political party) come to the meeting?'

B: *Nggak.*  
no  
'No.'

(66) Ruhut: *Dalam rekaman itu masa kau nggak ada? Aku nggak percaya.*  
on recoding it how.could you not there I not believe  
'How could you not be involved on the recording? I don't believe it.'

Fadli: *Nggak, aku ada.*  
no I there  
'No, of course I was there as well.'

Although *nggaks* in (65) and (66), respectively, are used in responding to a negative question, the two have different interpretation. *Nggak* in (65) conveys an affirmative interpretation (i.e. *no*, indeed, they did not come). It indicates that speaker B confirms the absence of PKB and Nasdem in the meeting. By contrast, *nggak* in (66), like the case of *no* in earlier (21), represents a negative interpretation. It suggests disagreement "no, I was there on the recoding as well". Here *nggak* is described as 'positive disagreeing' in Hoek's (2013) analysis. The case where negation-*nggak* conveys a positive/affirmative interpretation is in line with the discussion of Tian & Ginzburg (2016) in chapter 2. Tian & Ginzburg categorize it as the relative use of negation-*no*. It rejects its basic meaning in expressing negative proposition. Rather, it has a positive proposition, much like in English answer "No, I was there".

Like *nee* and *no*, *nggak* in response to a positive-negative question can have a positive-negative answer. Its interpretation heavily relies on the context of its utterance. It is noteworthy, however, that unlike Dutch which has special word 'jawel' to express positive disagreement (cf. Hoek, 2013), Indonesian only has a word *nggak/tidak* to express disagreement, for both positive and negative interpretation, just like *no* in English. In Dutch, 'jawel' is a variant of *ja*, not of *nee*. However, the existence of *jawel* to negate a negation makes it possible that *nee* is used to confirm a negation, which *no* and *nggak* are necessarily ambiguous. Thus, Indonesian *nggak* and English *no* are less straightforward compared to *nee* in Dutch.

Just like the use of affirmative *nee* in Dutch (Hoek, 2013), *nggak* used in my data to show an affirmative response occurs slightly more often (15 occurrences) than that used as a negative response (7 occurrences). It suggests that Indonesian speakers, just like Dutch speakers, try to reduce the uses of disagreement in their interaction. One possible explanation why the speakers prefer using more agreement than disagreement, in my point of view, is that we avoid conflicts in order to have a pleasant and enjoyable conversation.

#### 4.1.4. To offer a turn

Much like the function of tag-*ya*, *nggak* can be used to offer the next turn to the other speaker. Here, it occurs in the turn-final position. The tag-*nggak* is intended to ask for a confirmation, opinion, or clarification from the other speaker. Here, unlike *no* and *nee*, but like tag-*ya* above, *nggak* appears to have a similar function as the question tag in English. Consider examples (67) and (68) respectively:

(67) Dhani: *Jawaban gue serius **nggak**?*

answer my serious no

‘My answer is serious, isn’t it?’

Alfito: *Iya.. banget banget.*

yes sure sure

‘Yes, it is indeed.’

(68) M: *Ya di-tanya saja, anak perempuan-nya mau di-nikahi **nggak**?*

yeah PASS-ask just child daughter-GEN will PASS-marry no

*Kalau nggak mau, nanti ada sanksi apa nama-nya..sanksi desa.*

if no will later there punishment what call-GEN punishment village

‘Well, just ask her, will her daughter be married?’ If she will not, we have local punishment given by village authority.’

N: *Apa bentuk sanksi desa-nya?*

what form punishment village-GEN

‘What kind of punishment will be from her village?’

In (67) Dhani asks Alfito’s opinion towards his current statement. As Alfito is being questioned, he takes over the turn, saying *iya..banget banget*. The same function can be found in (68). By using tag-*nggak*, speaker M encourages speaker N to grab the turn. It is slightly different from tag-*nggak* in (67), *nggak* in (68) does not require speaker M to immediately take the turn, since he still has more to say. It should be noted that both tag-*ya* and tag-*nggak* can receive either an agreeing or disagreeing response.

#### 4.1.5. To interrupt

Another function which *nggak* shares with *ya* is marking an interruption. Here, *nggak* is used by the speaker to interrupt the other speaker, suggesting the speaker desires to claim the floor. For example, he wants to express rejection, correction, or disagreement with the current statement. Just like English *no* and Dutch *nee*, interrupter-*nggak* typically occurs turn-initially. Consider examples (69) and (70):

(69) A: *Ini kan tidak demokratis membangun organisasi / yang*  
this right no democratic develop organization which  
'This is not a democratic way to develop an organization / which'

B: */nggak ada hubungan-nya*  
no any relation-3SG  
*itu dengan demokrasi bung.*  
it with democracy brother

'No, it does not have any relation to the democracy brother.'

C: *Loh kok tidak ada hubungan-nya.*  
PRT how no any relation-3SG

'Wow, how could it not relate to each other?'

(70) Aziz : *Jadi gini.. ini ter-kait /*  
so like.this this PASS-relate  
'So, this is related to /'

Fito: */nggak..nggak saya kasi bonus.*  
no.. no I give bonus

*Kita break dulu nanti di-jawabnya setelah pariwisata berikut.*  
we break while later PASS-answer after advertisement follow

'No..no hold on! I give you a bonus (to think for a while). I will let you answer the question after the following advertisement break.'

In (69), speaker A criticizes speaker B. Speaker B reacts with *nggak*, suggesting that he disagrees with A's critic. He immediately interrupts A who is still speaking. Here, not only does *nggak* function as a token of interruption, but it also carries its basic function of disagreement. This simultaneous function of *nggak* corresponds to *no* in English and *nee* in Dutch. Lee-Goldman (2011), for instance, claims that *no* is possibly analyzed as carrying more than one function simultaneously in one utterance, which makes the two functions mutually inclusive. In line with this, Burridge & Florey (2002: 161) argue that *no* or *yeah-no* is quite different from the other conversational markers, since it can be used with a number of different functions simultaneously.

Much like *nggak* in (69), *nggak* in (70) is uttered to interrupt the on-going talk. When Aziz is holding the floor, Fito interrupts, but unlike interrupter-*nggak* in (69), *nggak* in (70) has only one function. That is, to interrupt the previous statement. It has no interpretation of disagreement with the previous talk as *nggak* suggests in (69).

In sum, interrupter-*nggak*, just like interrupter-*ya* above, always occurs turn-initially. It can occur in isolation or be modified. It can have a single or an overlapping function.

#### 4.1.6. To express emotion

Like *nee* in Dutch, *nggak* can be used to express speaker's emotion upon the previous utterance although it occurs like this only twice in my data. Emotive-*nggak* is used to express surprise, indignation, and disbelief. It appears to me that the main characteristic of emotive-*nggak*, just like *ya* above, is that it is uttered with particular intonation, mostly with high intonation. In (71) and (72), for instance, *nggak* is used to express a feeling of surprise.

(71) Host : *Bukan ter-bukti atau tidak ter-bukti.*  
           no    PASS-prove or not    PASS-prove  
           ‘It is not a matter of whether it can be proved or not.’

Herman: *Oh bukan!*  
           PRT no  
           ‘Of course, no!’

Host : *Oke.*  
           okay  
           ‘Okay.’

Herman: *Kalau perlu bukti berarti mati.. oh nggaklah.*

if need proof mean dead PRT no

‘If you mean that the proof is only if the victim is dead, oh of course it’s impossible.’

(72) Aziz: *Komando top down. Itu kelebihan sekaligus kekurangan.*

command top down that strength all.at.once weakness

‘He has top down command, it is his strength but also his weakness.’

Dhani: *Loh, nggak boleh!*

PRT no able

‘Wow, you cannot say that!’

Azis : *Boleh dong.*

able PRT

‘Of course, I can.’

Dhani: *Nggak boleh..hehe nggak boleh. (laughing and waving hands)*

no able no able

‘You cannot.’

*Nggak* in (71) is stretched out. Herman expresses his surprise *oh nggaklah!* Here, *nggaklah* basically has the same meaning as *nggak*. It is just another form of *nggak* combined with the interjection-*lah*, which is generally used to show disagreement while expressing emotion. Just like emotive-*nee* in Dutch, emotive-*nggak* potentially overlaps with other uses of *nggak* such as in (71) above. Here, *nggaklah* has two discourse functions, which are to express emotion and to express disagreement. The emotional expression is indicated by the use of interjection *oh* preceding it and *lah* adjoining it. The same interpretation also holds for *nggak* in (72). In this case, *nggak* is used to convey emotion (indicated by interjection *loh*) and to express disagreement. Dhani utters another emotive-*nggak* in the following utterance *nggak boleh hehe nggak boleh*. In this case, it is clear that *nggak* also has two functions: to express emotion (indicated by laughing *hehe*), and disagreement (indicated by his gesture of waving his hand).

#### 4.1.7. To underline or emphasize own statement

Much like *nee* in Dutch, *nggak* can be used to underline or emphasize the speaker’s own statement. Unlike emphasizing-*ya* which is used to underline the speaker’s affirmative

statement, *nggak* is used to emphasize the speaker's statement if the statement contains a negation. Here, it expresses its basic function. I found 35 occurrences of *nggak* in this use. One example can be seen in (73) below:

(73) Pohan: *Dan ini kan bukan lagi amal ma'ruf nahi mungkar yang sesuai*  
and this right not more amal ma'ruf nahi mungkar which suit  
  
*dengan koridor hukum. Jadi **nggak** boleh.*  
with corridor law so no able

‘And this is not any longer *amal ma'ruf nahi mungkar*<sup>1</sup> which is based on the Islamic principle, so it cannot be allowed.’

In (73) Pohan utters *nggak boleh* to underline his statement. Slightly different from *nee* in Dutch, which is only considered to be the example of emphasizing-*nee* if it occurs turn-finally (Hoek, 2013: 44), *nggak* in BI can occur before the turn-final position. In (73) for example, it is followed by a closing phrase *boleh*. Most of the occurrences of emphasizing-*nggak* in the data did not occur in isolation.

#### 4.1.8. Continuer when preceding discourse contains a negation

Similar to *ya*, *nggak* can be used as a continuer only if the preceding turn contains a negation as well. If the preceding turn does not convey a negation, *nggak* cannot be interpreted as a continuer but rather it has other functions, such as marking disagreement or emotion. One example of continuer-*nggak* can be seen in (74):

(74) Fadli: *Pak Ruhut, pernah nggak menerima misalnya kunjungan dari pengusaha?*  
sir Ruhut ever no accept example visit from businessman  
  
*pernah nggak?*  
ever no

‘Mr, Ruhut, haven't you ever hosted a visit from a businessman? Have you?’

---

<sup>1</sup> *Amal ma'ruf nahi mungkar* is one well-known Arabic advice in Islam, which is understood as a call for every Moslem to order right and prohibit wrong with one another.



Ruhut: Aku *nggak* pernah.

I not ever

‘Never.’

Fadli: *Nggak* pernah sama sekali.

no ever at all

‘Never at all.’

In (74), Fadli is asking Ruhut about a specific case, to which Ruhut responds by saying *aku nggak pernah* ‘never’. In this case, Ruhut negatively answers Fadli’s question. Fadli in the following turn utters *nggak pernah sama sekali* ‘never at all’ as a continuer. In this function, *nggak* occurs in the turn-initial position just like continuer-*ya*. It can appear in isolation, or be followed by some additional information. Continuer-*nggak* in Indonesian can be replaced by head-shaking or pointing-finger shaking. It should be noted that unlike continuer-*ya* which can be replaced by non-lexical *uh huh* or *mm*, or by non-verbal nodding, there is still doubt whether or not *nggak* in BI can be replaced by non-lexical items such as *mm mm*.

#### 4.1.9. To reject a request

Totally unlike *ya* which is used to comply with a request, *nggak* is used to reject a request. *Nggak* in this respect expresses its basic meaning of negation. To reject a request or an order in Indonesian does not necessarily mean that the order must have a negative meaning as well (i.e. *jangan lihat saya!* ‘don’t look at me!’), but it also can respond to an affirmative order (i.e. *lihat saya!* ‘look at me!’), as in (75):

(75) Ruhut : *Bukan dengan angkuh atau sombong.*

not with arrogant or arrogant

‘It is not for showing off.’

Margarito: *Loh tidak!*

PRT not

‘Wow of course you are!’

Ruhut : *Dengar dulu!*  
listen first  
'Just listen to me first!'

Margarito: *Nggak..nggak tidak.*  
no no no  
'No, I won't.'

Ruhut: *Sebentar dulu, pak Margarito!*  
wait later sir Margarito  
'Let me finish my sentence, Mr. Margarito!'

In (75), Ruhut tells Margarito that what he is doing is not showing off. Margarito denies Ruhut's statement, by saying *loh tidak* 'of course you are'. It suggests that Margarito negatively responds to (or disagrees with) Ruhut's statement. To reduce the conflict, Ruhut asks Margarito to listen to him first.

Instead of accepting the request, Margarito rejects Ruhut's request by uttering *nggak..nggak..tidak* (with repetition), which obviously marks that he refuses to listen to Ruhut's explanation. Margarito's attitude in rejecting Ruhut's request can be interpreted as disagreeing with Ruhut, no matter how Ruhut tries to convince him. Much like *no* in English, it is necessary to note that *nggak*, which is used to reject a request, appears mostly in the turn-initial position, immediately after the request is made in the preceding turn. It can be uttered alone, or it can be repeated twice or more as in (75) above, yielding a stronger rejection.

Unlike Dutch, where repeated *nee* in response to a statement containing a negation can be interpreted as "I understand" or "I see" (Hoek, 2013), repeated *nggak* in (75) above does not have these interpretations. It is merely a repetition to generate a stronger refusal. Just like repeated *nee* in Dutch, often no special interpretation is attributed to the repetition of *nggak* in Indonesian. Here, it can be treated as a single *nggak*, just like repeated-*ya* in example (29) above.

Finally, it can be said that *nggak* in Indonesian, much like *no* and *nee*, does not always get a negative interpretation. It can express an affirmative reaction, depending on what context it is used by the speakers, and which kind of question or statement it reacts.

## 4.2. Conclusion

This chapter has discussed the uses of *nggak* in the data. The categories of the uses of *nggak* have also been established, just like those of *ya* in chapter 3. Some comparison amongst *nggak* in BI, *no* in English, and *nee* in Dutch has been discussed here. From the data, it can be suggested that several uses of *nggak* correspond to the uses of *no* in English and *nee* in Dutch. There are, notwithstanding, few differences. For example, *nggak* in Indonesian, just like *no* English, is much less straightforward in its interpretation than Dutch *nee*. Also I did not find the same function as a Dutch quotative marker-*nee* in the data. Unlike *no* in English and *nee* in Dutch, *nggak* in Indonesian appears to be frequently used as a question or tag marker, which is used to encourage the other speaker to take the turn. The data reveals that *nggaks* have a few similar functions as *ya*, which is quite interesting. That is, both *ya* and *nggak* in Indonesian are used by speakers to interrupt the on-going talk of the other speaker, to underline or emphasize the speaker's own statement, and to offer the turn to the other speaker. *Ya* and *nggak* refer to different elements in the discourse. Each of them has a core meaning, but they can have other interpretations than their basic meaning. The following chapter will present the conclusion of this thesis.

## 5. Conclusion

This thesis analyzed the uses of *ya* and *nggak* in Indonesian, and compared them with *yes* and *no* in English, and *ja* and *nee* in Dutch respectively. Chapter 2 summarized some existing literature on English *yes* and *no*, Dutch *ja* and *nee*, and *ya* itself. I have not discussed any literature on *nggak* because as far as I know there is no literature available on *nggak*. A brief overview of the discussion on what constitutes a discourse marker was presented in this chapter. A working definition of DM was then formulated. It was argued that *ya* and *nggak*, just like *yes* and *no*, and *ja* and *nee*, indeed function as discourse markers as they establish coherence relations between utterances.

Chapter 3 presented the methodology applied in this study. It included the reasons of having chosen YouTube videos as the main source of data. All the uses of *ya* were established and then compared with English *yes* and Dutch *ja*. Although many uses of *ya* corresponded to what was mentioned in the literature on Dutch *ja* and English *yes*, several new functions were established, namely interrupter-*ya*, continuer-*ya*, emotive-*ya*, and tag-*ya*. This thesis, therefore, extends the findings of the interpretations of *ya* which have not been discussed in Wouk (1999).

Chapter 4 presented the data on *nggak*. Much like *ya* in chapter 3, all categories of the uses of *nggak* were established, discussed, and compared with English *no* and Dutch *nee* respectively. Although most uses of *nggak* were found to be the same as the functions of *no* and *nee* in English and Dutch respectively, there were few differences. Indonesian *nggak*, for example, has a unique function as a question marker or tag-*nggak*, which does not hold for English *no* and Dutch *nee*.

After establishing the categories of the uses of both *ya* and *nggak*, it can be argued that both *ya* and *nggak* have a core meaning. Their basic meanings greatly differ from each other. All instances of *ya* and affirmative *nggak* were used to express agreement or positive responses. All examples of negative *nggak* were used to deny or negate something. Additionally, both *ya* and *nggak* were found to have special interpretations than their basic meaning. They even share a few functions as a tag marker, an interrupting marker, an underlining marker, and an emotive marker. Just like Dutch *ja* and *nee*, the distinct interpretations of *ya* and *nggak* are mainly caused by which element of the discourse *ya* and *nggak* refer to in the conversation (as in table 5 below). The significant distribution between *ya* and *nggak*, as seen in table 3 and 4 respectively above, tells us that Indonesian speakers,

just like speakers from other languages, prefer affirmative responses more than negative ones, in order to establish pleasant conversation with their interlocutors.

<b>Refers to</b>	<i>Ya</i>	<i>Nggak</i>
Immediately preceding context	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Emotion-<i>ya</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Emotion-<i>nggak</i></li> </ul>
Propositional content of the immediately preceding sentence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Interrupter-<i>ya</i></li> <li>▪ Answer-<i>ya</i></li> <li>▪ Reaction-<i>ya</i></li> <li>▪ Response-<i>ya</i></li> <li>▪ Underlining-<i>ya</i></li> <li>▪ Request complier-<i>ya</i></li> <li>▪ Emotion-<i>ya</i></li> <li>▪ Continuer-<i>ya</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Interrupter-<i>nggak</i></li> <li>▪ Neg. reaction to statement-<i>nggak</i></li> <li>▪ Response to question-<i>nggak</i></li> <li>▪ Underlining-<i>nggak</i></li> <li>▪ Request rejecter-<i>nggak</i></li> <li>▪ Emotion-<i>nggak</i></li> </ul>
Propositional content of the immediately following sentence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Question-<i>ya</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Question-<i>nggak</i></li> </ul>
Propositional context of the speaker's on-going sentence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Filler/delay marker-<i>ya</i></li> </ul>	-
Propositional content of earlier sentence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Late answer-<i>ya</i></li> <li>▪ Late reaction-<i>ya</i></li> <li>▪ Late response-<i>ya</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Late neg. reaction to statement-<i>nggak</i></li> <li>▪ Late response-<i>nggak</i></li> <li>▪ Late response to question-<i>nggak</i></li> </ul>

Table 5. The uses of *ya* and *nggak* and what element of the discourse they refer to

Finally, although *ya* and *nggak* appear to be simple and straightforward, this study has shown that this is not the case in the conversation. In fact, they can be used to fulfill various discourse functions. This thesis has given an overview regarding some functions that *ya* and *nggak* are used in Indonesian. It has generated a further inventory on the study of discourse markers in Indonesian literature, especially the case of *ya* and *nggak*. However, not all descriptions or other functions of *ja* in Dutch, or *yes* in English have been found in this study, for example quotative-*ya*.

## References

- Adami, E. (2009). We YouTube: Exploring sign-making in video-interaction. *Visual Communication*, 8(4), 379-400.
- Aijmer, K. (2002). *English Discourse Particles. Evidence from a Corpus*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Archakis, A. (2001). On discourse markers: Evidence from modern Greek. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 33(8), 1235-1262.
- Bazzanella, C. (1990). Phatic connectives as interactional cues in contemporary spoken Italian. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 14, 629-647. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166\(90\)90034-B](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(90)90034-B)
- Bergen, G. van, & Degand, L. (2013). *Discourse markers as turn-transition devices: Variation in speech and instant messaging*. Manuscript. Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen, Université catholique de Louvain.
- Blakemore, D. (1987). *Semantic constraints on relevance*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Brinton, L. J. (1996). *Pragmatic markers in English: Grammaticalization and discourse functions*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/9783110907582>
- Burridge, K & Florey, M. (2002) 'Yeah-no He's a Good Kid': A Discourse Analysis of Yeah-no in Australian English, *Australian Journal of Linguistics*, 22(2), 149-171, DOI: 10.1080/0726860022000013166
- Burgess, J & Green, J. (2009). *Online Video and Participatory Culture*. Digital Media and Society.
- Chapeton, C.M. (2009). The uses and functions of discourse markers in EFL classroom interaction. *Columbia*, 57-77.
- Chen Y. and He. A.W. (2001). Dui bu dui as a pragmatic marker: Evidence from Chinese classroom discourse. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 33: 1441-465.
- Duran, M.E. & Unamuno, V. (2001). The discourse marker *a ver* (Catalan, *a veure*) in teacher-student interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 33, 193-208.
- Drummond, K., & Hopper, R. (1993). Some uses of *yeah*. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 26(2), 203-212.
- Fung, L., & Carter, R. (2007). Discourse markers and spoken English: Native and learner use in pedagogic settings. *Applied Linguistics*, 28(3), 410-439. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/applin/amm030>.
- Foolen, A., Van Alphen, I., Hoekstra, E., Lammers, H., Mazeland, H., & Pascual, E. (2006). Het quotatieve *van*. Vorm, functie en sociolinguïstische variatie. *Toegepaste*

*Taalwetenschap in Artikelen*, 76, 137-149.

- Fraser, B. (1999). What are discourse markers? *Journal of Pragmatics*, 31(7), 931-932.  
[http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166\(98\)00101-5](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(98)00101-5).
- Goodwin, C. (1994). Professional vision. *American Anthropologist*, 96(3), 606-633.
- Goodhue, D. & Wagner, M. (2015). It is not just what you say, it's how you say it: Intonation, yes and no (eds) in Deniz Ozyildiz & Thuy Bui (eds.) *Proceedings of the 45th Meeting of the North-East Linguistic Society (NELS) at MIT*.
- Guo, F. (2015). A review of discourse markers from the functional perspective. *Journal of Arts & Humanities*, 4(4), 69-75
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.
- Hogeweg, L., de Hoop, H., Ramachers, S., der Slik, F., & Wottrich, V. (2016). The L2-acquisition of the German particles Doch, *IRAL*, DOI 10.1515/iral-2016-9981.
- Heeman, P., Byron, D., & Allen, J.F. (1998). Identifying discourse markers in spoken dialogue. *Journal of AAAI Technical Report*, 44- 51.
- Hoek, J. (2013). Yeah No I agree?: The interpretation of *Yes* and *No* in Dutch. *MA Thesis: Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen*.
- Hulker, K. (1991). Französisch: Partikelforschung. *Lexikon der Romanistischen Linguistik, Niemeyer*, 5(1), 77-88.
- Jewitt, C. (2012). An introduction to using videos for research. *NCRM Working Paper*, 3(12), 1-25.
- Jucker, A. H. & Ziv, Y. (1998). *Discourse Markers: Descriptions and Theory*, 171-201. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Krifka, M. (2013). Response particles as propositional anaphors. *In The proceedings of SALT*, 23, 1-18.
- Lee-Goldman, R. (2010). No as a discourse marker. *Journal for Pragmatics*, 1-46.
- Meadow, G.S. (2000). Beyond words: the importance of gestures to researchers and learners. *Journal of Child Development*, 71(1), 231-239.
- Merriam-Webster dictionary (2016). Retrieved December 7<sup>th</sup>, 2016, from <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/yes>,
- Padmi, R.T. & Dianita, D. (2014). The use of Oh and Well as discourse markers in conversation of Bandung State Polytechnic Students. *Language Education and Acquisition Research Network*, 7(1), 762-771.

- Redeker, G. (1990). Ideational and pragmatic markers of discourse structure. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 14, 367-381.
- Roelofsen, F & Donka, F (2015). Polarity particle responses as a window onto the interpretation of questions and assertions. *Language* 91, 359–414.
- Sack, H., Schegloff, E., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematic for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Languages*, 50, 696-735.
- Schiffrin, D. (1986). Functions of and in discourse. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 10 (1), 41-66.  
[http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166\(86\)90099-8](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(86)90099-8)
- Schiffrin, D. (1987). *Discourse markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schiffrin, D et al. (2003). *The handbook of discourse analysis*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Schourup, L. (1985). *Common discourse particles in English Conversation: Like, well, y'know*. New York: Garland.
- Schourup, L. (1999). Discourse Markers. *Lingua*, 107(3), 227-265.
- Tian, Y. & Ginzburg, J. (2016) What are you saying “no” to?, in proceeding of the Sinn und Bedeutung, Edinburgh. Retrieved October 16<sup>th</sup>, 2016, from  
<http://rose.wp.hum.uu.nl/files/2016/07/Tian-Ginzburg.pdf>
- Wouk, F. (1999). Solidarity in Indonesian conversation: The discourse markers kan. *Journal of Multilingua*, 17(4), 379-406.
- Yang, S. (2011). Investigating discourse markers in pedagogical settings: a literature review, *Journal of ARECLS*, 8, 95-108.
- Youtube definition. Retrieved January 11<sup>th</sup>, 2017, from  
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/YouTube>



## *Appendices*

### *Appendix 1*

#### List of videos

1. President dihina, Penjara di depan mata, accessible on <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=t076Hj-K08I>
2. HMP babak baru DPRD vs Ahok, accessible on <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DCbUcUXroBU>
3. Jakarta memilih “the final round” Foke vs Jokowi, accessible on <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yjmojxdpyUA>
4. Full apa kabar Indonesia: Dibalik tangisan dan pembelaan Jessica, accessible on <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ECfEAAcWbmk>
5. Debat TV One, Pacaran larut malam nikah paksa menanti, accessible on <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=X55ExECjRzg>
6. Hotman Paris Hutapea sebut lawyers Jessisa Wongso bodoh, accessible on <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=96SRb3d9yq4&t=60s>
7. Full debat seru! Pantaskah FPI dibubarkan? , accessible on <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RzDIBrYZUVY>
8. Inilah gaya kroni Setya Novanto dalam membela Setya Novanto, accessible on <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4FVcv4RBRUI>

## *Appendix 2*

### List of tables

Table 1. The characteristics of DMs

Table 2. The number of occurrences of *ja* and *nee* in Dutch (cited from Hoek, 2013) compared with the uses of *ya* and *nggak* in Indonesian.

Table 3. The distinct uses of *ya* and the number of occurrences of each use in the data.

Table 4. The distinct uses of *nggak* and the number of occurrences of each use in the data.

Table 5. The uses of *ya* and *nggak* and what element of the discourse they refer to.

### Appendix 3

Fragment sources of *ya*

(Transcript number) : link of videos {the time code of appearance}

- (3) : <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=t076Hj-K08I> {25:37:00}
- (4) : <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DCbUcUXroBU> {16:43:00}
- (28) : <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yjmojxdpyUA> {1:12:17}
- (29) : <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ECfEAACwBmk> {14:00}
- (30) : <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=X55ExECjRzg> {32.21:00}
- (31) : <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=X55ExECjRzg> {6:22:00}
- (32) : <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=96SRb3d9yq4&t=60s> {11:17:02}
- (33) : <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RzDIBrYZUVY> {3:02}
- (34) : <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=96SRb3d9yq4&t=60s> {14:20}
- (35) : <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yjmojxdpyUA> {1:12:19}
- (36) : <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=U22WFqtwjt4> {1:16}
- (37) : <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=U22WFqtwjt4> {3:23}
- (38) : <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yjmojxdpyUA> {1:08:46}
- (39) : <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yjmojxdpyUA> {1:09:10}
- (40) : <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yjmojxdpyUA> {1:09:27}
- (41) : <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RzDIBrYZUVY> {8:01}
- (42) : <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=X55ExECjRzg> {6:08}
- (43) : <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ECfEAACwBmk> {4:15}
- (44) : <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RzDIBrYZUVY> {1:40}
- (45) : <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RzDIBrYZUVY> {0:47}
- (46) : <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yjmojxdpyUA> {1:09:43}
- (47) : <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yjmojxdpyUA> {1:09:57}
- (48) : <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RzDIBrYZUVY> {14:23:50}
- (49) : <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RzDIBrYZUVY> {0:16}
- (50) : <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RzDIBrYZUVY> {0:48}
- (51) : <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=V4TI582I8BQ> {14:27}
- (52) : <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NvNxq8VGk3c> {6:58}
- (53) : <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NvNxq8VGk3c> {12:04}
- (54) : [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=oSmSgfm6F\\_o&t=600s](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=oSmSgfm6F_o&t=600s) {4:30}

#### Appendix 4

Fragment sources of *nggak*

(Transcript number) : link of videos {the time code of appearance}

(55)	: <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=t076Hj-K08I">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=t076Hj-K08I</a>	{24:14}
(56)	: <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=t076Hj-K08I">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=t076Hj-K08I</a>	{7:26}
(57)	: <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4FVcv4RBRUI">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4FVcv4RBRUI</a>	{2:53}
(58)	: <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RzDlBrYZUVY">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RzDlBrYZUVY</a>	{7:38}
(59)	: <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4FVcv4RBRUI">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4FVcv4RBRUI</a>	{50:27}
(60)	: <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4FVcv4RBRUI">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4FVcv4RBRUI</a>	{1:13:10}
(61)	: <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=V4TI582I8BQ">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=V4TI582I8BQ</a>	{20:17}
(62)	: <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ECfEAACwBmk">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ECfEAACwBmk</a>	{21:39}
(63)	: <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ECfEAACwBmk">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ECfEAACwBmk</a>	{21:44}
(64)	: <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=R-PQ1Bzq884">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=R-PQ1Bzq884</a>	{2:51}
(65)	: <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DCbUcUXroBU">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DCbUcUXroBU</a>	{19:28}
(66)	: <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4FVcv4RBRUI">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4FVcv4RBRUI</a>	{50:45}
(67)	: <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NvNxq8VGk3c">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NvNxq8VGk3c</a>	{12:37}
(68)	: <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=X55ExECjRzg">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=X55ExECjRzg</a>	{17:31}
(69)	: <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=V4TI582I8BQ">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=V4TI582I8BQ</a>	{19:32}
(70)	: <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NvNxq8VGk3c">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NvNxq8VGk3c</a>	{13:35}
(71)	: <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ECfEAACwBmk">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ECfEAACwBmk</a>	{23:32}
(72)	: <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NvNxq8VGk3c">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NvNxq8VGk3c</a>	{11:34}
(73)	: <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RzDlBrYZUVY">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RzDlBrYZUVY</a>	{15:42}
(74)	: <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4FVcv4RBRUI">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4FVcv4RBRUI</a>	{40:09}
(75)	: <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=t076Hj-K08I">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=t076Hj-K08I</a>	{6:02}