



Indonesian Studies
Working Papers

No. 10


November
2009

Place in Indonesian Conversational Narrative

Dwi Noverini Djenar
Department of Indonesian Studies
The University of Sydney



The University of Sydney



The Indonesian Studies Working Papers series is published electronically by the department of Indonesian Studies at the University of Sydney.

© Copyright is held by the author or authors of each working paper. Electronic and paper copies may be made of a working paper, but its format may not be altered in any way without the author's permission.

Note: The views expressed in each paper are those of the author or authors of the paper. They do not represent the views of the series editors, the department of Indonesian Studies, or the University of Sydney.

Series Editors: Michele Ford and Keith Foulcher

Place in Indonesian Conversational Narrative

Dwi Noverini Djenar
Indonesian Studies
The University of Sydney

Studies on spoken narratives commonly consider information about place as background material that informs listeners of the spatial setting of a narrative.¹ Early studies such as Labov and Waletzky (1967) for example, treat place as part of ‘orientation’, that is, as narrative material that contains particulars about the physical and the temporal setting as well as the ‘behavioural situation’ of the characters. Place may be represented by geographical names (e.g. Indonesia, Melbourne) or non-geographical terms (e.g. home, department store, school); it may also be referred to by deictic terms such as ‘here’ and ‘there’.

Polanyi (1989: 20) accounts for references to place as part of ‘durative-descriptive propositions’, that is, propositions encoded in clauses that do not move a story along temporally and typically contain ‘descriptions of characters, settings, and motivations, as well as habitual, iterative, and non-instantaneous actions and actions that are semantically interpreted to off the main time line, in flash sequences’. Although durative-descriptive propositions do not move a story temporally, according to Polanyi, they often predominate. They also contain other important information such as evaluative comments about the states of affairs that are altered by the key events in a narrative. As key events are the crucial part of a narrative, speakers often emphasise the state of affairs altered by these events.

Norrick (2000: 33) considers place references as part of ‘framing’ (after Tannen 1979), frames being semantic schemata that facilitate the interpretation of discourse. ‘General frame’ contains information that relates to the narrative as a whole and not directly to the narrative proper, while ‘narrow frame’ includes information particularised to certain actions in the narrative and directly relates to the narrative proper. Narrative proper in Norrick’s view, as in Labov and Waletzky’s, is understood as a sequence of clauses that contains at least one temporal juncture, and is considered to be semantically equivalent in English to the temporal conjunction ‘then’. For example, the clause sequence ‘he attacked me’ and ‘the friend came in’ is semantically equivalent to ‘he attacked me then the friend came in’. References to place and time are found in both the general and narrow frames.

In considering place as part of the orientation or framing material, Labov and Waletzky, Polanyi, and Norrick, clearly recognise its significance. Nonetheless, references to place are rarely considered as information that merits greater attention beyond its function as orienting element. Moreover, the ways in which place as an orienting element interacts with other parts of a story is seldom discussed in detail. Studies such as Labov and Waletzky, Polanyi, and Norrick (see also Eggins and Slade, chapter 6) are concerned with identifying the structural elements of a narrative, focusing on the key events and the change of state brought about by them, underscoring the significance of temporal progression in the unfolding of these events. The focus on events has meant that relatively little attention has been afforded to other functions of place. My purpose in this paper is to explore what these other possible functions are. How do speakers make references to place? How do these references relate to the story as a whole and to its particular parts? In what way do place

¹ I use ‘listener’ to refer to participants in a conversation excluding the speaker, and ‘interlocutor’ or ‘speech participant’ to refer to all participants including the speaker.

terms reflect what a story is about? What do speakers achieve by making references to place in their stories? I propose that place, more than simply serving as an orienting element, is often what makes a story. Stating this might be objected to as merely repeating what is already understood in most narrative theories, namely, that place constitutes significant background material for a story ('place X is where the story happened') together with evaluative comments. However, I would argue that affording greater attention to place is not merely a matter of agreeing that place frames a story but also rendering explicit the interconnection between place, people, objects, and events. Furthermore, through references to place, speakers make claims about themselves and their social orientations.

Although much attention has been given to the study of conversational Indonesian (see e.g. Englebretson 2003, Ewing 2005), research on Indonesian conversational narrative is rare. In particular, as far as I am aware, there has not yet been any study of place in conversational narrative. This paper is intended to be a contribution toward that area of research. The stories to be examined are taken from two spontaneous conversations between members of a small network of friends. Members of this elite friendship group share the following attributes. All are university graduates who have either studied or worked overseas and all work as professionals in different fields such as journalism, education, and the academia. The group is elite in the sense that, being university graduates and professionals, they represent a very small proportion of Indonesia's population. They are also elite in the sense that all members of the network are graduates of one of Indonesia's largest universities and hold important positions within their workplaces and other institutions. All were aged between 32 and 38 at the time of recording (1997-1998) and were in close contact with each other. With the exception of one participant who is originally from Riau (East Sumatra), members of the group were born and raised in different parts of Java. Being close friends, they share many background assumptions, some of which are drawn upon in the conversations. The interactions took place within the context of 'catch-up' occasions in which members talk freely about their experiences and opinions on various issues. There were no topic prompts. Each recorded conversation is 45 minutes long.

The paper is organised as follows. The section immediately following discusses the 'small stories' approach to narrative (Bamberg 2004a, 2004b, 2005, Georgakopoulou 2006a, 2006b), an approach which focuses on describing what speakers accomplish through talk in interaction. I then relate this approach to Schefloff's (1972) study on 'place formulations', Barbara Johnstone's (1990) study on community stories, and philosophical studies of place (Casey 1997, Malpas 1999). I then use a story from Norrick's (2000) study to show the relation between references to place to key events in the narrative proper, arguing in particular that the significance of place in the orientation part of the story has been overlooked. The analysis of the Indonesian stories is given in the two sections that follow. The first story, *Way Kambas*, is an account of a fieldwork experience at a national park, and at a glance, looks similar to Labov and Waletzky's 'danger of death' stories. The second story, *Ullen Sentalu*, is a description of a visit to a new museum. These stories of place are both tied to claim making and serve as spaces where speakers articulate their social and professional values through interaction.

Narrative structure and small stories

Narrative in the Labov and Waletzky tradition is defined as verbalisation of temporally sequenced past events. This focus on past events is also found in Norrick's and Polanyi's studies. According to Polanyi (1989: 16), a story occurs in 'one specific past time world in order to make some sort of point about the world which teller and story recipients share', and includes 'events which took place in particular circumstances, involved particular

characters, and gave rise to states of affairs which contrast in some way with the situation obtaining in the storyworld at the beginning of the story' (1989: 21-22).²

Norrick defines narrative as 'a coherent set of two or more narrative elements', 'narrative elements' being understood as 'a past tense clause describing an action or change of state' (2000: 28). A minimal narrative must contain at least two clauses, a clause being understood as an information unit in the sense of Chafe (1982, 1994), e.g.

Judy loaded the car
and John drove off.

A developed narrative contains the narrative elements and other structural parts shown below. Not all narratives have all these parts, but to qualify as narrative, a story must contain at least two of these structural elements (Norrick 2000: 33):

The abstract, which answers the question, "What was this about?"

The orientation, which answers the questions, "Who, what, when, where?"

The main action

The evaluation, which answers the question, "So what?"

The result or resolution, which answers the question, "What finally happened?"

The coda, which puts off any further questions about what happened or why it mattered.

However, whereas Labov and Waletzky's study is essentially monadic³ (based on the story told by one speaker) and elicited through an interview, both Polanyi and Norrick show that narrative is jointly accomplished. Nevertheless, their emphasis on the structural coherence of past events means that references to place, though recognised as important in setting a story, remain relegated to the position of being background materials, secondary to the main events that constitute the narrative proper. As such, many stories about place, such as *Ullen Sentalu*, would be dismissed as being non-narrative due to their seeming lack of narrative elements.

An alternative approach to narrative analysis that places less insistence on temporal and event coherence is the 'small stories' analysis (Bamberg 1997, 2004a, 2004b, 2005, 2006, Georgakopoulou 2006a, 2006b). 'Small stories', according to Georgakopoulou (2006a: 123) is 'an umbrella-term that covers a gamut of under-represented narrative activities, such as tellings of ongoing events, future or hypothetical events, shared (known) events, but also allusions to tellings, deferrals of tellings, and refusals to tell'. Stories are 'small' in the sense that they may be smaller in quantity (e.g. shorter than biographical narratives), often told in passing in everyday encounters (Bamberg 2004b: 367), and metaphorically small compared to 'big' and full-fledged, prototypical narratives (e.g. Labov and Waletzky's). A small stories analysis is interested in looking closely at the way descriptions and evaluations are sequentially ordered in interaction, arguing that 'particular descriptions and evaluations are chosen for the interactive purpose of fending off and mitigating the interpretations of (present) others' and that they 'rhetorically function to convey how speakers signal to their audience how they want to be understood' (Bamberg 2006: 145).

Small stories are, according to Bamberg (2005: 223-224), 'rhetorical tools for point or claim making'. In telling a story, a speaker ultimately makes claims about her/his sense of self or identity, and in her/his attempts to make these claims understood, s/he also offers

² Eggins and Slade (1997: 236-263) distinguish between storytelling that focuses on the encounter and resolution of a problematic experience (as exemplified in Labov and Waletzky's study) and that which focuses on other aspects of the teller's experience. To them, 'narrative' belongs to the former category.

³ This term is borrowed from Georgakopoulou (2006a), used in her study to contrast with stories which are dyadic (constructed by the speaker in interaction with her/his interlocutor(s)).

counter claims in the face of possible misunderstandings. As Bamberg states: ‘In sum, narratives, irrespective of whether they deal with one’s life or an episode or event in the life of someone else, always reveal the speaker’s identity.’ This identity locally emerges through interaction rather than being pre-established independently of it (De Fina et al. 2006: 5). This is not to deny that there are social categories of identity recognised at the societal or community level, but it identifies which of these are of relevance to speech participants at a particular point in time is locally determined.

Recognition of the importance of descriptions and evaluations in conveying how a speaker wants to be understood opens an opportunity for references to place to be considered not as mere orienting material, but more significantly as part of the speaker’s overall claim making. In talking about a place, a speaker therefore also makes claims about her/himself. Paying close attention to the co-ordination of talk enables us to understand how this is achieved.

Place formulations and experience of place

The idea that place terms may indicate something more than a spatial setting has been touched upon for example by Harvey Sacks (1992[1966]: 462) who notes that in uttering ‘I’m going to the bathroom’, a speaker is not only mentioning a location but also announcing an activity that s/he is going to engage in, though this activity is not mentioned. Similarly, the utterance ‘I’m going to bed’ announces an activity that is not named. Schegloff (2001: 234) also points out that references to place serve a variety of purposes in talk and constitute an ‘action’, similar to other speech acts such as announcing, instructing, asking, and so on. The following example from Schegloff’s earlier study (1972: 98) is illustrative:

- (1) A: You uh wha ‘dijuh do, fer a living?
B: Ehm, I work inna driving school.

Here speaker A is asking B about what kind of occupation s/he holds. Rather than specifying this occupation, B answers with a place reference. Without further information, we have no way of knowing what kind of work B does in the driving school. S/he may be a driving instructor, an administrative officer, or something else.

The mention of a certain place can also evoke status (high or low). Consider (2) for example.

- (2) A: *Ibu* *kerja apa?*
Mother work what
‘Where does (your) mother work?’
B: *Di DPR*
at parliament
‘At parliament.’

Unless B’s family is from a low socio-economic class it is unlikely that s/he is interpreted as saying that her mother works as a cleaner at the parliament building. The mention of a place such as the parliament evokes an institution high enough in social status that B would hardly need to specify what her mother’s occupation is. It is possible for B to answer with an alternative place name, such as *Di Senayan* ‘in Senayan’ (the location of the Indonesian parliament building) for instance, but this would not invite the sort of inference that *Di DPR* does. Schegloff (1972: 99) refers to the issue of choice of term as a problem of place formulations. To him, the question regarding references to place is not which of the available

place terms will be chosen for a given situation, but rather, ‘which of the alternative ways of talking about a non-place concept (e.g. occupation, stage of life, activity) is a place term’. In other words, when a speaker uses a place term to convey something other than a spatial setting, in spite of the availability of other equally suitable formulations that are non-place formulations, it is the concern of an analyst to find out why.

Schegloff also observes that in any given talk, terms selected by a speaker seem to ‘go together’ or ‘fit each other’ and constitute the topic (of talk). Thus a topic about someone’s mother working for the Indonesian parliament might include references to the uniquely shaped parliament building, the mother’s position in the parliament, the names of members of parliament, the sitting arrangement for parliament sessions, the nature of parliament debates and the mother’s participation in them, and so forth.

The notion that place terms go together and constitute the topic of talk finds an echo in philosophical studies of place. Studies such as Malpas (1998, 1999) and Casey (1997), consider place more abstractly as a concept that encompasses physical locations as well as people, objects, and activity. According to Malpas (1999: 105), place ‘contains sets of interconnected locations that are nested within those places’ and thoughts about one’s own location invites those about other locations. Place, then, brings up other places. As he writes (1999: 170-1):

Places always open up to disclose other places within them (within the place that is a garden or a house, a town or a countryside, there are places for different activities, for different things, for different moods, for different people), while from within any particular place one can always look outwards to find oneself within some much larger expanse (as one can look from the room in which one sits to the house in which one lives).

Place, as an abstract concept, brings up other places in the following ways. First, it enables us to identify a certain place as being that in which an experience is possible, and hence to treat it as the place of that experience. Second, the concept of place gives rise to the development of concrete representations of our conceptualisation of that place, in the form of, for example, place terms, descriptions, maps, and symbols, which, to Malpas, are crucial in making possible the identification of places. In this regard, the assemblage of place terms that constitutes the topic of talk that Schegloff refers to can be understood as a concrete representation of a more abstract sense of place.

The interconnection between place, people, and objects is also demonstrated in Johnstone’s (1990) study on the stories told by the people of Fort Wayne (middle America). In reading through the stories, Johnstone is struck by the amount of detail about places, times, and people that storytellers supply. These are details which do not relate directly to the recounted events (‘extrathematic’ details, in Johnstone’s term). Tannen (2007: 139), who made a similar observation on the stories she examines, argues that the details create vividness of imagery and often evoke an emotional response in the hearer. By giving details, speakers satisfy her/his desire for self-involvement and give an impression of verisimilitude. Details in the Fort Wayne stories, according to Johnstone, create an impression of factualness and give a ‘local colour’ (1990: 108). They make places, people, and times easy to imagine. The supply of extrathematic details also reflects the community’s unspoken communicative convention that stories are supposed to be a true recounting of facts, not a form of entertainment, which means that speakers have the responsibility to give explicit factual information necessary to be understood. Stories are therefore tied to the places, people, and times mentioned in them. The two Indonesian stories to be discussed will show that as well as representing the speaker’s experience with a place, people, and objects and the genuineness

of that experience, details pertaining to place are used as a rhetorical tool to assert something about one's self.

Norrick's 'First Job' example

In this section I would like to show, through a reanalysis of the story 'First Job' (Norrick 2000: 30-31), that in the service of identifying the prototypical narrative elements in a story, the function of place references is overlooked. The place terms in the story below occur at the beginning as well as in the narrative proper. The story is cited in full below (italics in original). In his analysis, Norrick identifies lines 17-19 ('I remember the most embarrassing moment of my *life* happened then') as the beginning of the story proper, and lines 1-16 as background material for the embarrassing incident. The main action or the 'narrative elements' are identified as lines 42-45 (shown in bold).

First Job

- 1 Ellen: what was *your* first job?
- 2 April: first job, um oh
- 3 that was at the Halsted Burger King
- 4 in Halsted Minnesota.
- 5 Ellen: that near your house?
- 6 April: about six miles away.
- 7 Ellen: m-hm.
- 8 April: and they- they built it brand new,
- 9 and I was one of the *first* employees,
- 10 and because of that
- 11 we ah- um we had a head honcho woman
- 12 from International Burger King
- 13 come and train everybody in.
- 14 because there was like thirty of us?
- 15 Ellen: wow. Yeah?
- 16 April: and uh we had about a week of training
- 17 and I remember
- 18 the most embarrassing moment of my *life*
- 19 happened then. {laughs}
- 20 Ellen: {laughing} what does that *mean*? {laughing}
- 21 April: {laughing} um no this is just-
- 22 I can't believe I did this
- 23 but- um I was really nerv-
- 24 well it was my first *job*,
- 25 and I was nervous
- 26 and there's so much to learn.
- 27 I mean y'know there's so many things at Burger King
- 28 you have to [make and uh-]
- 29 Ellen: [how old were you?]
- 30 April: I was like a sophomore in high school.
- 31 Ellen: okay.
- 32 April: yeah, [the summer after my sophomore year.]
- 33 Ellen: [you were young,] okay.
- 34 April: and um we were learning the drive-through
- 35 and just the thought of speaking on-

the beginning of the story (line 3) is crucial in providing a contrast to ‘McDonalds’ in line 42, because it is through this contrast that we can apprehend the story as being one about an embarrassing moment in April’s life. Without it, the mention of ‘McDonalds’ does not invite the same inference. The main action (lines 42-45) derives its relevance precisely from the speaker’s misidentification of place.

Burger King does not only frame the story in the sense that it is where the story happens but also it is what makes the story worth telling. It is afforded significance early in the conversation by being described as ‘six miles away’ (line 6), which implies that, although far, it was a place where a job worth pursuing was found. The importance of the job training is indicated by the mention of the presence of a manager (‘head honcho woman’, line 11) from the company’s main branch (‘International Burger King’, line 12). The mention of this larger place suggests that the standing of Burger King as a large fast food chain is comparable to McDonalds. Having this knowledge heightens the speaker’s sense of embarrassment in making the error. The telling point of the story therefore rests upon and is comprehensible by virtue of this built up information about the place. Although ‘McDonalds’ is the only place included in the main action clauses, its mention only becomes meaningful when juxtaposed with ‘Burger King’ and its nested location, ‘the drive-through’ (line 34). These place terms thus fit each other and together they make the story. Through this story, Ellen presents herself as an inexperienced employee, which she attributes to young age and the job being her first.

The recognition that lines 1-16 are tied to the main action takes us to the following question. Where does the story begin? If we agree with Norrick, it begins in line 17 in which April says she remembers her most embarrassing moment (‘and I remember’). And indeed this is true when we consider place to be framing material that does not participate in the narrative proper. The identification of line 17 as the beginning of the story also reflects Norrick’s research concerns, namely, the remembering and verbalisation of past experience (2000: 6-9). But the embarrassing experience itself is dependent upon to the recollection of a place (Burger King), which is verbalised early in the conversation. Recollection of this place is in turn invited by the question from the interlocutor (Ellen) who asks April to recall her first job. This question itself presupposes some account of inexperience in the answer. In this sense, the main action can be expected from the question posed at the beginning (Tannen 1978, 1979). It is also in this sense that April’s answer in lines 2-4 (‘first job, um oh that was at the Halsted Burger King in Halsted Minnesota’) marks the beginning of her verbalisation of past experience.

Way Kambas

The first of the two Indonesian stories, which I call *Way Kambas*, is an excerpt from a long conversation between speakers E, N, and B.⁴ The main speaker is E, an entomologist by profession. The story is about her PhD fieldwork experience in the Way Kambas National Park, South Sumatra. To facilitate the discussion I segment this story into three parts. Part 1 describes the ranger who accompanies E during the fieldwork. Part 2 describes a scary experience in the park. This part also contains the narrative elements. Part 3 contains E’s evaluative comments about the whole story, taking us back to the beginning of the story.

The story is introduced in Part 1, given below, with a mention of the national park Way Kambas in line 1. This place is then nested within a larger and more general place

⁴ Like Norrick’s ‘First Job’, the numbered lines represent intonation units. In the analysis, the italicised *Way Kambas* refers to the story title, while the non-italicised form refers to the name of the national park. A list of transcription conventions is provided at the end to the paper.

(*taman nasional* ‘national park’, line 3). The name Way Kambas is mentioned again in line 20.

Way Kambas (Part 1)⁵

- 1 E: Yang di **Way Kambas** itu ada lagi.
 2 Yang karena .. gini ya.
 3 Kalo ... e= di **taman nasional** itu,
 4 kalo ada yang e lagi penelitian gini,
 5 terus ada yang ditugaskan untuk ndampingi,
 6 itu ha=rus apa yang dicari si peneliti
 7 itu harus sampe dapat gitu lho.
 8 Harus bantu sampe dia berhasil.
 9 N: Berat juga ya.
 10 E: Berat.
 11 Makanya itu
 12 pas itu pas apa namanya –
 13 Pokoknya <Q-Rg Ibu mau ke mana? Q-Rg>⁶
 14 <Q-Sp Ke sini Q-Sp>.
 15 Dia itu ndak akan bilang situ bahaya ndak.
 16 <Q-Rg Oh iya Q-Rg>,
 17 tapi dia jaga-jaga supaya ini bisa ngambil
 di @si@tu,
 18 dan tidak kena bahaya [gitu lho].
 19 N: [O=h].
 20 E: Lha itu .. di **Way Kambas** gitu.
- 1 E: In Way Kambas it's another story
 2 ... Which because .. it's like this.
 3 Whenever .. er= .. in national parks,
 4 .. whenever there is someone who er .. is doing research like this,
 5 and someone has been appointed to be their guide
 6 what the researcher is looking for
 7 mu=st end up being found .. you know.
 8 (He) must help the researcher until they get it.
 9 N: (It's) not easy then.
 10 E: Not easy.
 11 .. That's why
 12 when .. when, what's it called --
 13 Basically <Q-Rg Where do you want to go? Q-Rg>
 14 <Q-Sp (I want to work) here. Q-Sp>.
 15 He won't say it's dangerous there, no.
 16 <Q-Rg Right Q-Rg>,
 17 but he will keep a look out so the researcher gets (their specimens) @there@,
 18 and they don't run into any danger .. [like that].
 19 N: [O=h].
 20 E: That's it .. in Way Kambas it's like that.

⁵ Due to space, a morphemic gloss is not provided.

⁶ ‘Q-Rg’ indicates the speech of the ranger, and ‘Q-Sp’, the speaker’s.

Speaker E begins her story in line 1 by indicating that she is about to tell a story about her experience in a particular national park, but instead of giving further details about its location and the time of her visit, she continues in line 2 by signalling that she is about to say something else. In line 3 she begins to talk about how things operate at a national park when a researcher comes to conduct fieldwork, namely, that a ranger is assigned to help the researcher find what she is looking for. In lines 11-12 she signals a shift from talking about rangers in general to a particular ranger who assisted her.⁷ We know that she is referring to her past experience by the use of temporal conjunction *pas* ‘when’ in line 12.

Part 1 of *Way Kambas* is told with a sense of authority. In lines 13, 14, and 16, E quotes the supposed verbatim exchange between the ranger and herself. By quoting this exchange, she assures the listeners of the authenticity of her experience and at the same time asserts the right to narrate that experience (Heritage and Raymond 2005, Raymond and Heritage 2006). E’s experience of Way Kambas gives her a privileged access to knowledge of that place and to claim that knowledge (Myers 2006). In line 20 E repeats the name Way Kambas to round off her description. As Tannen (1987, 2007; also Norrick 2000: 57-65) shows, repetition is a common strategy in conversation and serves various functions such as to segment parts of a story and to create dramatic effects.

In Part 2, E elaborates on her claim to knowledge of the rangers’ code of conduct by recounting a dangerous situation that she and her ranger experienced at Way Kambas. Here she highlights the exemplary behaviour of the ranger in dealing with a situation. Part 2 also contains the narrative elements (given in bold, lines 39-40 and 42-43). I include line 20 below from Part 1 because as well as marking the end of that part, it also marks the beginning of Part 2.

Way Kambas (Part 2)

- 20 E: *Lha itu .. di **Way Kambas** gitu.*
 21 <Q-Sp *Saya mau masuk ke sini* Q-Sp>
 22 <Q-Rg *Oh ya* Q-Rg>,
 23 *dia terus .. terus=s*
 24 *.. jalan terus ngujuk gitu.*
 25 N: *Hm hm.*
 26 E: *Tak pikir orang tuh ngapai=n ngujuk ke sana jauh gitu.*
 27 *Terus saya masih wo=*
 28 *Kan itu .. <Q-Rg **Pokoknya .. gini aja Bu,***
 29 *kalo kerja kalo bisa jam empat keluar.*
 30 *Soalnya gajahnya keluar jam empat Q-Rg> gitu kan.*
 31 N&B: @@@
 32 E: *Iya.*
 33 *.. Terus saya 'kan juga berusaha supaya*
 34 *.. jam empat selesai.*
 35 *Nah waktu itu mendung gitu lho.*
 36 *Waktu itu mendung terus akhirnya*
 37 <Q-Sp *Sudah Mas .. ini sudah mendung* Q-Sp>
 38 <Q-Rg *Iya* Q-Rg> *dia itu cuman clingak-clinguk.*
 39 ***Saya pulang gitu***

⁷ Indonesian rangers are mostly men. We know that the one assisting E is a man from the address term *Mas* she uses in line 37.

- 40 .. <Q-Rg Ibu duluan Q-Rg> .. gitu.
 41 N: Hm.
 42 E: **Dia di belakang saya.**
 43 **Dah gitu ngunjal ambegan setelah sampe di jalan itu.**
 44 Ternyata
 45 .. malemnya itu gajah ngamuk di situ [yang saya masuk]
 46 N [@@]
 47 E: .. belum ketemu sampe hari i@tu.
 48 <L2Jv Dadi dheke jogo-jogo [engko mak bedhengus] gajahe metu gitu lho L2Jv>.
 49 N: [A=h]
 50 E: Ning <nggak> nggak –
 51 dia ndak diomongin.
 52 N: Soalnya kalo dia omong pasti udah <XX>
 53 B: [Iya].
 54 E: [Saya 'kan] nggak ngambil di situ sehingga
 55 .. nanti apa yang saya cari nggak dapat.
 56 Ndak bole=h .. gitu itu .. gitu lho.
- 20 E: That was .. in Way Kambas it's like that.
 21 <Q-Sp I want to go here Q-Sp>
 22 <Q-Rg Right Q-Rg>
 23 he kept going .. kept go=ing
 24 .. kept walking quickly.
 25 N: H-hm.
 26 E: I thought wh=at was he doing, rushing off into the distance like that?
 27 So I was still o=h
 28 Isn't that .. <Q-Rg Put it .. this way Bu⁸,
 29 when you're working make sure you're out by four o'clock
 30 Because the elephants come out at four Q-Rg> It's like that.
 31 N&B: @@@
 32 E: OK.
 33 .. So of course I tried to
 34 .. finish by four.
 35 Well, there were heavy clouds that afternoon
 36 It looked like rain, so finally
 37 <Q-Sp That's it Mas⁹ .. it looks like it's going to rain Q-Sp>
 38 <Q-Rg Ok Q-Rg> he just looked cautiously left and right.
 39 **I started walking back**
 40 **.. <Q-Rg You go first Q-Rg> .. that's what he said.**
 41 N: Mm.
 42 E: **He was behind me.**
 43 **We were almost out of breath when we got to the road.**
 44 It turned out
 45 .. the night before some elephants went on a rampage there [where I went]
 46 N: [@@]
 47 E: .. no-one had seen them since.

⁸ Address term for adult females.

⁹ Address term for adult males.

- 48 <L2Jv So he was on the lookout [in case suddenly] the elephants appeared,
you know L2Jv>
- 49 N: [A=h]
- 50 E: But <no> no—
- 51 he didn't say anything.
- 52 N: Because if he said something you would have <XX>
- 53 B: [Yeah].
- 54 E: [I wouldn't have] gone looking there, so
- 55 .. I wouldn't have got what I wanted.
- 56 He can't do= that .. you know.

As in Part 1, in Part 2, E continues to use direct speech as a rhetorical strategy to create a sense of authenticity to the story. Two instances are a repetition of the direct speech in Part 1, as shown below. The directional phrase *ke sini* '(to) here' in line 14 is repeated in line 21, while the phrase *oh iya* 'right' in line 16 is repeated in line 22. These instances of repetition illustrate the importance that E places on describing the ranger's code of conduct and her knowledge of that code.

- 14 <Q-Sp *Ke sini* Q-Sp>.
<Q-Sp Here Q-Sp>.
- 21 <Q-Sp *Saya mau masuk ke sini* Q-Sp>
<Q-Sp I want to go in here Q-Sp>
- 16 <Q-Rg *Oh iya* Q-Rg>,
<Q-Rg Right Q-Rg>
- 22 <Q-Rg *Oh ya* Q-Rg>,
<Q-Rg Right Q-Rg>

E's account in Part 2 also becomes more personal. Notice for example, the use of the first person pronoun *saya* in line 27. Temporal progression is shown through the clause *dia terus teru=s* 'he walked on walked on' (lines 23) and linking phrases *terus* 'and then' (lines 27 and 33) and *dah gitu* 'after that' (line 43).

Whereas in Part 1 speaker E introduces the role of the ranger, in Part 2 she presents him as an ideal ranger, someone with deep knowledge of safety in the park, who does not say much but knows how to ensure that researchers get the specimens they need. In lines 23-24, for example, E mentions that this ranger walks quickly straight and far ahead without telling her why he was going in the direction that he was (notice her puzzlement in line 26). Here she positions herself as a researcher who respects her guide. She trusts his word when he says that elephants usually roam the area around 4 pm and observes his instruction to finish her work around then (lines 33-34). The sense of danger is inexplicitly expressed in lines 39-43 (which I have identified as the main event) but is inferable from line 43 (E and the ranger walked quickly from the park back to the main road, to avoid an encounter with elephants). It is only in lines 44-45 that we learn about the reason for the ranger's instruction to E, indicated by N's response in the form of a short laugh in line 46. Further explication is given by E in lines 47-48. N's backchannel response in line 49 indicates her acknowledgment and understanding of E's explanation.

The comprehensibility of this part of E's story rests much on shared knowledge of place. Way Kambas is Indonesia's key conservation area for elephants. For Indonesians, elephants are as characteristic of Way Kambas as komodo dragons are of Komodo Island in Eastern Indonesia. Because of this shared knowledge, 'elephant' is an identifiable referent in

the story (Chafe 1994) and is expressed as a definite noun phrase (*gajahnya* ‘the elephant’, line 30). Unlike the carnivorous komodo dragons, elephants are not always thought of as dangerous animals. Television reports frequently show the Way Kambas elephants as tame animals, many being trained to help people do manual work and entertain visitors to the park.¹⁰ E’s story about a potential encounter with angry elephants therefore becomes meaningful given this background knowledge.

In lines 50-55, E repeats the description in Part 1 of the ranger’s code of conduct and relates it to her own experience (notice her use of first person pronoun *saya* in lines 54-55) before rounding it off with an evaluation in line 56. By personalising the description, E asserts her position as a researcher who has professional knowledge of fieldwork conduct, including how to work with a ranger.

Part 3 begins with an evaluation by N (lines 57-58), which prompts E to elaborate on what she thinks are the attributes of an ideal a ranger (lines 60-70). In lines 63-69, E describes what a ranger does to prepare for his task before closing with an evaluation in line 70. This part can be considered as a ‘coda’, that is, part of a story that gives an evaluation of the whole story and also takes us back to the beginning.

Way Kambas (Part 3)

- 57 N: Hm
 58 [Berat ya jadi ranger].
 59 E: [Wong mesti sel- kalo] –
 60 Makanya jadi ranger itu
 61 <Q-Rg Ibu mau kemana? Q-Rg> gini.
 62 <Q-Rg Yang mau diambil apa? Q-Rg> gitu.
 63 Dia sudah .. persiapan apa yang harus dibawa dia,
 64 ini gini gini .. gitu.
 65 N: Ehm.
 66 E: <Q-Sp Gimana Mas?
 67 Kira-kira ndak bisa ya ini? Q-Sp>
 68 <Q-Rg Oh ndak.
 69 .. Anu .. ndak pa-pa Q-Rg>.
 70 Padahal tuh kayaknya iya .. gitu lho.
- 57 N: Mm.
 58 [It’s not easy to be a ranger]
 59 E: [You have to always – whenever] –
 60 That’s why being a ranger is like
 61 <Q-Rg Where do you want to go? Q-Rg> right.
 62 <Q-Rg What are you looking for? Q-Rg> right.
 63 He’s got .. everything ready to take with him,
 64 All this stuff .. right.
 65 N: Mm.
 66 E: <Q-Sp So what do you think Mas?
 67 It’s not really possible, right? Q-Sp>
 68 <Q-Rg Oh no.
 69 .. er .. it’s not a problem Q-Rg>

¹⁰ The Way Kambas National Park website mentions, for example, that they have an elephant training program and have tamed 290 elephants (www.dephut.go.id/.../tn_waykambas.htm, accessed 15 May 2009).

70 when actually it looked like it was .. you know.

In this part of the story, E once again uses repetition of the direct speech she used earlier. As shown below, line 61 is a repetition of line 13.

13 *Pokoknya* <Q-Rg *Ibu mau ke mana?* Q-Rg>
 Basically <Q-Rg Where do you want to go? Q-Rg>
 61 <Q-Rg *Ibu mau kemana?* Q-Rg> *gini.*
 <Q-Rg Where do you want to go? Q-Rg> right.

This repetition, and the repetition alluded earlier in the discussion of Part 2 is noteworthy. In both parts of the story, what is repeated is the supposed exchange between E and the ranger. Apart from adding a dramatic effect and a vivid image of the exchange, the repetition is used here to suggest an image of E as a researcher who knows how to conduct herself professionally, evidence of which E's ability to develop a good rapport with a ranger.

Looking at the structure of *Way Kambas*, some might argue that this story is not so much about place as it is about a possible encounter with danger, similar to the 'danger of death' stories in Labov and Waletzky, and that the place merely frames the story. This view is perhaps acceptable if one is concerned with basically identifying the prototypical narrative structure. Part 1 of E's story, in which she painstakingly describes the duty of a ranger, would in that case be considered as extraneous background material that does not advance the story temporally. But it is information about the ranger that is re-emphasised in Part 3. Part 2, which contains the prototypical narrative, in fact serves as an illustration for Parts 1 and 3. The portrayal of an ideal ranger in Part 1 is justified through an illustration of the heroic quality of this ranger in Part 2. This quality is then reinforced in Part 3.

Like 'First Job', *Way Kambas* as a story arises from and is tied to the speaker's experience of place. But the two stories are structured differently. In 'First Job' we are provided with details about place, which build up and lead to the narrative proper before ending in a coda. By contrast, the point of the story in *Way Kambas*, which is indicated in E's description of the code of conduct in Indonesian national parks, is presented at the beginning. This is supported by an illustration in the middle part, and reinforced at the end. Through the story about the ranger, E presents her professional self, a self that is articulated and asserted locally through talk.

Ullen Sentalu

The second story, *Ullen Sentalu*, consists mostly of descriptive clauses, and, unlike *Way Kambas*, does not have a 'danger of death' element. The main speaker, M, is a travel journalist who visited a new museum which has just been built near the city of Yogyakarta, Central Java. As with *Way Kambas*, I also segment the story into parts to facilitate the discussion. In Part 1 M introduces the museum by mentioning the location and what kind of a museum it is, while in Part 2 she details the exhibits. Parts 3 and 4 contain clauses showing speakers N and S challenging M's account and M's response to them.

Part 1, given below, begins with a strong statement by M that museums are uninteresting because they are repositories for 'dead objects' (lines 1-3). In the preceding discourse, speakers M, N, and S criticise people in big cities such as Jakarta who prefer to frequent shopping malls to other public places such as museums and zoos.

Ullen Sentalu (Part 1)

- 1 M: *Musium memang nggak menarik kok.*
 2 *Cuman <Eng display Eng> barang mati gitu lho.*
 3 *Nggak ada yang menarik –*
 4 *Di Yogya,*
 5 *di Kaliurang*
 6 *itu ada musium baru nama-nya=*
 7 *Ullen Sentalu.*
 8 *A=*
 9 *Itu,*
 10 *musium batik.*
 11 *Tapi dia cuman –*
 12 *Dia biki=n*
 13 *apa gimana,*
 14 *ensiklopedi=*
 15 *kehidupan wanita Jawa.*
 16 N: *Oya?*
- 1 M: *Sure, museums in general aren't interesting.*
 2. *They only display dead objects.*
 3 *Nothing interesting –*
 4 *In Yogya,*
 5 *in Kaliurang*
 6 *there is a new museum called=*
 7 *Ullen Sentalu.*
 8 *Er=*
 9 *It's*
 10 *a batik museum.*
 11 *But they only –*
 12 *They created=*
 13 *what is it,*
 14 *an encyclopedia=*
 15 *of the lives of Javanese women.*
 16 N: *Oh yeah?*

In lines 1-3, M uses her negative statement about Indonesian museums to introduce her topic. The statement gives an implicit contrast between other museums (which are uninteresting) and the new Ullen Sentalu museum (lines 6-7). Ullen Sentalu is introduced, first, by a nested location (Kaliurang nested within a larger location, namely, Yogya; lines 4-5). All speech participants have lived and went to the same university in Yogya and are familiar with Kaliurang as a small recreation area on the outskirts of this city. The two referents are therefore identifiable. The mention of Yogya before Kaliurang is significant, not only because Yogya is a larger location and is therefore more identifiable, but also because Kaliurang and a batik museum evoke an unlikely association. Although N (see line 16) and S (whose turns are shown later in Part 3) are familiar with Kaliurang, they remember it as a small, relatively undeveloped recreation spot at the foot of Mount Merapi. As such, it is an unlikely place for a batik museum. Indeed, later in the story, S questions the suitability of Kaliurang as a museum location.

In lines 9-10, M mentions that the museum is a batik museum, implying that Ullen Sentalu is a different kind of museum. Having said so, she specifies that this new museum houses 'an encyclopedia of the lives of Javanese women' (lines 11-15). This statement is

preceded by the adversative conjunction *tapi* ‘but’ in line 11. This conjunction is significant. If one is familiar with places of interest around the city of Yogya, one would know that some upmarket batik galleries in this city stock a wide range of batik and they function as part-museum and part-store.¹¹ The speech participants share this knowledge. By using the conjunction *tapi* M mitigates potential criticism from her interlocutors that she is not telling them anything new. Lines 11-15 thus serve as a disclaimer for M. In this regard, N’s response in line 16 is worth noting because even after M provides a disclaimer, N is not entirely convinced, as indicated by her rising intonation (written in the transcription by a question mark).

Part 2 shows M giving details of the museum exhibits. These details illustrate what she has introduced and also justify her telling about the place.

Ullen Sentalu (Part 2)

- 17 M: *Jadi,*
 18 *semuanya itu serba yang masih—*
 19 *Mulai dari anak-ana=k*
 20 *gitu ya.*
 21 *Terus ada foto-nya.*
 22 *Jadi setiap .. <Eng display Eng> --*
 23 *Jadi baru mau buka=*
 24 *Januari ini nanti.*
 25 *Setiap <Eng display Eng>,*
 26 *jadi misalnya ada kain,*
 27 *gitu ya.*
 28 *Di situ ada lukisan-nya,*
 29 *menggambarkan siapa yang memakai dulu,*
 30 *siapa yang membuat disain-nya=*
 31 *Bagus.*
 32 *Siapa itunya gitu.*
 33 *Terus ada satu ruangan itu yang –*
 34 *Itu sebenarnya untuk e=*
 35 *pakaian pengantin gitu lho.*
 36 *Dia terangin satu-satu.*
 37 *Ini dari apa,*
 38 *ini apa maknanya apa gitu lho.*
 39 *Tapi dengan foto dan dengan barangnya,*
 40 *betul gitu lho.*
- 17 M: So,
 18 they’ve got everything
 19 From childhood=
 20 Right.
 21 Then (they have) photos
 22 So every .. display --
 23 So (this museum) will open
 24 this coming January.
 25 Every display,
 26 so for example where there might be a cloth,

¹¹ Galeri Supto Hudoyo and Galeri Amri Yahya are two long-standing and prominent examples.

27 something like that,
 28 there's a painting,
 29 showing who used to wear it,
 30 who created the design=
 31 Nice.
 32 Who it was, like that.
 33 Then there is one room where--
 34 It's actually for er=
 35 bridal attire, right.
 36 They explain (the items) one by one
 37 What this one is for,
 38 what this one means, you know.
 39 But with the photo and the items together,
 40 it all fits, you know.

It is interesting to note that nowhere in the story prior to line 30 does M explicitly mention that her knowledge of the museum is a result of a recent visit. Neither is such information invited by the listeners. This is possibly because the other participants share the knowledge that as part of M's work as a travel journalist, she is frequently invited to visit new tourist destinations. One can also infer from the following clues in the talk that it is a firsthand account: (a) the detailed nature of M's description of the exhibits, and her evaluative comment in line 31 (*bagus* 'nice'), suggesting that she was there and saw the exhibits; (b) the indication in line 33 that M moves from a larger, more general room to a particular room in the museum ('then there is this room where -'), and (c) the mention of date of the museum's opening in lines 23-24.

The evaluative comment in line 31 shows M making a further effort at convincing her listeners that Ullen Sentalu is not like other museums, and that it is worth hearing about. This effort is continued in lines 39-40 where M once again uses the adversative conjunction *tapi* 'but' to suggest a contrast between other museums and Ullen Sentalu. This conjunction also suggests M's assumption that the other participants share her perception of Indonesian museums as uninteresting places. By mentioning details such as the correct matching between the photographs (of Javanese women) and the exhibits (batik attire) at Ullen Sentalu, M indicates that this detail is important. This assertion, considered together with her evaluative comment at the opening of the story in Part 1 (lines 1-3), and the evaluative comment *bagus* 'nice' in line 31, suggest M's claim to authority as a travel journalist, that she has familiarity with Indonesian museums and is confident of her judgment about Ullen Sentalu.

Of interest in M's account up to this point is her use of third person pronoun *dia* 's/he', which I translate as 'they'. This pronoun appears in Part 1 (lines 11-12: *Dia bikin apa gimana, ensiklopedi kehidupan wanita Jawa* 'They made what is it, an encyclopedia of the lives of Javanese women') and Part 2 (line 36: *Dia terangin satu-satu* 'They explain (the items) one by one'). The use of *dia* in Part 1 is ambiguous, referring both to 'the people who set up the exhibits' and 'the museum' (personified). In Part 2 the pronoun may refer to a person who showed her around the museum and explained the exhibits to her but is not explicitly mentioned, or to the caption attached to each exhibit. The ambiguity is not resolved even though towards the end of the story, shown later in Part 4 (line 68), we learn that M was escorted during her travel. This unresolved ambiguity can be considered as a linguistic articulation of the interconnectedness between people, place, and objects. Thoughts of place bring up the people and objects in them. M's experience of Ullen Sentalu therefore is not divorceable from the objects she saw and the people she met there.

Part 2 is the only part of the story in which there is an indication of temporal progression, but this indication is also ambiguous at best. The conjunction *terus* ‘and then’ in line 33 can be interpreted as indicating M’s movement from one room to another (from a room with general exhibits to a special room where bridal attire is kept), or as part of a listing of items in a series (there was a cloth, a painting related to this cloth, and then, there is this room; see lines 26-35). M’s story, then, is not a narrative in the prototypical sense, but as Georgakopoulou (2006a) argues, ‘small stories’, though non-canonical, are narratives nonetheless.¹²

Part 3, as given below, begins with N asking M to repeat the name of the museum. Note that this question comes after the provision of details by M of the quality of the exhibits. Also recall that N previously responded to M’s description with a sceptical *Oya?* ‘Oh yeah?’ (Part 1, line 16).

Ullen Sentalu (Part 3)

- | | | |
|----|----|--|
| 41 | N: | <i>Itu nama musiumnya apa?</i> |
| 42 | M: | <i>Ullen Sentalu.</i> |
| 43 | N: | <i>Ullen Sentalu?</i> |
| 44 | M: | <i>Di Kaliurang.</i> |
| 45 | | <i>Persi=s di Kaliurang</i> |
| 46 | | <i>Jadi kalo yang di=</i> |
| 47 | | <i>di apa tu,</i> |
| 48 | | <i>Di tempat rekreasi itu,</i> |
| 49 | | <i>itu belok ke kiri <Jv mentok Jv>.</i> |
| 50 | | <i>Ba=gus.</i> |
-
- | | | |
|----|----|--|
| 41 | N: | That museum, what is it called? |
| 42 | M: | Ullen Sentalu. |
| 43 | N: | Ullen Sentalu? |
| 44 | M: | In Kaliurang. |
| 45 | | Ri=ght in Kaliurang |
| 46 | | So at the |
| 47 | | what is it, |
| 48 | | At that recreation park, |
| 49 | | You turn left and keep going to the end. |
| 50 | | It’s ni=ce. |

N’s request suggests a change of attitude toward M’s story, from scepticism to interest. Schegloff (1972: 109) argues that in using place names and in asking for them, speakers claim recognisability or seek to provide for future recognisability. N’s request is an attempt to ensure future recognition of Ullen Sentalu. Notice that she repeats the name in line 43, to check that she hears the name correctly. Interestingly, M responds in line 44 by repeating the name of the location ‘Kaliurang’, which was a potential point of contention that she was concerned to mitigate at the beginning of the story. M further tries to convince N of the truthfulness of her story by stressing the name of this location in line 45 and supplying more precise locational details in lines 46-49. In line 50, she repeats the same evaluative comment

¹² *Ullen Sentalu* approximates a ‘recount’ in Eggins & Slade’s (1997: 259) analysis. Recounts, according to them, are a type of storytelling that focuses on the record of a series of events rather than on a main action, and presents an ongoing interpretation and evaluation of the events. *Ullen Sentalu* does not contain events *per se*, however.

she gave earlier in Part 2 (line 31), this time with a lengthened vowel in the first syllable (*ba=gus* ‘ni=ce’, line 50), stressing that her judgment of the museum is not misguided.

Part 4 begins with S challenging M’s story by expressing her scepticism about the suitability of Kaliurang as a museum location (line 51). This obliges M to further justify her account by giving more locational details.

Ullen Sentalu (Part 4)

- 51 S: *Tapi kok di situ ya bikinnya ya?*
 52 M: *.. E= salah satu usaha untuk menghidupkan Kaliurang lagi.*
 53 *Soalnya di sananya kan sekarang –*
 54 *Bukan di Kaliurangnya,*
 55 *tapi di –*
 56 *Kalo mau ke= apa sih –*
 57 *Kalo ke=*
 58 *Pakem ke utara itu ada jalan,*
 59 *.. memecah gini lho.*
 60 *Satunya ke –*
 61 *Itu di situ tuh sekarang sudah ada <Eng golf course Eng> gitu lho.*
 62 *Oh Kali- --*
 63 *Pakem ada <Eng golf course Eng>.*
 64 S: *Nggak kebayang [ya]?*
 65 M: *[O iya].*
 66 *O kamu nggak kebayang.*
 67 *Aku aja dibawa ke sana –*
 68 *<Q Lho Mas, Q>*
 69 *<Q Di sini itu ada yang nginep sini?Q>*
 70 *<Q O sekarang malah justru,*
 71 *orang lebih banyak ke sini dari pada yang ke Ambarukmo Q>.*
- 51 S: But why did they build it there?
 52 M: .. Er= (it’s) one of the attempts to reinvigorate Kaliurang.
 53 Because – you know what it’s like there now –
 54 Not right in Kaliurang itself,
 55 but in –
 56. When you go to what’s it called –
 57 Towa=rds
 58 Pakem to the north there is a road,
 59 .. which splits like this.
 60 One goes to –
 61 There’s a golf course there now, you know.
 62 Oh Kali –
 63 There’s a golf course at Pakem.
 64 S: Can’t imagine it, [can you]?
 65 M: [No]
 66 Oh you can’t imagine it.
 67 Even I when (I was) taken there --
 68 <Q-Sp By the way Mas, Q-Sp>
 69 <Q-Sp Here, do people stay here? Q-Sp>

70 <Q-Ht Oh now they do.¹³
 71 More people come here than to Ambarukmo Q-Ht>

M responds to S's challenge by revealing her knowledge of new tourist attractions in Kaliurang, asserting her professional stature as a travel journalist. She first tells S the reason for the choice of Kaliurang as the location for the new museum (line 52), then elaborates on it by giving details about other places of interest in the nearby area (a golf course (lines 61-63) and a big hotel (inferable from lines 67-71)).

S's statement in line 64 shows a softening of her previous scepticism. Here she gives an evaluation about Pakem, a nearby place long known as the location of a psychiatric hospital. The stigma attached to this hospital makes Pakem an unlikely location for a golf course and a big hotel.¹⁴ M's agreement with S's response in line 63 is followed by a strong claim to authority in lines 66-67, expressed by the use of the second person pronoun *kamu* 'you' (*O kamu nggak kebayang* 'Oh you can't imagine it', line 66), which is contrasted with first person pronoun *aku* 'I' in the following line (*Aku aja dibawa ke sana* 'even I when (I was) taken there').

In lines 68-71 M quotes the supposed exchange between herself and a person at the big hotel (whose name or position is not mentioned). The existence of this hotel is not even previously mentioned yet is inferable from this direct speech. Notice for example, the use of the verb *nginep* 'stay the night' (line 69) and the mention of *Ambarukmo* (line 71), the name of what has long been known as the largest hotel in the city of Yogya. The direct speech is structurally and symbolically significant for two reasons. First, it signals a further attempt by M to convince her interlocutors that her story is authentic. Second, the appearance of this direct speech following the contrastive use of second and first person pronouns symbolically shows M's final effort to establish her authority on the topic amidst challenges from S and N. By quoting the hotel person's speech M calls upon an independent authority to support her in proving the validity of her account.

Like *Way Kambas*, *Ullen Sentalu* is a recollection of an experience of a particular place. Like *Way Kambas*, the point of the story in *Ullen Sentalu*, namely that M has knowledge of a new museum which stands above other museums, is asserted at the beginning. This point continues to be asserted until the end, despite challenges from the other participants. Also, like E in *Way Kambas*, M uses quoted speech as rhetorical strategy not only to create a sense of authenticity to her story but also to assert her professional self. Through the telling of her experience, M presents herself as a travel journalist who has an appreciation for places of cultural value.

Conclusion

Both *Way Kambas* and *Ullen Sentalu* are stories told among intimates who share background knowledge about places. One difference is that whereas the interlocutors in *Way Kambas* have no first-hand experience of the place, those in *Ullen Sentalu* do (though of the larger locale, not of the museum itself). This difference has interesting implications in terms

¹³ Q-Ht indicates the speech of the hotel staff/guide to whom M's question in line 69 is directed. Q-Sp indicates M's self-quoted speech.

¹⁴ The stigma is often expressed, for example, in jokes, e.g. people often say of a person who is acting silly that s/he should be sent to Pakem, meaning to be sent to the psychiatric hospital in Pakem. It is interesting that in 2003, in an attempt to lift this stigma, the Pakem hospital was renamed *Rumah Sakit Grhasia Yogyakarta* ('Grhasia Yogyakarta Hospital') (*Kompas*, <http://www2.kompas.com/kompas-cetak/0312/18/jateng/754214.htm>, accessed 15 May 2009).

of the way that the stories are told and structured. *Way Kambas* is told with a strong sense of authority, which derives from the speaker's knowledge that within the context of the interaction, her experience of the place is unique. Not having experience of the place obliges the other speech participants to accept E's story at face value. What E says is received without contestation. By contrast, in *Ullen Sentalu*, the main speaker's attempt to claim authority is challenged by the other participants. To establish that authority she keeps supplying further details of the place she describes, and in addition, provides an independent, external support, through the use of direct speech. From the beginning of her story, M makes a careful choice of expression to mitigate potential criticisms, knowing that her interlocutors are familiar with the setting of her story. She makes a considerable effort to impress upon them that her account is worth listening to.

The participants in the two stories know the main speakers (E and M) as confident and assertive individuals who have wide experience in their fields and who possess professional integrity. Nonetheless, these participants respond differently to the stories. The difference in their responses contributes to the difference in the way these stories unfold. Challenges invite further justification of the account. The difference between the two stories therefore is a result not only of the speech participants being different individuals with different experiences and shared knowledge, but is also a product of the dynamics of their interaction.

Despite the difference in the interactional dynamics, the two stories share a similar structure. In both, the main point is not represented by some action told in temporal sequences, but rather, through descriptive clauses. This point is reinforced towards the end in a similar manner. In this sense, these Indonesian stories depart from prototypical stories such as 'First Job' whose main point is a culmination of the details of place that come before. Also, in the Indonesian stories, quoted speech is used as an important rhetorical tool, not only to create a sense of authenticity and assert the point of the story, but also to assert the speaker's identity. By quoting the supposed verbatim exchange with a person representative of the place being described, speakers E and M are able to present themselves as credible individuals who know how to conduct themselves professionally.

Transcription conventions

--	truncated intonation unit
-	truncated word
[]	speech overlap
...	medium pause
.....	short pause
=	lengthening
@	laughter
<Q Q>	quoted speech
<Jv Jv>	codeswitching (Javanese)

References

- Bamberg, Michael G. W. 1997. Positioning between structure and performance. *Journal of Narrative and Life History* 7(1-4): 335-342.
- _____. 2004a. 'I know it may sound mean to say this, but we couldn't really care less about her anyway': Form and functions of 'slut bashing' in male identity constructions in 15-year-olds. *Human Development* 47: 331-353.

- _____. 2004b. Talk, small stories, and adolescent identities. *Human Development* 47: 366-369.
- _____. 2005. Narrative discourse and identities. In Jan Christoph Meister, Tom Kindt, and Wilhelm Schernus, eds. *Narratology Beyond Literary Criticism: Mediality, Disciplinary*, 213-238. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- _____. 2006. Stories: Big or small: Why do we care? *Narrative Inquiry* 16(1): 139-147.
- Casey, Edward S. 1997. *The Fate of Place: A Philosophical History*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Chafe, Wallace. 1982. Integration and involvement in speaking, writing, and oral literature. In Deborah Tannen, ed. *Spoken and Written Language: Advances in Discourse Processes, Volume 9*, 35-54. Norwood, Ablex.
- _____. 1994. *Discourse, Consciousness, and Time*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- De Fina, Anna, Deborah Schiffrin, and Michael Bamberg, eds. 2006. *Discourse and Identity*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Eggins, Suzanne and Diana Slade. 1997. *Analysing Casual Conversation*. London: Cassell.
- Englebretson, Robert. 2003. *Searching for Structure: The Problem of Complementation in Colloquial Indonesian Conversation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Ewing, Michael. 2005. Colloquial Indonesian. In Alexander Adelaar and Nikolaus P. Himmelmann, eds. *The Austronesian Languages of Asia and Madagascar*, 227-258. London: Routledge.
- Georgakopoulou, Alexandra. 2006a. Thinking big with small stories in narrative and identity analysis. *Narrative Inquiry* 16(1): 122-130.
- _____. 2006b. Small and large identities in narrative (inter)action. In Anna de Fina, Deborah Schiffrin, and Michael Bamberg, eds. *Discourse and Identity*, 83-102. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heritage, John and Raymond, Geoffrey. 2005. The terms of agreement: Indexing epistemic authority and subordination in Talk-in-Interaction. *Social Psychology Quarterly* 68(1): 15-38.
- Johnstone, Barbara. 1990. *Stories, Community, and Place: Narratives from Middle America*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Labov, Williams and Waletzky, Joshua. 1967. Narrative analysis: Oral versions of personal experience. In June Helm, ed. *Essays on the verbal and visual arts: Proceedings of the 1966 Annual Spring Meeting of the American Ethnological Society*, 12-44. Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- Malpas, Jeffrey E. 1998. Finding Place: Spatiality, locality, and subjectivity. In Andrew Light & Jonathan Smith, eds. *Philosophies of Place: Philosophy and Geography III*. Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield.
- _____. 1999. *Place and Experience: A Philosophical Topography*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Myers, Greg. 2006. 'Where are you from?': Identifying place. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 10(3): 320-343.
- Norricks, Neal R. 2000. *Conversational Narrative: Storytelling in Everyday Talk*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Polanyi, Livia. 1989. *Telling the American Story: A Structural and Cultural Analysis of Conversational Storytelling*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- Raymond, Geoffrey and Heritage, John. 2006. The epistemics of social relations: Owning grandchildren. *Language in Society* 35: 677-705.
- Sacks, Harvey. 1992[1966]. The 'motive power' of a story: 'Ex-rationals'. In *Lectures on Conversation*, volumes I and II. Oxford: Basil Blackwell. Edited by Gail Jefferson, with an introduction by Emanuel Schegloff.

- Schegloff, Emanuel A. 1972. Notes on a conversational practice: Formulating place. In Pier Paolo Giglioli, ed. *Language and Social Context*, pp. 95-135. London: Penguin.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A. 2001. Discourse as an interactional achievement III: The omnirelevance of action. In Deborah Schiffrin, Deborah Tannen, and Heide E. Hamilton, eds. *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, 229-249. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Tannen, Deborah. 1978. The effect of expectations in conversation. *Discourse Processes* 1: 203-9.
- _____. 1979. What's in a frame? Surface evidence for underlying expectations. In Roy O. Freedle, ed. *New Directions in Discourse Processing*, 137-81. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex.
- _____. 1987. Repetition in conversation: Towards a poetics of talk. *Language* 63: 574-605.
- _____. 2007. *Talking Voices: Repetition, Dialogue, and Imagery in Conversational Discourse*. 2nd edn. New York: Cambridge University Press.