

Assessment in Jakartan Indonesian Food Reviews: A Case of

Nih

Rika Mutiara*

rika.mutiara@esaunggul.ac.id

Department of English Language Education

University of Esa Unggul

Jakarta, Indonesia

Abstract

The present study sheds light on epistemic stance of discourse markers *nih* on the assessment conducted on YouTube food reviews spoken in colloquial Jakartan Indonesian. *Nih* indicates speakers' claim of sharing knowledge. The speakers position themselves as the ones who have knowledge and share it with the watchers who are assumed as the ones with no knowledge of the objects. Mostly, *nih* is used in the first assessment. In the second assessment, the speakers tend to illustrate the unclear aspect of the first assessment by applying *nih*. The speakers also apply simile when assessing the dishes to associate the items assessed with more common items. Thus, it will be easier for the audience to comprehend every detail of the assessment. *Nih* tends to collocate with demonstratives *nih*, *ni*, and *ini*. With the collocations, the speakers guide the hearers to notice the objects or the actions before distributing the knowledge.

Keywords: Assessment, Epistemics, Discourse Markers, Jakartan Indonesian

1. Introduction

Human interaction is about positioning oneself and others. Speakers set up their positions in interaction. Through the talk, they reveal and negotiate their position. When the speakers position themselves, their utterances might represent epistemic stance. Epistemic stance concerns speakers' knowledge which is close to assessment conducted by the speakers (Du Bois, 2007). As the speakers get access to the object, they get knowledge about it. Then, based on the knowledge, they assess the object. The present study used the term first and second assessments similar to what has been done by the previous studies on assessment (Goodwin & Goodwin, 1992; Heritage, 2002; Heritage

& Raymond, 2005; Pomerantz, 1984). When a speaker begins initial assessment, it can be called as the first assessment. While responding to the first assessment, the recipient might produce another assessment which is called the second assessment. In the first assessment, the speakers convey their thought, expect agreement from the recipients and claim their epistemic rights (Heritage & Raymond, 2005; Pomerantz, 1984). They also can invite the recipients to assess (Couper-Kuhlen & Selting, 2017; Pomerantz, 1984). While the speakers of the second assessment might agree or disagree with the first assessment, the preferred response is agreement. An agreement can be at the upgraded, same, or downgraded levels. An intensifier can be seen in an upgraded agreement. Restating the evaluative terms mentioned in the first assessment can be found in the same evaluation agreement. A downgraded agreement is a sort of weak agreement in which the recipients' response is reaffirming stronger assessment (Pomerantz, 1984). Agreements can be prefaced with *oh* which shows speakers' independent access to the object. The speakers claim their epistemic rights, deliver knowledge to others and show that their assessment is based on their own experiences and knowledge (Heritage, 2002). The characteristics of the objects being assessed might appear in assessment. If it does not happen, speakers' personal stance such as in the utterance of *I loved them* occurs in assessment (Couper-Kuhlen & Selting, 2017).

In assessment, epistemic asymmetry can be seen clearly because the speakers do the actions of giving knowledge to achieve a symmetry condition among participants (Enfield, 2011). Stevanovic & Peräkylä (2012) also argue that the speakers have different positions regarding their knowledge in assessment. They manage to what extent they want to show their knowledge to others. Distinctive accesses to the object, moreover, result in different assessments (Goodwin & Goodwin, 1992). Whether an utterance is acknowledged as having epistemics can be seen from the responses of the hearers. Epistemic stance and other stances such as affective stance are close to each other (Stevanovic & Peräkylä, 2012). An utterance might sound like giving knowledge and expressing emotions at the same time. The hearers might perceive it as a message of epistemics or not. The way they perceive it might influence their responses.

Epistemics covers the issues of authority and access. Authority is categorized into two namely, source-based authority and status-based authority. In source-based authority, the speakers have knowledge because of their experiences while in status-based authority, the status matters. The speaker who is in the first position has the

primary right compared to the second speaker that mainly gives a response. Acknowledging the status of others is a part of the interaction that keeps the talk going on (Enfield, 2011). The discussion of epistemic includes primacy, access, and authority. Several previous studies on epistemic aspects deal with assessment/assessment turns. Claiming one's epistemic position is conducted by applying several strategies. In Japanese, detailed assessment is given as proof of the speaker's claim of epistemic primacy in assessment by using discourse marker (DM) *yo*. The speaker has a higher epistemic position compared to the hearers because they have epistemic access. They know better than the interlocutors. Despite asymmetry conditions, they still preserve solidarity with the other participant (Hayano, 2011). Furthermore, DM *yo* and *ne* are found to be used to negotiate speakers' positions in doing assessment. *Ne*, particularly, is used to indicate the speaker's different position (Morita, 2015). Negotiating positions was also found in Cantonese by applying DMs in the final positions of the utterances with other strategies such as silence and pause, interjections, and gap fillers to stress speakers' existing stance (Chor, 2018). Some DMs in Mandarin such as *aiyou* (Wu, 2018) and *wenti-shi* (Hsieh, 2018) are uttered to show the coming knowledge is newsworthy. *Aiyou* also indicates speakers' epistemic primacy and authority in disagreement. They prove it by giving knowledge that only belongs to them (Wu, 2018). A similar case happens in DM *mi* and *ta* in Upper Napo Kichwa spoken in the Ecuadorian Amazon. The DMs index knowledge that exclusively belongs to the speakers (Grzech, 2020).

Djenar *et al.* (2018) argue that DMs in Indonesian that occur on the right periphery of phrases/clauses deal with organizing speakers' positions in interaction. They studied the DMs *kan*, *sih*, *deh*, and *dong* in the register of novels while Hamdani and Barnes (2018) explored *kan* and *ya* in conversation. All the DMs are on the right periphery. However, DM *nih* which is also on the right periphery has not been analysed in terms of how it functions in positioning the speaker and the hearer. As there is no standard spelling in Colloquial Jakartan Indonesian (CJI), it may be written as *nih* or *ni*. The examples below were taken from Sneddon (2006). He used the term *dp* (discourse particle) for what is meant by DM in this paper (refer to the Appendices for transcription conventions and abbreviations).

Extract 1

- (1) *Belum foto lagi ni gua.*
not.yet photo again *dp* 1SG

I still haven't had my photo taken.

- (2) *Eh, Tina! Lagi makan nih?*
EXC T still eat *dp*

Hey, Tina. Are you still eating?

(Sneddon, 2006)

In (1) of Extract 1, *nih* is a declarative while (2) presents it in an interrogative. In both examples, *nih*'s position is on the right periphery of the predicate. Sneddon (2006) only gives a brief overview of *nih*. *Nih* is used to give stress to a predicate in an utterance. However, no closed examination was conducted on how *nih* plays a role at a discourse level. Sneddon's claim of the relation of *nih* to the predicate may lead to distinctive findings from other DMs on the right periphery. According to Ewing (2021), in Indonesian conversation, the pivotal role of predicates influences grammar. Little attention has been given to DM *nih* and how it is used to convey the grammatical aspects of talks. Studying DM *nih* is necessary to give a complete picture of how DMs on the right periphery convey epistemic stance in Indonesian. Thus, the present study aims to answer the following research questions:

1. How is epistemic stance built by using *nih*?
2. What grammatical construction is used with *nih*?

As epistemic stance is related to assessment, the present study focuses on the analysis of assessment with DM *nih* on food reviews as epistemics can be observed in food reviews. The speakers in the reviews speak CJI. CJI is a language variety spoken in Jakarta, the capital city of Indonesia. As the reviews are designed to be watched by the audience, the speakers talk to each other and the audience. They consider their relationship with the audience. The fact that the audience is not at the same time and place with them influences the way they interact including the way they convey the epistemic stance. In the reviews, they share knowledge based on their personal experiences.

In a preliminary study I conducted, I found that speakers tended to express their knowledge with DM *nih*. For example, in Extract 2, the speaker asserts knowledge to the hearers (audience and interlocutor). The talk takes place after the speakers taste several Padangnese dishes from a restaurant in Jakarta. In this extract, K evaluates the food (lines

1-2). *Nih* is used to strengthen the speaker's action of sharing knowledge with the audience. Speaker G agrees with this assessment (line 3). K gives more knowledge by specifying the location. He clarifies that it is the tastiest only for the scope of Jakarta. Stating that it is the tastiest also implies that K has a positive attitude toward the food. He enjoys it and finally gives a good assessment. Therefore, *nih* indicates that the speaker shared his knowledge about the object evaluated.

Extract 2

1 K: *Wah, ini salah satu Padang terenak nih (0.1)*

EXC this [one of the] tastiest Padangnese [the tastiest] DM

2 *yang pernah ku makan.*

which ever 1SG eat

Wow, this is one of the tastiest Padangnese dishes that I have ever eaten in Jakarta.

3 G: *Iya ya.*

yes INTJ

Right.

4 K: *Di Jakarta*

in Jakarta

In Jakarta

2. Declaratives in Indonesian

As given knowledge can be seen more clearly in declaratives, the section only discusses declaratives in Indonesian. Indonesian is a Malay variety spoken in Indonesia. Standard Indonesian is used in educational settings and news broadcasting. There are several regional varieties of colloquial Indonesians. The local languages, such as Betawinese, Sundanese, Javanese, Bataknese, Madurese, and Makassarrese, might influence the regional varieties. In CJI, English words might appear so does the vocabulary of the local languages. Both Standard Indonesian and Colloquial Indonesian apply the structure of SVO most of the time as in (1) and (2).

(1) *Saya membantu ibu.*

1SG help mother

I am helping mother.

(2) *Ali menjual mobilnya.*

A sell car.3SG:POSS

Ali sold his car.

In CJI, the subject might appear as a post-predicate in the final position of the utterance as in (1) or in the middle position in (3). The post-predicate is possible in intransitive (Cumming, 1986).

- (3) *Bingung gua sama dia.*
 confused 1SG with 3SG
 I am confused with her.

It is common for verbs to get affixes. Affixation in CJI is different from the ones in Standard Indonesian. In Standard Indonesian, it is *me-N* while in CJI, it is replaced by *N+*. The initial consonant of the base words influences the derived words (Sneddon, 2006). From the replacement, some verbs have affixes *ny-* and *ng-*.

- (4) N+c
N+cuci → *nyuci* (wash)
N+coba → *nyoba* (try)
N+cari → *nyari* (seek)
- (5) N+k
N+kumpul → *ngumpul* (gather)
N+kasih → *ngasih* (give)
N+kontrol → *ngontrol* (control)

Pronouns are frequently omitted in CJI. However, it does not distract the communication because the context helps the participant to get the meaning of the utterance (Cumming, 1986; Sneddon, 2006). In example 6, the pronoun is omitted in B's utterance.

- (6) A: *Siapa sih Ibu Reta?*
 who dp Mrs R
 Who is Mrs Reta?
- B: *Sekretarisnya Pak Harimurti.*
 secretary. 3SG.POSS Mr H
 [She is] Mr H's secretary.

(Sneddon, 2006)

(7) <i>ya</i>	<i>si</i>	<i>petani</i>	<i>ini</i>	<i>memetik</i>	<i>buah</i>	<i>pearsnya</i>	<i>dan</i>
yes	DET	farmer	this	pick	fruit	pears.3SG:POSS	and
<i>dikumpulkannya</i>	<i>dalam</i>	<i>keranjang</i>					
PASS.gather.DEF	in	basket					

This farmer is picking pears and putting them into a basket.

(Cumming, 1986)

3. Methodology

The data were obtained from the videos of food reviews on YouTube uploaded from May 2018 to April 2022. The language spoken in the videos is colloquial which has a salient feature namely DM. The interactions are between two reviewers or the reviewers and the seller. The reviewers are popular in Indonesia. In the videos, the reviewers are aware that they have audience (videowatchers). Thus, they do not only talk to each other but also to the audience. The talks in the videos were transcribed. In one extract, *nih* may occur several times. A YouTube video might consist of several scenes. In the present study, *nih* in the first utterance of a new scene was not selected to avoid a limited context in the data analysis.

The present study was conducted based on the principles of Interactional Linguistics with a focus on informal conversation. Interactional Linguistics, moreover, concerns how speakers organize language based on actions and sequences in interaction (Couper-Kuhlen & Selting, 2017). It is relevant to pinpoint participants' positions especially epistemics in assessing objects in food reviews. The first step to gather the data is by selecting *nih* that is used in assessment. As a result, there were thirty utterances of *nih* in the present study. The utterance of *nih* was identified whether it is on a first or second assessment. If it is on a first assessment, the response of the recipient was analysed. If it is on a second assessment, the assessment was identified as an agreement to the first assessment or not. In both assessments, how speakers convey their epistemic stance was analysed. Identification of a discourse strategy that accompanied *nih* in assessment was also conducted. A close examination of the data was also carried out to identify grammatical patterns used with *nih*.

4. Findings and Discussion

This section presents how epistemic stance was built. The speakers of *nih* tend to claim their epistemic position after observing or tasting the dishes. This can be seen from the existence of 27 occurrences of *nih* in the first assessment. There were only three occurrences of *nih* in the second assessment. Moreover, the discussion continues with grammatical structure with *nih*. In analysing grammar at the level of discourse in this genre, some salient features were found. The features are indicated by some lexical items (see Table 1). They function to build the discourse to present a comprehensive review to the audience.

Table 1: Salient features in the assessment with *nih*

Features	Frequency
Demonstratives (<i>ini</i> , <i>ni</i> , and <i>nih</i>)	12
Simile	5
Intensifier <i>banget</i> (very) in the first assessment	8
Intensifier <i>banget</i> (very) in the second assessment	2
Lexical epistemic marker	5

In terms of grammatical construction, some demonstratives tend to be found in the utterance of *nih*. Demonstratives *ini*, *ni*, and *nih* have the following frequencies: 7, 3, 2. Another salient feature was simile as indicated by *kayak* (like) or *mirip* (alike). Unlike the demonstratives which are used at an utterance level, simile was found in five extracts at the discourse level. It is used to make speakers' assessments clear. Furthermore, intensifying specific parts is common in assessment. This was done by the word *banget* (very). This was used eight times in the first assessment while it was uttered twice in the second assessment. In the second assessment, the speakers agreed with the assessment given by the prior speakers and intensify the idea given in the first assessment with *banget*. Thus, upgraded assessment was produced. Since the speakers of the first assessment and the hearers have equal access to the dishes, the hearers wanted to build symmetrical conditions by providing relevant knowledge by giving the second assessment.

In Extract 3, the speakers (S and N) evaluate a dish named *tahu gejrot*. It is a deep-fried tofu with sweet and hot sauce. S instructs N to see the chili on the dish and raised the topic of chili (line 1). N is shocked with the chili indicated by the word *buset* (line 2). However, what makes him shocked is unclear. He, moreover, responds by

specifying the kind of chili namely green chili (line 2). S takes the floor to give an assessment (line 3). She makes it clear that the quantity of the chili is worth noticing. Even though she does not give the first assessment, it does not make her a less knowledgeable party in this talk because she can elaborate on the unclear assessment. She gives clarity that the quantity of the chili is shocking. S makes N's previous utterance clear. N tries to make a symmetrical epistemic position by moving to another aspect of the dish, the tofu itself. N continues the talk by evaluating the texture (line 4). He also provides evidence of his assessment. He claims he also has knowledge because of a direct access to the tofu.

Extract 3

- 1 S: *Liat deh nih cabenya uh=.*
 look DM PRO chili.DEF INTJ
 Look at the chili.
- 2 N: *=Cabe ijonya buset dah.*
 chili green.DEF damn DM
 What green chili.
- 3 S: *Banyak banget^o [nih].*
 much very DM
 There is so much chili.
- 4 N: *[Trus] tahunya garing tadi pas gua tusuk.*
 then tofu.DEF crispy just.now when 1SG skewer
 Then, when I skewered the tofu, I found it crispy.

The talk in Extract 4 gives an overview of how *nih* is applied in the second assessment. There were only three utterances where *nih* was found in speakers' second assessment. Out of three cases, two cases show how the speakers of *nih* gives clarity to the assessment conducted by the first speakers. In one case, the speaker of *nih* intensifies the assessment given by the first speaker (Extract 4). The assessment yields a negative result. In this case, the speakers compare the experience by using a simile. In assessment, it was common for the reviewers to create a simile in which they compare an object in the dishes with another object that is more common to the audience.

Extract 4

- 1 N : *Kalo pas gua gigit esnya itu,*
if when 1SG bite ice.cube.DEF that
- 2 *esnya ngga ada berasa apa-apa.*
ice.cube.DEF not be feel anything
When I bite the ice cube, it is tasteless.
- 3 S : *Iya ya. Ngga ngeresep ampe ke dalam*
yes INTJ not become.absorbed till to in
- 4 *[gitu ya jadinya ya.*
thus DM result.DEF DM
Right. It's not well absorbed to the inside.
- 5 N : *[Iya bener]. Ngga ngere ngeresep ke*
yes true not become.absorbed to
- 6 *esnya (0.2) [Sayang banget nih].*
ice.cube.DEF pity very DM
Yes. That's true. It's not absorbed into the ice cube. That's too bad.
- 7 S : *[Jadi nih] (0.1) ujung-ujungnya kita*
so this finally 1PL:INCL
- 8 *juga kayak minum Milo sih=.*
also like drink Milo DM
Finally, it is like drinking Milo.
- 9 N : *=Bener banget=.*
true very
That's very true.
- 10 S : *=Ya kan?*
INTJ DM
You see
- 11 N : *Kayak minum=.*
like drink
It's like drinking.
- 12 S : *=Kayak air gitu jadinya.*
like water thus result.DEF
Finally, it is like water.
- 13 N : *Jadi kayak apa tau ngga? Kayak susu coklat*
become like what know not like milk chocolate
dikasih es
give.PASS ice.cube
Do you know it is like what? It's like chocolate milk with ice cubes.

14 S: Bener.
true
Right.

N builds his talk by giving knowledge in his first turn-taking (line 1). S agrees and elaborates that it is not well absorbed (line 3). N agrees and restates S' opinion (lines 5-6). In addition, he gives his negative assessment in the form of a personal stance (line 6). It is a second assessment in which the speaker agrees with the first assessment. The use of intensifier *banget* in line 6 displays a big disappointment towards a pitiful condition. *Nih* is applied to indicate a strong feeling-sharing. Up to here, N claims his epistemic stance. S creates a simile of their experience tasting the beverage. The experience is like drinking Milo (lines 7-8). N agrees (line 9). S specifies that it is like drinking water (line 12). S' utterances in lines 8 and 12 show she wants to be equal to N by creating simile indicated by the word *kayak* (like). N is still willing to claim his epistemic position by creating a simile too. He creates it by giving a rhetorical question as a preface (line 13). It focuses on whether the hearer knows or not. Giving such a question indicates that the speaker knows something that the other may not know. He points his knowledge to the interlocutor. Then, he continues by giving the answer in the form of a simile (line 13). His simile is more detailed compared to the simile used by S. Then, S agrees how accurate it is (line 14).

Creating a simile with the word *mirip* was also found in Extract 5. G and K discuss one component of the dish namely the sauce. They make simile for evaluating the sauce. However, when they compare the sauce of the dish, they also mention differences between the two types of sauces.

Extract 5

1 G:	<i>Em::.</i>					
	INTJ					
	Mmm.					
2 K:	<i>Wow.</i>	<i>Cocok</i>	<i>nih.</i>	<i>Pedes,</i>	<i>asin,</i>	<i>manis,</i>
	EXC	appropriate	DM	spicy	salty	sweet
3	<i>gurih.</i>	<i>Ada</i>	<i>asemnya.</i>	<i>Wow.</i>	<i>Enak.</i>	
	tasty	be	sour.DEF	EXC	yummy	
	Wow. It is just right. It is spicy, salty, sweet, tasty, and sour. Wow. That's yummy.					
4 G:	<i>Enak,</i>	<i>enak,</i>	<i>enak.</i>	<i>Sambal</i>	<i>mangganya</i>	<i>tuh</i>
	yummy	yummy	yummy	chili	mango.DEF	that

5	<i>juga,</i>	<i>mangganya</i>	<i>ngga</i>	<i>terlalu</i>	<i>kecil</i>	<i>jadi</i>
	also	mango.DEF	not	too	small	become
6	<i>masih</i>	<i>berasa</i>	<i>digigit</i>	<i>ya.</i>	<i>(cuma)</i>	<i>[ini].</i>
	still	feel	bite.PASS	DM	only	this

Yummy, yummy, yummy. The mango slices in the sauce are not too small so I can taste it when I eat it.

7	K					<i>[Sebenarnya</i>
						actually

8	<i>rasanya</i>		<i>agak</i>	<i>mirip</i>	<i>sambal</i>	<i>jeruk =.</i>
	taste.3SG:POSS		rather	alike	sauce	lime

Actually, the taste is like lime chili sauce.

9	G	<i>=Tapi</i>	<i>ada</i>	<i>mangganya</i>	<i>lebih^o</i>	<i>asem (0.1)</i>	<i>[(dia)].</i>
		but	be	mango.DEF	more	sour	3SG

But, there are some slices of mango on it. It is sourer.

10	K					<i>[Cuma]</i>
						but

11	<i>ada</i>	<i>mangganya,</i>	<i>lebih</i>	<i>asemnya</i>	<i>bener.</i>	
	be	mango.DEF	more	sour.DEF	right	

But, there are some slices of mango. You are right it is more sour.

G tastes the dish (line 1). Then, K gives a positive assessment with *nih*. Next, he describes the details of the taste and concludes that it is tasty (lines 2-3). The exclamation *wow* in the initial part of her assessment strengthens the expression of attitude. G agrees with the assessment and intensifies it by repeating the word *enak* three times (line 4). G's response to sharing her attitude indicates she perceived K's assessment as attitude sharing. Thus, she continues assessing the dishes by sharing her attitude. Moreover, she points out one of the ingredients of the sauce, namely the mango (line 5). In the second assessment, G provides specific details to the audience to build a more symmetrical relationship among them. K creates a simile by comparing the taste of the mango sauce to lime chili sauce which is more familiar to Indonesians (lines 7-8). G is not in line with K's assessment and explains the reason (line 9). K acknowledges G's assessment (lines 10-11).

In Extract 6, the speakers make simile before giving assessment. The first simile is in line 1 indicated by word *kek*, which is a short form of *kayak*. The simile is used to give a clear picture of the dish (sweet and sour fish). The second one is in line 6 by using the word *kayak*. The simile is created to illustrate one of the components of the dish

namely the strawberry. The issue is raised because it is uncommon in Indonesia to put a strawberry on sweet and sour fish.

Extract 6

- 1 M: *Ada stroberi cuy. Ni kek es*
 there strawberry guy this like ice
- 2 *buah (eks) ikan asam manis.*
 fruit fish sour sweet
- There is a strawberry, guy. It is like iced fruit cocktail, sweet and sour fish.
- 3 N: *Iya ini ikan asam manis.*
 yes this fish sour sweet.
- Yes. This is sweet and sour fish.
- 4 *Tapi kan stroberi itu kan memberinya rasa*
 but DM strawberry that DM give taste
- 5 *asam juga.*
 sour too
- But you know a strawberry gives the taste of sour too.
- 6 M: *=Asi.:k. Jadi kayak nanas gitu ya.*
 cool so like pineapple thus DM
- That's cool. So, it is like pineapple, right?
- 7 N: *Yoa.*
 yes
 Right.
 ((Tasting the food))
- Some lines are omitted.
- 8 N: *Ni bener-bener asam manisnya dapat banget nih=.*
 this real sour sweet.DEF can very DM
- Its taste of sweet and sour is really real.
- 9 M: *=Heheh.*
 INTJ
 Uh-huh
- 10 N: *Pas pertama masuk Mulut manis, begitu*
 when first put.in Mouth sweet thus
- 11 *after testnya lu gigit-gigit asamnya keluar.*
 after test.3SG:POSS 2SG Bite sour.DEF come.out
- First, when it's put on my mouth, it tasted sweet. When you bite, the taste of sour came.
- 12 M: *Betul. Dan rasanya tuh apa ya,*
 right and taste.3SG:POSS that what DM

13 *lembut banget asemnya Jadi nggak kayak terlalu*
 soft very sour.DEF Become not like too

14 *asem gitu ya?*
 sour thus DM

Right. And what should I say about the taste, eh? It is mildly sour. It is not really sour.

15 N: *Ya itu dia. Ngga terlalu:: biki:n (0.1)*
 yes that 3SG Not too make

16 *kecut banget gitu ya?*
 sour very thus DM

That's my point. Thus, it doesn't make a very sour taste.

M provides her knowledge of one of the ingredients on the dish, strawberry (line 1). She evaluates that the dish is like iced fruit cocktail because there is a strawberry on it (line 2). N confirms that it is sweet and sour fish even though there is a strawberry on it. Furthermore, he explains the function of a strawberry on it (lines 4-5). M compares the function of a strawberry to a pineapple to relate it to N's explanation (line 6). N agrees (line 7). Then, they taste the dish. N gives an assessment of the taste by uttering DM *nih* (line 8). It is a first assessment which is based on his experience of tasting the food. This opportunity is not owned by the watchers. By uttering *nih*, he pinpoints the action of sharing knowledge. DM *nih* collocates with demonstrative *ni*. Demonstrative *ni* in initial position makes the hearers focus on the object discussed. Therefore, the speaker directs the hearers to get ready for the new knowledge about the object to be shared soon. N, then, states that he agrees with M's assessment. He gives details about the sensation of the taste (lines 10-11). By using the clause *pas pertama masuk mulut* (first, when it's put in my mouth), N emphasizes he has knowledge because he has an experience tasting the food. He has access to the taste of the food that can be used to claim his epistemic primacy. M agrees and adds her assessment (lines 12-14). Evaluating the taste as a mildly sour shows that she specifies N's assessment (line 12-13). Her assessment of not really sour indicates she agrees with N's assessment that the taste of sour is in a good proportion. Her agreement makes N restate his assessment. N emphasizes how balance the sourness is (lines 15-16).

In line 8, N also expresses their attitude towards the object. The word *benar-benar* intensifies the taste of sour and sweet. Uttering *dapet banget* (line 8), moreover,

shows that the speaker evaluates that the taste of sour and sweet is in the right proportion. The combination of both tastes results in a positive sense. M's response indicates she has the same attitude towards the food.

In the following extract, there are two occurrences of *nih*. The first one is in line 6 and the other is in line 17.

1 K:	<i>Kayaknya</i>		<i>menu</i>	<i>Aku</i>	<i>hari</i>	<i>ini</i>	<i>lebih</i>
	like.3SG:POSS		menu	1SG	day	this	more
2	<i>ke</i>	<i>arah</i>	<i>cutenya</i>	<i>ya?</i>			
	to	heading	cute.DEF	DM			
	I think the focus of my menu for today is how cute it is.						
3 G:	<i>Iya</i>	<i>lucunya.</i>	<i>Kalo (0.1)</i>	<i>Rasanya</i>		<i>sih(0.1)</i>	<i>oke</i>
	yes	cute.DEF	if	taste.3SG:POSS		DM	okay
4	<i>oke</i>	<i>aja</i>	<i>ya.</i>				
	okay	just	DM				
	Right. How cute it is. The taste is fine.						
5 K:	<i>=Iya=.</i>						
	yes						
	Right.						
6 G:	<i>=Ini</i>	<i>kalo</i>	<i>dibawain</i>	<i>Bekel</i>	<i>ke</i>	<i>sekolah</i>	<i>udah</i>
	this	if	bring.PASS	packed.meal	to	school	just
7	<i>mewah</i>	<i>nih =.</i>					
	luxurious	DM					
	It will be luxurious for a school meal.						
8 K:	<i>=Weh.</i>						
	EXC						
	Wow.						
9 G:	<i>Nasi,</i>	<i>telor,</i>	<i>daging.</i>				
	rice	egg	meat				
	Rice, egg, meat.						
10 K	<i>Menurut</i>	<i>aku,</i>	<i>ini</i>	<i>Terlalu</i>	<i>ngga</i>	<i>tega</i>	
	according.to	1SG	this	Too	not	bear	
11	<i>dimakan=.</i>						
	eat.PASS						
	In my opinion, it is too beautiful to be eaten.						
12 G:	<i>Karna</i>	<i>cakep</i>	<i>banget</i>	<i>yah.</i>			
	because	beautiful	very	DM			
	Because it is very beautiful.						

13	K	<i>Oke.</i> Okay Okay. Let's continue.	<i>Lanjut</i> continue	<i>lanjut.</i> continue				
14	G	<i>Ke</i> to Let's see my meal, imported poultry.	<i>makanan</i> meal	<i>aku</i> 1SG	<i>ya.</i> DM	<i>[imported</i> imported	<i>poultry</i> poultry	<i>ya.</i> DM
15	K					[xxx] (0.2)	<i>imported</i> imported	
16		<i>poultry</i> poultry I think imported poultry is	<i>kayaknya</i> ↓ like.3SG:POSS					
17	G:	<i>Menarik</i> interesting I think it is interesting.	<i>nih</i> DM	<i>kayaknya.</i> like.3SG:POSS				
18	K:	<i>Menarik</i> interesting	<i>banget.</i> very	<i>Ini</i> this	<i>Lengkap</i> Complete	<i>ya</i> DM	<i>ada</i> there	<i>tomat,</i> tomato
19		<i>ada</i> be	<i>sayur,</i> vegetable	<i>dan</i> and	<i>Ada</i> Be	<i>saos</i> sauce	<i>ini</i> this	<i>kayak</i> like
20		<i>macem (0.1)</i> kind	<i>chicken</i> chicken	<i>nanbanlah</i> nanban.FOC	<i>ya?</i> DM			

It is very interesting. It is complete. There is a tomato, vegetable, and sauce. It is a kind of chicken nanban.

K evaluates the meal as how cute it is (line 1). G agrees and she also gives her assessment (line 2). She characterizes it as luxurious for a school meal (lines 6-7). *Nih* co- occurs with demonstrative *ini* by which the speaker highlights the object before showing that she has knowledge that the watchers do not have. Applying *if* clause (*kalo*) in sharing her knowledge shows she also assesses the suitability of this meal. She can determine the suitability because she has knowledge about it. K's response indicates how amazing the meal is (line 8). This response is congruent with G's assessment. Then, G gives detailed information by mentioning all components of the dish to support her assessment of luxurious meal (line 9). Then, they show their attitude towards the appearance of the meal (lines 10-12). Then, K asks them to continue the reviews (line 13). G proposes to review her food first (line 14). K tries to evaluate the dish but his utterance is not completed yet (line 16). G takes the floor and evaluates it as an interesting dish. G's utterance of assessment uses *nih* (line 17). Moreover, she applies the word

kayaknya which indicates epistemic issue. *Kayaknya* refers to the speaker's uncertainty. G is uncertain with her own assessment because of seeing the dish at glance. Then, K responds by evaluating it as very interesting. Furthermore, he does not use *kayaknya*, which indicates he is sure. He convinces G and the audience that it is very interesting.

K upgrades the assessment. He has a more positive point of view compared to G's. The assessment is intensified by using the word *banget*. The way they construct the utterances is also different. G applies *nih* while K does not. G utters her assessment first. Thus, as the first one that evaluates the dish, she positions she knows best. The dish, moreover, belongs to her so she gets more access than anyone else. K, hence, does not utter his assessment with *nih* (line 13). He gives evidence of his assessment by stating the details components. Having put it as a kind of chicken *nanban* shows that K has sufficient knowledge about the dish. He can see the similarities of the dish to chicken *nanban*. He claims that he also has knowledge about such kind of dish. His knowledge is not lower than G. Overall, G agrees with K's assessment.

The present study is restricted to a very specific context and setting of assessment in YouTube food reviews. Thus, the results cannot be generated to the use of *nih* in larger context where other actions appear. The results give an overview of how professional food reviewers manage the knowledge sharing and position themselves and others to construct reliable reviews that draw audience's attention. It may give insights to those interested in producing food reviews or beginner reviewers to achieve the goal of the reviews.

5. Concluding Remarks

Having access to the objects leads the speakers to take the stances in assessment. *Nih* is more commonly used on the first assessment. Speakers claim he has the right to share knowledge and attitude in which *nih* was found on the first assessment. When the interlocutors give responses, their responses are always congruent. They may give relevant information to claim that they also have knowledge about the object. Thus, the position of the speakers and interlocutors is equal. When *nih* is used in the second assessment, the speakers show clarity or intensity towards the first assessment. The speakers claim the right to share knowledge and attitude to give clearer picture to the watchers. The common strategy accompanying assessment is creating simile. As the speakers connect two things by using simile, they show they have wider knowledge.

They have sufficient knowledge in the field of culinary that enables them to discuss similarities and differences among some dishes. The simile aims to provide a clear description to let the audience have the full sensation. Besides, having access to the dish makes a speaker may give suitability of the meal that can be taken as advice by the hearers. The speakers claim their epistemic position. Having observed or tasted the dishes makes the speakers obtain knowledge that they use as the foundation to express their feelings and attitude towards the dishes. Demonstratives tend to occur with *nih* to show it is worth noticing the knowledge that is going to be shared soon. The occurrence of the epistemic lexical marker such as *kayaknya* also indicates that the speakers display their level of certainty in sharing the knowledge and attitude. This conclusion was drawn based on limited data. To the best of my knowledge, stance-taking and assessment in any colloquial Indonesian variations are still understudied. Further studies might explore how speakers conduct stance-taking in assessment in other genres in colloquial Indonesian.

Acknowledgements

I thank the anonymous reviewers for the comments and suggestions to improve the manuscript. I also would like to thank Dr. Mohammad Umar Muslim for the insightful discussion.

References

- Chor, W. (2018). Sentence final particles as epistemic modulators in Cantonese conversations: A discourse-pragmatic perspective. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 129, 34–47. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2018.03.008>
- Couper-Kuhlen, E., & Selting, M. (2017). *Interactional linguistics*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781139507318>
- Cumming, S. (1986). Word order change in Malay. In P. Geraghty & L. Carrington (Eds.), *FOCAL I: Papers from the Fourth International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics* (pp. 97–111). Pacific Linguistics. <https://doi.org/10.15144/PL-C93.97>
- Djenar, D. N., Ewing, M., & Manns, H. J. (2018). *Style and intersubjectivity in youth interaction*. (Contributions to the sociology of language, Vol. 108). De Gruyter Mouton.
- Du Bois, J. (2007). The stance triangle. In R. Englebretson (Ed.), *Stancetaking in Discourse: Subjectivity, evaluation, interaction* (pp. 139–182). John Benjamins Publishing Company.

- Enfield, N. J. (2011). Sources of asymmetry in human interaction: Enchrony, status, knowledge and agency. In T. Stivers, L. Mondada, & J. Steensig (Eds.), *The Morality of knowledge in conversation* (pp. 285–312). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511921674.013>
- Ewing, M. C. (2021). The predicate as a locus of grammar and interaction in colloquial Indonesian. In T. Ono, R. Laury & R. Suzuki (Eds.), *Usage-based and typological approaches to linguistic units* (pp. 161–202). John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/bct.114.07ewi>
- Goodwin, C., & Goodwin, M. H. (1992). Assessments and the construction of context. In A. Duranti & C. Goodwin (Eds.), *Rethinking context* (pp. 147–190). Cambridge University Press.
- Grzech, K. (2020). Managing common ground with epistemic marking: ‘evidential’ markers in Upper Napo Kichwa and their functions in interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 168, 81–97. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2020.05.013>
- Hamdani, F., & Barnes, S. (2018). Polar questions in colloquial Indonesian: A pilot study. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 132, 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2018.05.002>
- Hayano, K. (2011). *Claiming epistemic primacy: Yo-marked assessments in Japanese*. In T. Stivers, L. Mondada & J. Steensig (Eds.), *The morality of knowledge in conversation* (pp. 58–81). Cambridge University Press.
- Heritage, J. (2002). Oh-prefaced responses to assessments: A method of modifying agreement/disagreement. In C. Ford, B. Fox & S. Thompson (Eds.), *The language of turn and sequence* (pp. 196–224). Oxford University Press.
- Heritage, J., & Raymond, G. (2005). The terms of agreement: Indexing epistemic authority and subordination in talk-in-interaction. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 68(1), 15–38. <https://doi.org/10.1177/019027250506800103>
- Hsieh, C. Y. C. (2018). From turn-taking to stance-taking: Wenti-shi ‘(the) thing is’ as a projector construction and an epistemic marker in Mandarin conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 127, 107–124. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2018.02.002>
- Morita, E. (2015). Japanese interactional particles as a resource for stance building. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 83, 91–103. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2014.12.008>
- Pomerantz, A. (1984). Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: Some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shaped. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. 57–101). Cambridge University

- Press. https://scholarsarchive.library.albany.edu/cas_communication_scholar
- Sneddon, J. N. (2006). *Colloquial Jakartan Indonesian*. Pacific Linguistics.
- Stevanovic, M., & Peräkylä, A. (2012). Deontic authority in interaction: The right to announce, propose, and decide. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 45(3), 297–321. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08351813.2012.699260>
- Wu, R. J. R. (2018). Indexing epistemic authority/primacy in Mandarin conversation: Aiyou- prefacing as an interactional resource. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 131, 30–53. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2018.04.008>

Appendices

Transcription Conventions

.	falling terminal intonation
?	rising intonation
°	following talked markedly soft
[point of onset overlap
]	end overlap
(0.1)	micropause
,	continuing intonation
:	sound prolongation or stretching
=	latching
(word)	uncertain transcription
(())	transcriber's description of event

Abbreviations

CJI:	Colloquial Jakartan Indonesian
DEF:	Definite
DET:	Determiner
dp:	Discourse Particle
DM:	Discourse Marker
EXC:	Exclamative
FOC:	Focus INCL :
Inclusive INTJ:	Interjection
PL:	Plural
POSS:	PossessivePRO :
Pronoun SG:	Singular