ANALYSING THE GRAMMAR OF CASUAL CONVERSATION: ENACTING ROLE RELATIONS

Intan Permata Hapsari
Semarang State University

ABSTRACT

This article offers an overview of the conversation analysis (CA) method and its theoretical and practical applications for qualitative social scientific research. The article also discusses the method's analytical contributions and methodological applications based on the grammar of casual conversation offered by Eggins and Slade (1997). For illustration, analyses of data fragments are presented, using English language from telephone conversation recorded from one of radio programs. The recorded conversation was taken from the English Program at RCT FM radio on Sunday. The analyses try to describe and explain how language enables us to initiate and sustain casual talk. The article highlights CA's unique insights into the way social processes, relations, and identities are constructed and experienced at the level of everyday interaction, and draws attention to some of the ways in which the method can be of benefit to social scientists from a variety of disciplines.

Key words:

INTRODUCTION

As socialized individuals, we spend much of our lives talking, or interacting, with other people. Interacting is not just a mechanical process of taking turns at producing sounds and words. Interacting is a semantic activity, a process of making meanings. As we take turns in any interaction we negotiate meanings about what we think is going on in the world, how we feel about it, and how we feel about the people we interact with. This process of exchanging meanings is functionally motivated: we interact with each other in order to accomplish a wide range of tasks. Very often we talk to other people to accomplish quite specific, pragmatic tasks: we talk to buy and to sell, to find out information, to pass on knowledge, to make appointment, to get jobs, and to jointly participate in practical activities.

At other times we talk simply for the sake of talking itself. An example of this is when we get together with friends or workmates over coffee or dinner and just have a chat. It is to these informal interactions that the label casual conversation is usually applied (Eggins and Slade 1997:6). Despite its sometimes aimless appearance and apparently trivial content, casual conversation is, in fact, a highly structured, functionally motivated, semantic activity. Motivated by interpersonal needs continually to establish who we are, how we relate to others, and what we think of how the world is, casual conversation is a critical linguistic site for the negotiation of such important dimensions of our social identity as gender, generational location, sexuality, social class membership, ethnicity, and subcultural and group affiliations. In fact, casual conversation is concerned with the joint construction of social reality.

As stated by Eggins and Slade (1997:7), "we treat conversation as an exchange of meanings, as text, and recognize its privileged role in the construction of social identities and interpersonal relations." They (1997:8) also add that "casual conversation is the kind of talk we engage in when we are talking just for the sake of talking."

This raises the question of just what we mean by "casualness". Berger and Luckman in Eggins and Slade (1997:18) point out that to see the taken-for-granted background of everyday life, we need to problematize it in some way. How, then, can we problematize the casualness of casual conversation to discover what is going on? They state that we problematize the casualness of casual conversation by critically analyzing it. Critical analysis involves describing casual talk in an explicit, systematic, and necessarily, technical way. It involves analysing how language is used in different ways to construct casual conversation and how patterns of interaction reveal the social relations among the interactants.

Therefore through this article, I try to analyze the interactional patterns in casual conversation through which interactants jointly construct social relations. However, I just analyzed the grammatical patterns at the clause level which indicate power and subordination within interaction.

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE
Casual Conversation
Eggins and Slade (1997:8) state "casual conversation is the kind of talk we engage in when we are talking just for the sake of talking." In casual conversation we see language being used as a resource to negotiate social identity and interpersonal relations. Casual conversation is motivated by interpersonal goals: people chat not just to kill time, but rather to clarify and extend the interpersonal ties that have brought them together. Interpersonal ties are the accumulation of values for four main dimensions: the status relationships enacted by participants, the frequency with which they come into contact, the degree of affective involvement they feel towards each other, and their sense of affiliation with each other.

The apparent triviality of casual conversation disguises the significant interpersonal work it achieves as interactants enact and confirm social identities and relations. This is what we regard as the central paradox of casual conversation. The paradox lies in the fact that casual conversation is the type of talk in which we feel most relaxed, most spontaneous, and most ourselves, and yet casual conversation is a critical site for the social construction of reality. The relaxed nature of casual conversation leads to a very common perception by those who participate in such talk that it is trivial and that 'nothing' happens. However, the evidence of analysis suggests that conversation is anything but trivial. It suggests that casual conversation, in fact, constructs social reality.

Conversation Analysis
Conversation analysis is an approach to the study of natural conversation, especially with a view to determining the following:

- Participants' methods of turn-taking, constructing sequences of utterances across turns, identifying and repairing problems, and employing gaze and movement.
- How conversation works in different conventional settings. Here are some examples of conventional settings in which conversation analysis could take place: Interviews, Court hearings, Telephone conversations, Card games.

Conversation analysis (commonly abbreviated as CA) is the study of talk in interaction (both verbal and non-verbal in situations of everyday life). CA generally attempts to describe the orderliness, structure and sequential patterns of interaction, whether institutional (in school, a doctor's surgery, court or elsewhere) or in casual conversation. CA is the study of recorded, naturally occurring talk-in-

interaction. But what is the aim of studying these interactions? Principally, it is to discover how participants understand and respond to one another in their turns at talk, with a central focus on how sequences of action are generated (Hutchby and Wooffitt 2008).

CA investigates social action with a focus on participants' understanding of one another's conduct. This premise (language use as social action), as well as certain aspects of sequence organization, which refers to relations between turns such as adjacency pairs. Through their messages, participants accomplish actions and display their understanding of one another's actions, and these actions can stand in a particular relation to one another. Moreover, for CA the research data are typically naturally occurring interactions.

Grammatical Patterns in Casual Conversation
The major grammatical resource which English offers for making the interpersonal meanings: the clause systems of Mood is used. The analysis of mood choices in casual conversation can reveal tensions between equality and difference, as interactants enact and construct relations of power through talk. The grammatical resources of the language here are used to construct and enact personal identity and interpersonal relationships.

Grammatical patterns are revealed by studying the types of clause structures chosen by interactants and are displayed within each speaker's turns. The patterned choices are part of what indicates the different social roles being played by the interactants, and how such roles are constructed in our culture.

At the clause level, the major patterns which enact roles and role relations are those of **mood**, with the associated subsystems of **polarity** and **modality**. Mood refers to patterns of clause type,

such as interrogative, imperative, and declarative. These patterns have to do with the presence and configuration of certain negotiable elements of clause structure. Polarity is concerned with whether clause elements are asserted or negated, while modality covers the range of options open to interactants to temper or qualify their contributions.

RESEARCH METHOD
This research is based on the analysis of casual conversation of telephone conversation recorded from the radio. The recorded conversation was taken from the 'English Program' broadcasted by RCT FM radio on Sunday. As usual there are three speakers in that program, two as broadcasters, while the other is the participant of the program who calls them by phone. Each participant/caller spends about 10 to 15 minutes to talk with the broadcasters. The speakers of the 'English Program' on that day were Andi and Asri as the broadcasters and the caller, Irwan.

There are three stages in analyzing the grammar of casual conversation of the 'English Program', namely: (1) Transcribing the conversation completed with the transcription key; (2) Presenting the summary of *turn*, *move* and *clause* completed with *conversational structure* as offered by Eggins and Slade (1997). It is aimed to describe the interactants' position by looking at who makes what kinds of moves, and who plays which roles in the exchanges of a dialogue. This summary, then, is used as a base of quantifying Speech Function Choices (Table 1) and Mood Choices (Table 2). Based on those two tables, it is possibly that the interactants' position could be analyzed and interpreted; (3) Making interpretation of the conversation based on Speech Function and Mood Choices Analysis as offered by Eggins and Slade (1997).

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

Based on the analysis of speech function choices and mood choices, it may reveal whether the speaker is as dominant or as incidental participant in that talk, and how the speaker expresses his proposition. The results of Speech Function and Mood Choices analysis are presented in Table 1 and Table 2.

Table 1Summary of Speech Function Choices in " English Program "

No	Speech Function	Andi	Irwan	Asri
1.	Number of Turns	29	25	25
	Number of Moves	42 (7) (NV 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 9, 10)	30 (3) (NV 7, 8, 11)	26 (2) (NV 5, 11)
	Number of Clauses	53	35	31
2.	OPEN			
	initiate : offer	2	-	-
	initiate : question : opinion	3	2	1
	initiate : state : opinion	1	1	-
	initiate : state : fact	-	1	-
	Total	**6**	**4**	**1**
3.	CONTINUE			
	monitor	2	-	-
	prolong : elaborate	2	3	1
	prolong : extend	2	1	-
	prolong : enhance	2	1	-
	append : elaborate	-	2	-
	append : extend	1	1	-
	append : enhance	1	3	-
	Total	**10**	**11**	**1**
4.	REACT : RESPONDING			
	develop : elaborate	-	1	-
	develop : extend	3	-	-
	engage	1	1	1
	register	12	1	17
	reply : accept	2	-	1
	reply : agree	2	-	2
	reply : acknowledge	-	-	1
	reply : answer	2	4	1
	reply : affirm	-	2	-
	confront : disavow	1	-	-
	confront : contradict	-	1	-
	Total	**23**	**10**	**23**
5.	REACT : REJOINDER			
	tracking : confirm	-	1	-
	tracking : clarify	3	-	1
	tracking : probe	-	1	-
	response : resolve	-	2	-
	response : repair	-	1	-
	Total	**3**	**5**	**1**

Table 2
Mood Choices in " English Program "

No	Mood Choices	Andi	Irwan	Asri
1.	Number of Turns	29	25	25
	Number of Clauses	53	35	31
2.	DECLARATIVES	23 (43,4%)	19 (54,3%)	13 (41,2%)
	full	17 (32,1%)	13 (37,1%)	1 (3,2%)
	elliptical	4 (7,5%)	6 (17,1%)	4 (13%)
	incomplete	2 (3,8%)	-	8 (25,8%)
3.	POLAR INTERROGATIVE			
	full	2 (3,8%)	1 (2,9%)	1 (3,2%)
	elliptical	1 (2%)	2 (5,7%)	2 (6,5%)
	incongruent interrogative	2 (3,8%)	-	1 (3,2%)
4.	WH-INTERROGATIVE			
	full	3 (5,7%)	1 (2,9%)	1 (3,2%)
	elliptical	1 (2%)	1 (2,9%)	-
	incomplete wh-interrogative	1 (2%)	-	-
5.	IMPERATIVE	1 (2%)		
6.	MINOR	14 (26,4%)	4 (11,4%)	9 (29%)
7.	MOST FREQUENT SUBJECT CHOICE	I : 2; Irwan : 2; we (Retmono & Asri) : 2; we (generic) : 1 ; you (Irwan) : 7; you (Asri) : 1; your opinion (Irwan & Asri) : 1; impersonal : 6	I : 5; the topic : 1; my time : 1; you (Asri) : 1; your opinion (Asri's opinion) : 1; we (generic) : 1; impersonal : 3	Irwan : 2; you (Irwan) : 1; impersonal : 1
8.	NEGATION	1 (2%)	1 (2,9%)	
9.	ADJUNCTS :			
	circumstantial	4	13	7
	interpersonal	8	12	2
	textual	20	9	7
10.	MODALIZATION			
	(i) probability high	-	2 (subjective; impl.)	
	median	-	5 (subjective; expl.)	
	low	-	3 (subjective; impl.)	
	(ii) usuality high	1	1	
	median	-	1	
11.	MODULATION			
	(i) obligation median : advice		1	
	Total no of modalities	1	13	-

Dominant and Incidental Participants

We can see from the table 2 that there are three participants in "English Program" (Andi, Irwan and Asri). It shows that Andi produces 29 turns while Irwan and Asri produce the same turns, 25. This suggests that three of them are the dominants. Although Irwan and Asri both have the same turn, Asri always tends to re-say what Andi and Irwan have already said. It may be her lack of shared knowledge (she does not have enough knowledge about the topic they are talking about in that Sunday morning, so she is rather excluded from a lengthy section of the talk). It can be seen from her moves; she often produces supporting reactions (register). From the talk it shows that both Andi and Irwan do not seem to listen to the moves made by Asri, as exemplified by the following utterances:

14 / c	Andi	(iii) and how much time you spend … == reading ==
15 / a	Asri	(i) == reading.
16 / a	Andi	(i) == and get information from other sources.

31 / a	Irwan	(i) No, no (ii) everyday.
NV 4	Andi	[laughter]
32 / a	Asri	(i) Oh, really ?
NV 5	Asri	[laughter]
33 / a	Irwan	(i) You know, (ii) in a week I must … meet with a … lecture, (iii) my lecture ==

Asri produces one initiating question of opinion, twenty four supporting reaction (2 agree, 1 acknowledge, 1 answer, 1 accept, 1 engage, 1 clarify and 17 register). In contrast, two other interactants are active in order to sustain the conversation. It may suggest that the topic they are talking about is interesting and they know it much better than Asri does.

Number of Turns

There is a remarkably close similarity in the number of turns for each of the dominant players, with Andi just beating the others. This suggests that the three are competing for turns, or at least consider themselves to have the right to equal turns at talk ('talk among equals'). Andi is revealed as the most assertive interactant.

Number of Moves

The number of moves produced by each interactant is also almost similar, realizing the equality of their position. However, proportions have changed slightly: Andi emerges as speech functionally dominant (he gets more moves into his turns), while Irwan also gets more value out of his turns, producing more moves though same turns to Asri.

Number of Clauses

Andi produces more clauses for his number of turns/moves. This confirms that he gets more airspace than the others, more value from his role as speaker. It also reveals that there is substantial, but certainly not total, congruence between moves and clauses, as we would expect in a casual context.

By considering the categories of moves produced by the three speakers, Table 1 shows the following:

- Andi dominates openings, with Irwan opens four and Asri only once. This shows that Asri is strikingly dependent on the other interactants: mostly she talks only in reaction to the contributions of others.
- As an opener, Andi favours questions to the other interactants' opinion, suggesting that he enacts a role of 'stirrer'. It also indicates a certain egocentricity. Asri's single opening is a question of opinion to Irwan in order to know whether there is any other question to

Andi (*Okay, is == that all Irwan ?*). Her question to Irwan is caused by the limited time in "Engish Program" for each caller. Asri's single opening also indicates that she does not risk presenting her own opinions for debate.

- Irwan continues more often in which he has to prolong his statements by elaborating. It shows that he wants to make his statements understandable and clear for the other interactants. It can be seen through the following moves: move 9/a – clause (i) "*I want to practice English*"; move 24/a – clause (i) "*Maybe I… I* [pause] *must use time to… work mm… a job,*"; move 26/b – clause (ii) "*maybe it needs about three hours a day.*"; move 58/b – clause (ii) "*Roberto Benigni.*" and move 68/a – clause (i) "*What we will do to our beloved person.*". He also continues his statements by qualifying them, thus using more argumentative strategies. However, when Andi continues, he is more inclined to add information, a neutral means of broadening the field. While Asri only continues once by elaborating her statement. It seems that she does not try to keep her talking for it is possibly that she does not have the idea or knowledge of what they are talking about; consequently, it will be safe for her only as a listener.

- Andi monitors twice, while Irwan and Asri do not. The first monitor, he checks to see whether the other interactant, Irwan, still follow him (turn 18: *Can you see it clearly* ?). While the second one, he monitors whether the other interactants, Irwan and Asri, support his response, as the following description:

Rs: D: extend 44/b Andi (ii) but okay, mm … but … but honestly, that's what most of us do.
C: monitor 44/c (iii) Right?

- In responding reactions, we see that both Andi and Asri produce the most, and Irwan the fewest. Even though Asri produces the same responding reactions with Andi, she does not talk as much as him. In fact, the most of her responses are register (very minimal supporting reactions) with two agreeing reply. While other responses are engage, accepting reply, acknowledge and answering reply. Thus, all her responses are supporting, and many are minimal in negotiatory terms. She appears to be using language to construct a role for herself as a supporter.

- Andi's responses, on the other hand, are proportionally similar to Asri's which 12 of his 23 responses are registers. Thus, he can be said as a facilitator and a supporter since he encourages the other speaker to take turn. His registering reactions are also used as backchannel, as well as evaluative reactions, for example in his utterances: *hmm* (backchannel) and *oh, that's nice* (evaluative reaction). Besides using confronting response, he also prefers extensions, a continuation of his pattern in continuing moves. These results indicate that he plays a confrontational role, in which he also adds more to extend the discussion, while the others tend to keep things on the same terms. Irwan appears with 10 responses consisting of elaborating develop, engage, register, answering reply, affirmation and contradicting confront. Thus, Irwan appears to be using language to construct a role for

himself more than as a supporter. His reaction in various responses shows that he can be called a good interactant since he is not only able to elaborate his response, but also able to express his engage, register, answer, affirmation and contradicting confront when he thinks it should be confronted.

- The number of rejoinders produced by each speaker indicates that all speakers contribute to the maintenance and open-endedness of the talk. We can see from the Table 1 that Irwan produces the most rejoinder which nearly half of his rejoinders are tracking moves (i.e. supporting). This suggests that Irwan supports sustaining interaction by keeping the exchange open. Irwan confirms in which he seeks verification of what he indicates he has heard from Andi's statement. He is also the only one to probe, indicating the work he does to promote continued talk. Besides that, he gets to resolve a lot, enacting his position as an insider relative to Andi and Asri. He also repairs what he has said (turn 42: *Oh... four times*).

- However, all of Andi's rejoinders are tracking moves (i.e. supporting). He clarifies by seeking additional information in order to understand the prior move. This shows not only his role as a supporter, but also his role as a provocateur.

- Asri's rejoinder on the other hand is only once. She also clarifies in order to seek additional information from Irwan's statement in turn 51 (*Mm... I think I am interested in* [pause] *movie*).

In brief, the speech function analysis shows that interactants differ in the roles they play. These role differences can be summarized as follows.

- Andi takes on the role as a provocative initiator, and offers much new information after his initiations. He is willing to keep his negotiation going on by his initiating open and supporting of other's contributions.

- Irwan keeps negotiating by his sustaining moves, which is achieved either by continuing his contributions, or by reacting the others' contributions. He offers new information after his initiations and also supports the others' contributions. His role is to react, frequently giving responses (Andi's questions), taking time to justify and develop his position.

- Asri is dialogically active, but again largely through reacting to others' contributions. Her reactions are overwhelmingly supporting, and this indicates a concern to facilitate and uphold the talk.

Table 2 for Mood Choices both confirms and extends on the picture which emerged from the speech function analysis. In summary, Table 2 shows the following patterns:

Declaratives
Declarative clauses can be defined as clauses in which the structural element of Subject occurs before the Finite element of the clause.
Approximately half of Andi's, Irwan's and Asri's contributions are declaratives. Both for Andi's and Irwan's contributions are mostly full declaratives, but for Asri the figure is much less. The table shows that the figure for Andi's contributions of full declaratives is the most.
This is consistent with his contributions being more initiating than the others. His full declarative clauses are also accounted for in his production

of many qualifications and explanations of his reactions: his develop and continue moves are non-elliptical structures. This is further evidence that he does indeed get more value for his turns than other speakers, making full comments rather than elliptical reactions.

Interrogatives

There are two types of interrogatives, polar interrogative and Wh-interrogative. The former is also known as yes-no interrogatives, can be identified as clauses where the Finite element occurs before the Subject, while the latter consists of a wh-question word e.g. who, what, which, when, where, why, how, in what way, for what reason, etc. The purpose of the wh-word is to probe for a missing element of clause structure.

If we aggregate all interrogatives (Andi: 10; Irwan: 5; and Asri: 5), the results are consistent with suggestions that Andi takes his role as initiator by requesting information from others. The supportive/facilitative nature of Andi's questions is implied in wh-interrogatives (which give the respondent more room to respond) and polar questions.

For his incongruent interrogatives (in the form of declarative) can be aimed to ascertain what the other interactant, Irwan, has done. It also shows that he has close relationship with Irwan by not presenting standard interrogative pattern. He may think that it will be more familiar if his utterances are expressed informally.

Andi's wh-interrogative are mostly fully expressed and aimed to:

(1) keep him as an initiatory role by greeting the caller of 'English Program', Irwan, and asking him to introduce himself, like Andi's turn no 1 (*Okay, who's this calling ?*)

(2) challenge prior talk by asking for other interactant's opinion, such as Andi's turn no

50 (*Yeah, what are you interested in … Irwan?*)

Thus Andi's high use of full wh-interrogatives is another way in which he engages Irwan in talk while retaining some status as an initiator.

Imperatives

Imperative typically do not contain the elements of Subject or Finite but consists of only a Predicator, plus any of the non-core participants of Complement and Adjunct.

Although the number of imperatives is very small, it is significant that Irwan and Asri do not produce any imperatives, while Andi does. Andi's imperative is addressed to Irwan. This is one way Andi enacts his authority.

Minor Clauses

One very important category of clauses in casual conversation is that of minor clauses. These are clauses which have no mood structure at all e.g. *right, thanks, yeah*. Minor clauses tend to be very brief, and are often formulaic. However, their brevity is not due to ellipsis. Minor clauses do not have any mood structure, i.e. they do not consist of elements of Subject, Finite, etc.

Andi uses a strikingly high proportion of minor clauses, indicating his supportive role in the interaction. He often provides feedback and gives his full attention to the other interactant, Irwan, by presenting minor clauses, such as: *Oh, good*; *hmm, yea*; *yeah*; etc. in order to show that he is still involved in the conversation. It also seems that Indonesian speakers tend to say "*Okay*" when they want to turn to another subject, such as in:

(1) Andi's turn 12: (i) *Okay*
(ii) *So… tell us so …*
(iii) we listen
(2) Andi's turn 44: (i) *Okay,*

(ii)   but okay, mm… but… but honestly, that's what most of us do.

(iii) Right?

(3) Asri's turn 70: (i)   *Okay,*

(ii) is == that all Irwan?

Most Frequent Subject Choice

The subject is the pivotal participant in the clause, the person or thing that the proposition is concerned with and without whose presence there could be no argument or negotiation. A casual conversation cannot proceed unless a Subject is proposed.

We can see that Irwan is very frequently the Subject of his own clauses, and while he just makes Asri the Subject, he never makes Andi the Subject. This suggests that Irwan is by far the most egotistical of the speakers: his involvement in the conversation is highly personal, as he frequently talks about himself and his interests. In contrast, Asri never makes herself Subject. Her preference for getting absent people, Irwan and generalization as Subject is further evidence of her lack of personal engagement: she is getting the talk going, but it does not closely touch her.

Andi does refer occasionally to himself as Subject, but is strikingly oriented towards having Irwan as Subject. He makes Irwan the Subject either by appointing him with the word "you" or using vocative, "Irwan." It indicates that he always supports Irwan's utterances. It also suggests that Andi has close relationship with Irwan by addressing his name as the Subject. It may also indicate that Andi wants to intensify that his utterance is addressed to certain speaker (i.e. Irwan) that should be the next turn in his talk.

Negation

Negation is not used at all by Asri while both Andi and Irwan produce one negated clause. This

shows when both of them make confronting moves; they employ the negative and contrary realizations.

Adjuncts

Adjuncts are elements which are additional, rather than essential, to the proposition. They function to add extra information about events expressed in the core of the proposition.

We find almost the same proportion of circumstantial Adjuncts and interpersonal Adjuncts produced by Irwan. This seems to suggest that Irwan's moves are concerned more with adding extra details than the others. He also often expresses his utterances with metaphorical expressions of probability "*I think*" (in his moves no. 9/c, 21/a, 51/a, 54/a and 66/a) and probability value in the clause through word "*maybe*" (in his moves 21/a, 24/a, 26/b and 35/a).

Andi, on the other hand, produces a higher proportion of textuals than the others. This suggests that his moves are concerned more with establishing coherence and continuity. This also indicates his orientation to the logical continuity of his contribution in relation to prior talk (his own, or that of others) and his orientation to the interactive continuity of his contribution.

We also can see that Asri has the same proportion of circumstantials and textuals. This seems to suggest that Asri's moves are concerned with adding

extra details and also with establishing coherence and continuity. But the analysis shows that in adding extra details, Asri only re-say what Andi and Irwan have said in their contributions such as:

(1) Andi's move 16/c: (iii) or you watch mm …

(iv) you know,

(v) your activity every == day.

NV2 [laughter]

Asri's move 7/a   :   (i) == Everyday.

(2) Irwan's mov 26/b : (ii) maybe it needs about three hours a day.
     Asri's move 27/a : (i) Three hours a day.

Modalities

One final dimension of Mood which needs to be considered in the analysis of casual conversation is that of modality. Modality refers to a range of different ways in which speakers can temper or qualify their messages. There are two types of modality: modalization and modulation. Modalization is a way of tempering the categorical nature of the information we exchange. Modulation is a way of tempering the directness with which we seek to act upon each other. Figures for total modalities show that Irwan uses most, then followed by Andi while Asri does not. In fact, Andi uses no modulation, and just one modalization (a *will* of usuality).

Thus, it can be said that Andi modalizes slightly more than Irwan, which is perhaps more evidence of Irwan's assertive status in the interaction. Irwan uses most modalizations and he is concerned with life's uncertainty. He also prefers to modalize subjectively, indicating his ego-orientation.

CONCLUSION

The categories and procedures involved in analyzing the grammatical resources interactants can draw on to make interpersonal meanings in casual talk. The grammatical tools represent the essential starting point for a comprehensive analysis of casual conversation. Choices in mood have allowed us to explore, confirm, and extend our intuitive impressions of the differential roles being enacted by conversationalists in a range of excerpts. The analysis of mood choices in casual conversation can reveal tensions between equality and difference, as interactants enact and construct relations of power through talk.

REFERENCES

Eggins, S. 1994. *An Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics*. London: Pinter.

Eggins, S. and D. Slade. 1997. *Analysing Casual Conversation*. London

Gerot, L. and P.Wignell. 1994. *Making Sense of Functional Grammar*. Sydney: Antipodean Educational Enterprises.

Hutchby, I. and R. Wooffitt. 2008. *Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: Polity Press