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Abstract

NLP research is impeded by a lack of resources and awareness of the challenges presented by under-represented languages and dialects. Focusing on the languages spoken in Indonesia, the second most linguistically diverse and the fourth most populous nation of the world, we provide an overview of the current state of NLP research for Indonesia’s 700+ languages. We highlight challenges in Indonesian NLP and how these affect the performance of current NLP systems. Finally, we provide general recommendations to help develop NLP technology not only for languages of Indonesia, but also other underrepresented languages.

1 Introduction

Research in natural language processing (NLP) has traditionally focused on developing models for English and a small set of other languages with large amounts of data (see Figure 1, bottom right). While the lack of data is generally cited as the key reason for the lack of progress in NLP for under-represented languages (Hu et al., 2020; Joshi et al., 2020), we argue that another factor relates to the diversity and the lack of understanding of the linguistic characteristics of such languages. Through the lens of the languages spoken in Indonesia, the world’s second-most linguistically diverse country, we seek to illustrate the challenges in applying NLP technology to a such diverse pool of languages.

Indonesia is the 4th most populous nation globally with 273 million people spread over 17,508 islands. There are more than 700 languages spoken in Indonesia, equal to 10% of the world’s languages, second only to Papua New Guinea (Eberhard et al., 2021). However, most of these languages are not well documented in the literature; many are not formally taught and no established standard exists across speakers (Novitasari et al., 2020). Many of them are decreasing in use, as Indonesian (Bahasa Indonesia), the national language, is more frequently used as the primary language across the country. This process may ultimately result in a monolingual society (Cohn and Ravindranath, 2014). One study finds that among 98 Indonesian local languages, 36 are considered safe, 51 are endangered, and 11 are already extinct (Anindyatri and Mufidah, 2020).

Table 1 shows the 10 Indonesian local languages with the most speakers, along with Indonesian for comparison (Eberhard et al., 2021). Javanese and Sundanese are at the top with 84M and 34M speakers respectively, while Madura, Minangkabau, and Buginese have around 6M speakers. Despite their large speaker populations, these local languages are poorly represented in the NLP literature. Compared to Indonesian, the number of research papers...
Table 1: The 10 most spoken Indonesian local languages according to Ethnologue (Eberhard et al., 2021).

| Language       | ISO | # Speakers |
|----------------|-----|------------|
| Indonesian     | id  | 198 M      |
| Javanese       | jav | 84 M       |
| Sundanese / Sunda | su  | 34 M       |
| Madurese / Madura | mad | 7 M        |
| Minangkabau    | min | 6 M        |
| Buginese       | bug | 6 M        |
| Betawi         | bew | 5 M        |
| Acehnese / Aceh | ace | 4 M        |
| Banjar         | bjn | 4 M        |
| Balinese       | ban | 3 M        |
| Palembang Malay (musi) | mus | 3 M |

mentioning these languages has barely increased over the past 20 years (Figure 1, top). Furthermore, compared to their European counterparts, Indonesian languages are drastically understudied (Figure 1, bottom). This is true even for Indonesian, which has nearly 200M speakers.

Language technology should be accessible to everyone in their native languages (European Language Resources Association, 2019), including Indonesians. In the context of Indonesia, language technology research offers some benefits. First, language technology is one of the potential peacemaker tools in a multi-ethnic country, helping Indonesians understand each other better and avoid the ethnic conflicts of the past (Bertrand, 2004). On a larger scale, language technology promotes language use (European Language Resources Association, 2019) and helps language preservation.

Despite these benefits, following Bird (2020), we recommend a careful assessment of individual usage scenarios of language technology so they are implemented for the good of the local population.

For language technology to be useful in the Indonesian context, it additionally has to account for the dialects of local languages. Dialects in Indonesia are influenced by the geographical location and regional culture of their speakers (Vander Klok, 2015) and thus often differ substantially in morphology and vocabulary, posing challenges for NLP systems. In this paper, we provide an overview of the current state of NLP for Indonesian languages. We then discuss the challenges presented by those languages and demonstrate how they affect state-of-the-art systems in NLP. We finally provide recommendations for developing better NLP technology not only for languages in Indonesia but also other under-represented languages.

2 Background and Related Work

2.1 History and Taxonomy

Indonesia is one of the richest countries in the world in terms of linguistic diversity. More than 400 of its languages belong to the Austronesian language family, while the others are Papuan languages spoken in the eastern part of the country. As shown in Figure 2, the Austronesian languages in Indonesia belong to three main groups: Western-Malayo-Polynesian (WMP), Central-Malayo-Polynesian (CMP), and South-Halmahera-West-New-Guinea (SHWNG) (Blust, 1980). WMP languages are Malay, Indonesian, Javanese, Sundanese, Balinese, and Minangkabau, among others. Languages belonging to CMP are languages of the Lesser Sunda Islands from East Sumbawa (with Bimanese) onwards to the east, and languages of the central and southern Moluccas (including the Aru Islands and the Sula Archipelago). The SHWNG group consists of languages of Halmahera and Cenderawasih Bay, as far as the Mamberamo River, and of the Raja Ampat Islands. The Papuan languages, meanwhile, are mainly spoken in Papua, such as Dani, Asmat, Maybrat, and Sentani. Some Papuan languages are also spoken in Halmahera, Timor, and the Alor Archipelago (Palmer, 2018; Ross, 2005).

Most Austronesian linguists and archaeologists agree that the original ‘homeland’ of Austronesian languages must be sought in Taiwan and, prior to Taiwan, in coastal South China (Adelaar, 2005; Bellwood and Dizon, 2008; Bellwood et al., 2011). The Austronesian people moved from Taiwan to the Philippines in the second millennium CE. From the Philippines, they moved southward to Borneo and...
Sulawesi. From Borneo, they migrated to Sumatra, the Malay Peninsula, Java, and even to Madagascar. From Sulawesi, they moved southward to the CMP area and eastward to the SHWNG area. From there, they migrated to Oceania and Polynesia, as far as New Zealand, Easter Island, and Hawaii (Gray and Jordan, 2000). The people that lived in insular Southeast Asia, such as in the Philippines and Indonesia, before the arrival of Austronesians were Australo-Melanesians (Bellwood, 1997). Gradual assimilation with Austronesians occurred although some pre-Austronesian groups still survive such as Melanesian people in eastern Indonesia (Ross, 2005; Coupe and Kratochvil, 2020).

At the time of the arrival of the first Europeans, Malay had become the major language (lingua franca) of interethnic communication in Southeast Asia and beyond (Steinhauer, 2005; Coupe and Kratochvil, 2020). It functioned as the language of trade and the language of Islam because Muslim merchants from India and the Middle East were the first to introduce the religion into the harbor towns of Indonesia. After the arrival of Europeans, Malay was used by the Portuguese and Dutch to spread Catholicism and Protestantism. When the Dutch extended their rule over areas outside Java in the nineteenth century, the importance of Malay increased, and thus, the first standardization of the spelling and grammar occurred in 1901, based on Classical Malay (Abas, 1987; Sneddon, 2003). In 1928, the participants of the Second National Youth Congress proclaimed Malay (henceforth called Indonesian) as the unifying language of Indonesia. During World War II, the Japanese occupying forces forbade all use of Dutch in favor of Indonesian, which from then onward effectively became the new national language. After independence until the present, Indonesian has functioned as the main language in education, mass media, and government activities. Many local language speakers are increasingly using Indonesian with their children because they believe it will help them toward a better education and career (Klamer, 2018).

2.2 Efforts in Multilingual Research

Recently, pretrained multilingual language models such as mBERT (Devlin et al., 2019), mBART (Liu et al., 2020), and mT5 (Xue et al., 2021b) were proposed. Their coverage, however, focuses on high-resource languages. Among them, only mBERT and mT5 include Indonesian local languages, i.e., Javanese, Sundanese, and Minangkabau, but with comparatively little pretraining data.

Some multilingual datasets for question answering (TyDi QA; Clark et al., 2020), dialogue (XPersoma; Lin et al., 2021), passage ranking (mMARCO; Bonifacio et al., 2021), cross-lingual visual question answering (xGQA; Pfeiffer et al., 2021), common sense reasoning (XCOPA; Ponti et al., 2020), abstractive summarization (Hasan et al., 2021), language and vision reasoning (MaRVL; Liu et al., 2021), and machine translation (FLORES-101; Goyal et al., 2021) include Indonesian but most others do not, and very few include Indonesian local languages. An exception is the weakly supervised named entity recognition dataset, WikiAnn (Pan et al., 2017), which covers several Indonesian local languages, namely Acehnese, Javanese, Minangkabau, and Sundanese.

Parallel corpora including Indonesian local languages are i) CommonCrawl; ii) Wikipedia parallel corpora like MediaWiki Translations1 and WikiMatrix (Schwenk et al., 2021); iii) the Leipzig corpora (Goldhahn et al., 2012), which include Indonesian, Javanese, Sundanese, Minangkabau, Madurese, Acehnese, Buginese, Banjar, and Balinese; and iv) JW-300 (Agić and Vulić, 2019), which includes dozens of Indonesian local languages, e.g., Batak language groups, Javanese, Dayak language groups, and several languages in Nusa Tenggara.2

2.3 Progress in Indonesian NLP

Most NLP research on Indonesian has been done across multiple topics, such as sentiment analysis ( Naradhipa and Purwarianti, 2011; Lunando and Purwarianti, 2013), hate speech detection (Alfina et al., 2017; Ibrohim and Budi, 2019; Sutejo and Lestari, 2018), morphological analysis (Pisceldo et al., 2008), POS tagging (Wicaksono and Purwarianti, 2018; Dinakaramani et al., 2014; Kurniawan and Aji, 2018), named entity recognition (Budi et al., 2005; Gunawan et al., 2018), question answering (Mahendra et al., 2008; Fikri and Purwarianti, 2012), machine translation (Yulianti et al., 2011), and speech recognition (Lestari et al., 2006; Baskoro and Adriani, 2008; Zahra et al., 2009).

However, many of these studies either kept the data private or used non-standardized resources with a lack of documentation and open-sourced code, 

1https://mediawiki.org/wiki/Content_translation

2Recent studies (Caswell et al., 2021), however, have raised concerns regarding the quality of such multilingual corpora for under-represented languages.
which makes them extremely difficult to reproduce. Recently, Wilie et al. (2020), Koto et al. (2020b), and Cahyawijaya et al. (2021) collect Indonesian NLP resources as benchmark data. Others have also begun to create standardized labelled data for Indonesian NLP, e.g. the works of Kurniawan and Louvan (2018), Guntara et al. (2020), Mahendra et al. (2021), Koto et al. (2021), and Artari et al. (2021).

On the other hand, a handful of NLP research explore the local languages. Suryani et al. (2015) study machine translation in Sundanese by using prior POS tagging information, while Suryani et al. (2018) develop a word stemmer for Sundanese. Koto and Koto (2020) explore sentiment analysis and machine translation for Minangkabau. Safitri et al. (2016) work on spoken data language identification in three Indonesian local languages, i.e., Minangkabau, Sundanese and Javanese. Azizah et al. (2020) develop end-to-end neural text-to-speech model for Indonesian, Sundanese, and Javanese. Recently, Cahyawijaya et al. (2021) established a machine translation benchmark in Sundanese and Javanese using Bible data. Wibowo et al. (2021) studied a family of colloquial Indonesian, which is influenced by some local languages via morphological transformation, and Putri et al. (2021) worked on abusive language and hate speech detection on Twitter for five local languages, namely Javanese, Sundanese, Madurese, Minangkabau, and Musi.

3 Challenges for Indonesian NLP

3.1 Limited Resources

Monolingual Data Unlabelled corpora are crucial for building large language models, such as GPT-$2$ (Radford et al., 2019) or BERT (Devlin et al., 2019). Available unlabelled corpora such as Indo4B (Wilie et al., 2020) and Indo4B-Plus (Cahyawijaya et al., 2021) mainly include data in Indonesian, with the latter containing $\approx 10\%$ of data in Javanese and Sundanese (see Appendix C). In comparison, in multilingual corpora such as CC-100 (Conneau et al., 2020), Javanese and Sundanese data accounts for only $0.001\%$ and $0.002\%$ of the corpus size while in mC4 (Xue et al., 2021b), there are only 0.6M Javanese and 0.3M Sundanese tokens out of a total of 6.3T tokens.

In addition, we measure data availability in Wikipedia, compared to the number of speakers as in Figure 3. Among highly spoken local lan-

3The number of speakers is collected from Wiki-

guages, much fewer data is available for Indonesian languages, compared to European languages with similar numbers of speakers. For example, Wikipedia contains more than 3 GB of Italian articles but less than 50 MB of Javanese articles, despite both languages having a comparable number of speakers. Similarly, Sundanese has less than 25 MB of articles, whereas languages of comparable speakers have more than 1.5 GB of articles. Similar trends hold for most other Asian languages.4

Beyond the most spoken local languages, other Indonesian local languages do not have Wikipedia instances, in contrast to European languages with few speakers. However, it is very difficult to find alternative sources for high-quality text data for other local languages of Indonesia (such as news websites), as most such sources are written in Indonesian. Resources in tail languages are even more lacking, due to a very low number of speakers. Moreover, most of the languages in the long tail are mainly used in a spoken context, making text data difficult to obtain.

These statistics demonstrate that collecting unlabelled corpora for Indonesian local languages is extremely difficult. This makes it impractical to develop strong pretrained language models for these languages, which have been the foundation for many recent state-of-the-art NLP systems.

Labelled Data Most work on Indonesian NLP (see §2) did not publicly release their data or mod-

data (Vrandečić and Krötzsch, 2014), from the number of speakers (P1098) property as of Nov 7th 2021, while the size is collected from the 20211101 Wikipedia dump.

4Other continents such as Africa are even more under-represented in terms of Wikipedia data (see Appendix D).
3.2 Regional Dialects and Style Differences

Indonesian local languages often have multiple dialects, depending on the geographical location. Local languages of Indonesian spoken in different locations might be different (have some lexical variation) to one another, despite still being categorized as the same language (Fauzi and Puspitorini, 2018). For example, Anderbeck (2008) shows that villages across the Jambi province use different dialects of Jambi Malay. Similarly, Kartikasari et al. (2018) show that Javanese between different cities in central and eastern Java can have more than 50% lexical variation, while Purwaningsih (2017) shows that Javanese in different districts in the Lamongan Regency has up to 13% lexical variation. Similar studies have been conducted on other languages, such as Balinese (Maharani and Candra, 2018) and Sasak (Sarwadi et al., 2019).

Moreover, Indonesian and its local languages have multiple styles, even within the same dialect. One factor that affects style is the level of politeness and formality—similar to Japanese and other Asian languages (Bond and Baldwin, 2016). More polite language is used when speaking to a person with a higher social position, especially to elders, seniors, and sometimes strangers. Different politeness levels manifest in the use of different honorifics and even different lexical terms.

To illustrate the distinctions between regional dialects and styles, we highlight common words and sometimes strangers. Different politeness levels manifest in the use of different honorifics and even different lexical terms.

Table 2: Lexical variation of Jambi Malay across different villages in Jambi, collected from Anderbeck (2008).

| English | Context | Ngoko | Krama |
|---------|---------|-------|-------|
| I/me    | I like to eat fried rice. | inyong, enyong | kulo |
| You     | Where will you go? | rika, kowe, ko | panjenengan |
| How     | How do I read this? | priwe | pripun |
| Why     | Why is this door broken? | ngapa | punapa |
| Will    | Where will you go? | arep | badhe |
| Not/no  | The calculation is not correct. | ora | mboten |

Table 3: Lexical variation of Javanese dialects and styles across different regions of Java island. Native speakers were asked to translate the words, given the context.

| English | Mersam | Suo Suo | Teluk Kuali | Lubuk Telau | Bunga Tanjung | Pulau Aro |
|---------|--------|---------|-------------|-------------|---------------|-----------|
| I/me    | aku    | sayo    | am‘o        | ambo        | ambo         | ambo     |
| You     | kau    | kau     | kau         | am, kau     | kau           | kau      |
| he/she  | dio?   | ka‘n    | po          | po          | po            | po       |
| if      | jiko, kalu | po | jiko       | jiko        | ko?           | ko?      |
| one     | satu   | seko?   | seko?       | seko?       | seko?, so    | seko?    |

3.2 Language Diversity

The diversity of Indonesian languages is not only due to the large number of local languages, but also the large number of dialects of these languages (§3.2.1). Speakers of local languages also often mix languages in conversation, which makes colloquial Indonesian more diverse (§3.2.2). In addition, some local languages are more commonly used in conversational contexts, so they do not have consistent writing forms in written media (§3.3).
Jambi Malay is not widely spoken (1M speakers), but has many dialects across villages. As shown in Table 2, many common words are spoken differently across dialects and styles. Similarly, Javanese is also different across regions. Not everyone Javanese speaker understands Krama, since its usage is very limited. Moreover, the number of Javanese speakers who can use Krama is declining (Cohn and Ravindranath, 2014). Examples from other languages are shown in Appendix E.

### Case Study in Javanese

Dialectical and style differences pose a challenge to NLP systems. To explore the extent of this challenge, we conduct an experiment to test the robustness of NLP systems to variations in Javanese dialects. We ask native speakers to translate 29 simple sentences into Javanese according to the specified dialect and style. We then evaluate several language identification systems on those instances. Language identification is a core part of multilingual NLP and a necessary step for collecting textual data in a language. Despite its importance, it is an open research area, particularly for under-represented languages (Caswell et al., 2020).

We compare Langid.py (Lui and Baldwin, 2012), FastText (Joulin et al., 2017), and CLD3.\(^1\) The results can be seen in Table 4. In general, the language identification systems are more accurate in detecting Javanese texts in the Ngoko-Central dialect, or Krama, since the systems were trained on Javanese Wikipedia data, which is written in either the Ngoko-Central or Krama dialects and styles. If an NLP system can only detect certain dialects, then this information should be conveyed explicitly. Problems arise if we assume that the model works equally well across dialects. For example, in the case of language identification, if we use the model to collect datasets automatically, then Javanese datasets with poor-performing dialects will be under represented in the data.

### 3.2.2 Code-Mixing

Code-mixing is an occurrence where a person speaks alternately in two or more languages in a conversation (Poplack, 1980; Winata et al., 2019, 2021). This phenomenon is common in Indonesian conversations (Barik et al., 2019; Wibowo et al., 2020, 2021). In a conversational context, people sometimes mix their local languages with standard Indonesian, resulting in colloquial Indonesian (Siregar et al., 2014). This colloquial-style Indonesian is used daily in speech and conversation, and is common on social media (Sutrisno and Ariesta, 2019). Some frequently used code-mixed words (especially on social media) are even intelligible to people that do not speak the original local languages. Interestingly, code-mixing can also occur in border areas where people are exposed to multiple languages, therefore mixing them together. For example, people in Jember (a regency district in East Java) combine Javanese and Madurese in their daily conversation (Haryono, 2012).

Indonesian code-mixing not only occurs at the word level but also at the morpheme level (Winata, 2021). For example, *quotenia* (‘his/her quote’, see Table 4) combines the English word ‘quote’ and the Indonesian suffix -nya, which denotes possession; similarly, *ngetag* combines the Betawinese prefix *nge*- and the English word ‘tag’. More examples can be found in Table 5.

### Table 4: Language identification accuracy based on different Javanese dialects and styles. Systems do not perform equally well across dialects and styles.

| Model          | Ngoko Central | Ngoko Eastern | Krama Eastern |
|----------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Langid.py      | 0.241         | 0.276         | 0.345         |
| FastText       | 0.621         | 0.552         | 0.759         |
| CLD3           | 0.069         | 0.103         | 0.379         |
| Top-1          | 0.724         | 0.552         | 0.828         |

### Table 5: Colloquial Indonesian code-mixing examples from social media. Color code: English, Betawinese, Javanese, Minangkabau, Sundanese, Indonesian.

| Colloquial Indonesian | Translation                                                                 |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Ada yang ngetag foto  | Someone is tagging old photos in FB                                         |
| lawas di FB            | This Andrew Ng quote is very relevant                                        |
| Quotenia Andrew Ng ini | When will we go play again?                                                  |
| relevan banget         | Why is this Javanese script very difficult?                                  |
| Bilo kita pergi main lagi? | When will we go play again?                                                  |
| Ini teh aksara jawa kenapa susah banget? | Why is this Javanese script very difficult? |

\(^1\)Krama is used to speak formally (e.g., with older or respected people). Nowadays, however, people prefer to use Indonesian more in formal situation. People who move from sub-urban areas to bigger cities tend to continue to use Ngoko and thus also pass Ngoko on to their children.

\(^2\)Our annotators are based in Banjumas for Western Javanese, Jogjakarta for Central Javanese, and Jember for Eastern Javanese. Using dialects from different cities might result in a slightly different result.

\(^3\)https://github.com/google/cld3
3.3 Orthography Variation

Many Indonesian local languages are mainly used in spoken settings and have no established standard orthography system. Some local languages do originally have their own archaic writing systems that derive from the Jawi alphabet or Kawi script, and even though standard transliteration into the Roman alphabet exists for some (e.g., Javanese and Sundanese), they are not widely known and practiced (Soeparno, 2015). Hence, some words have multiple romanized writings that are mutually intelligible by speakers, as they are pronounced the same. Some examples can be seen in Table 6. Such variety of the written form is common in many local languages in Indonesia. This variation leads to a significantly larger vocabulary size, especially for NLP systems that use word-based representations, and results in words being spelled differently despite referring to the same word, a challenge for subword-based models.

| Language      | Meaning | Written Variation | IPA          |
|---------------|---------|-------------------|--------------|
| Javanese      | what    | apa / opo         | /o'p/        |
| (Eastern–    | there is| ana / ono / onok  | /oa'no/      |
| Ngoko)        | you     | kon / koen        | /ko'n/       |
| Balinese      | yes     | inggih / nggih   | /i'nggih/    |
| (Alas–       | 1/me    | tiang / tyang     | /ti'ang/     |
| Sengkham)     | <greeting> | swastiastu / swastiastu | /swastiastu/ |
| Sundanese     | please / sorry | punten / punteun | /pun'ten/    |
| (Badui–      | red     | beureum / berem  | /bo'rem/     |
| Loma)         | salivating | ngacai / ngacay  | /ngac'ai/    |

Table 6: Written form variations in several local languages, confirmed by native speakers.

3.4 Societal Challenges

Language evolves together with the speakers. A more widely used language may have a larger digital presence, which fosters a more written form of communication while languages that are used only within small communities may emphasize the spoken form. There are also languages that are declining, where the speakers prefer to use Indonesian rather than their local language. In contrast, there are isolated residents that use the local language daily and are less proficient in Indonesian (Nurjanah et al., 2018; Jahang and Meirina, 2021). These variations give rise to different requirements and there is no single solution for all.

Technology and education is not well-distributed within the nation. Internet penetration in Indonesia is 73.7% in 2020, but is mainly concentrated on the Java island. Among the non-Internet users, 39% explain that they do not understand the technology, while 15% state that they do not have the device to access the internet. In some areas where Internet is not seen as a basic need, imposing NLP technology on them may not necessarily be relevant. At the same time, general NLP development within the nation faces difficulties due to the lack of funding especially in universities outside of Java. GPU servers are still scarce, even on Java.

The dynamics of population movement in Indonesia also need to be taken into consideration. For example, there are urban communities who transmigrate to remote areas for social purposes, such as teaching or becoming doctors for underdeveloped villages. Each of these situations might call for various new NLP technologies to be developed to facilitate better communication.

4 Opportunities

Based on the challenges for Indonesian NLP highlighted in the previous section, we formulate proposals for improving the state of Indonesian NLP research, as well as of other under-represented languages. Our proposals cover several aspects including metadata documentation; potential research directions; and engagement with communities.

4.1 Better Documentation

In line with studies promoting proper data documentation for NLP research (Bender and Friedman, 2018; Rogers et al., 2021; Alyafeai et al., 2021), we recommend the following considerations.

Regional Dialect Metadata We have shown that the same languages can have a large variation depending on region and dialect. Therefore, we suggest adding regional dialect metadata to NLP datasets and models, not only for Indonesian but for other languages as well. This is particularly important for languages with large dialectal differences. Regional dialect metadata is also important to clearly communicate NLP capabilities to stakeholders and end users as it will help set an expectation of what types of dialects systems can handle. Additionally, regional metadata can directly inform the topics of the data, especially for crawled data sources.  

*The Indonesian Internet Providers Association (APJII) survey: https://apjii.or.id/survei2019x

*For instance, we estimate the whole computer science faculty of the nation’s top university owns 8 V100 GPUs.
Style and Register Metadata  Similarly, we also suggest adding style and register metadata. This metadata can capture the politeness level of the text, not only for Indonesian but also other languages. In addition, this metadata can be used to document the formality level of the text, so may be useful for research on modeling style or style transfer.

4.2 Potential Research Direction
In Indonesia, there are only few widely spoken languages that have been investigated in NLP, while the rest remain unstudied. Mitigating this limitation, we suggest future research to focus more on under-represented and unexplored languages.

Data-Efficient NLP  Pretrained language models, which have taken NLP world by storm, require an abundant amount of monolingual data. However, data collection has been a long-standing problem for low-resource languages. Therefore, we recommend more exploration into designing data-efficient approaches such as adaptation methods (Artetxe et al., 2020; Aji et al., 2020; Gururangan et al., 2020; Koto et al., 2021), few-shot learning (Winata et al., 2021b; Madotto et al., 2021; Le Scao and Rush, 2021), and learning from related languages (Khanuja et al., 2021; Khemchandani et al., 2021). The goal of these methods is effective resource utilization, that is, to minimize the financial costs for computation and data collection as advocated by Schwartz et al. (2020), Cahyawijaya (2021), and Nityasya et al. (2021).

Data Generation  Data collection efforts need to be commenced as soon as possible, despite all the challenges (§3.1). Here, we suggest collecting parallel data between Indonesian and each of the local languages due to several reasons. First, a lot of Indonesians are bilingual (Koto and Koto, 2020), that is, they speak both Indonesian and their local language, which facilitates data collection. Moreover, the fact that the local languages have some vocabulary overlap with Indonesian (See Table 7 in Appendix) might help building translation systems using relatively fewer parallel data (Nguyen and Chiang, 2017). Finally, having such parallel data, we can build translation systems for synthetic data generation. In line with this approach, the effectiveness of models trained on synthetic translated dataset can be explored.

Robustness to Code-mixing and Non-Standard Orthography  Languages in Indonesia are prone to variations due to code-mixing and non-standard orthography, which occurs on the morpheme or even grapheme level. Models that are applied to Indonesian code-mixed data need to be able to learn morphologically faithful representations. Therefore, we recommend more exploration on methods derived from subword tokenization (Gage, 1994; Kudo, 2018) and token-free models (Gillick et al., 2016; Tay et al., 2021; Xue et al., 2021a) to deal with this problem.

NLP Beyond Text  For many Indonesian local languages that are rarely if ever written, speech is a more natural communication format. We thus recommend more attention on less text-focused research, such as spoken language understanding (SLU) (Chung et al., 2021; Serdyuk et al., 2018), speech recognition (Besacier et al., 2014; Winata et al., 2020), and multimodality (Dai et al., 2020, 2021) in order to progress NLP in such languages.

4.3 Engage with Communities
As discussed in §3.4, it is difficult to generalize a solution across local languages. We thus encourage the NLP community to work more closely with native speakers and local communities (Nekoto et al., 2020). This is necessary to provide solutions and resources that support use cases benefiting the native speakers and communities of under-represented languages. We advise the involvement of linguists, for example to aid the language documentation process (Anastasopoulos et al., 2020). As GPU access can be a challenge for Indonesian research institutions, we suggest to engage with academic communities. We support open-science movements such as BigScience\textsuperscript{10} or ICLR CoSubmitting Summer\textsuperscript{11}, which help to start collaborations and to reduce the entry barrier to NLP research.

5 Conclusion
In this paper, we have highlighted challenges in Indonesian NLP. Indonesia is one of the most populous country and the second-most linguistically diverse, with over 700 local languages, yet Indonesian NLP is under represented and under explored. Based on the observed challenges, we have also presented recommendations to improve the situation, not only for Indonesian, but for other under represented languages as well.

\textsuperscript{10}https://bigscience.huggingface.co/
\textsuperscript{11}https://blog.iclr.cc/2021/08/10/broadening-our-call-for-participation-to-iclr-2022/
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A Language Statistics

In Figure 4, we contrast the distribution of publication with Indonesian language compared to European languages. Despite number of Indonesian speakers is much larger compared to some European languages, number of published research in Indonesian is still comparatively lower.

B Wikipedia Vocabulary Overlap

| Lang   | # Vocab | KBBI (%) |
|--------|---------|----------|
| id     | 2023    | 59.3     |
| jav    | 435     | 46.8     |
| su     | 286     | 44.3     |
| min    | 252     | 30.3     |
| bug    | 23      | 35.7     |
| map-hms| 14      | 76.7     |
| gor    | 12      | 40.5     |
| ace    | 12      | 37.6     |
| ban    | 10      | 43.3     |
| bijn   | 4       | 62.9     |
| ma     | 1       | 25.9     |
| mad    | 1       | 26.9     |

Table 7: Vocabulary of Indonesian languages in Wikipedia, filtered with KBBI third edition

In Table 7, we present vocabulary statistics of Indonesian languages in Wikipedia. Due to the noisy nature of Wikipedia, we use “Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia” (KBBI) third edition, the official dictionary for the Indonesian language to filter the top 1% and top-100 most frequent words. As expected, the top 1% words are less reliable, with only 59.3% of the vocabulary overlap between id and KBBI. In the top-100 words, there is a 96% word overlap with KBBI, making this set more reliable. Previous work on Minangkabau by Koto and Koto (2020) also showed that id-min words have a 55% overlap in a manually curated bilingual dictionary, closer to the top-100 value for min in Table 7.

C Indonesian NLP Resources

On Table 8, we list statistics of Indonesian language corpora for different tasks, including sentiment analysis, part-of-speech tagging, summarization, NLI, and discourse. Although most datasets are in Indonesian and only a few are in Minangkabau (Koto and Koto, 2020), Javanese and Sundanese (Cahyawijaya et al., 2021), these resource collections are arguably beneficial for constructing resources in other local languages. This is because 1) Indonesian can be used as a pivot language with regard to local languages due to the large vocabulary overlap (see Table 7), and 2) most Indonesians are bilingual, speaking both Indonesian and their local language (Koto and Koto, 2020).

D Wikipedia Availability

In Figure 5 we compare Wikipedia size (in GB file size) compared to the number of speakers across various languages. We show that some African languages are even more under-resourced.
| Name | Task Type | Size | % Indo | % Local |
|------|-----------|------|--------|---------|
| **Labelled Datasets** | | | | |
| POSP (Hoesen and Purwarianti, 2018) | PoS Tagging | 8k | 100% | 0% |
| BaPOS (Dinakaramani et al., 2014) | PoS Tagging | 10k | 100% | 0% |
| NERGrit (Wilie et al., 2020) | Named Entity Recognition | 2k | 100% | 0% |
| NERP (Hoesen and Purwarianti, 2018) | Named Entity Recognition | 8k | 100% | 0% |
| (Gultom and Wibowo, 2017) | Named Entity Recognition | 2k | 100% | 0% |
| Singgalang (Alfina et al., 2016) | Named Entity Recognition | 48K | 100% | 0% |
| (Fachri, 2014) | Named Entity Recognition | 2K | 100% | 0% |
| KEPS (Mahfuzh et al., 2019) | Keyphrase Extraction | 1k | 100% | 0% |
| FacQA (Purwarianti et al., 2007) | Question Answering | 3k | 100% | 0% |
| WReTE (Setya and Mahendra, 2018) | Natural Language Inference | 0.5k | 100% | 0% |
| IndoNLI (Mahendra et al., 2021) | Natural Language Inference | 18k | 100% | 0% |
| CASA (Imlania et al., 2018) | Sentiment Analysis | 1k | 100% | 0% |
| SmSA (Purwarianti and Crisdayanti, 2019) | Sentiment Analysis | 13k | 100% | 0% |
| HoASA (Azhar et al., 2019) | Sentiment Analysis | 3k | 100% | 0% |
| SA in IndoLEM (Koto et al., 2020b) | Sentiment Analysis | 5k | 100% | 0% |
| SA in MinangNLP (Koto and Koto, 2020) | Sentiment Analysis | 5K | 0% | 100% |
| (Sapatri et al., 2018) | Emotion Classification | 4k | 100% | 0% |
| (Ibrohim and Budi, 2019) | Hate Speech Detection | 13k | 100% | 0% |
| TED En-Id (Guntara et al., 2020) | Machine Translation | 93k | 100% | 0% |
| News En-Id (Guntara et al., 2020) | Machine Translation | 42k | 100% | 0% |
| Religion En-Id (Guntara et al., 2020) | Machine Translation | 590k | 100% | 0% |
| MT in MinangNLP (Koto and Koto, 2020) | Machine Translation | 11K | 0% | 100% |
| EN++ID MT (Cahyawijaya et al., 2021) | Machine Translation | 31K | 100% | 0% |
| SU++ID MT (Cahyawijaya et al., 2021) | Machine Translation | 16K | 0% | 100% |
| JV++ID MT (Cahyawijaya et al., 2021) | Machine Translation | 16K | 0% | 100% |
| IndoSum (Kurniawan and Louvan, 2018) | Summarization | 20k | 100% | 0% |
| Liputan6 (Koto et al., 2020a) | Summarization | 215k | 100% | 0% |
| Kethu (Arwidarasti et al., 2019) | Constituency Parsing | 1k | 100% | 0% |
| UD-Id GSD (McDonald et al., 2013) | Dependency Parsing | 5k | 100% | 0% |
| UD-Id PUD (Zeman et al., 2018) | Dependency Parsing | 1k | 100% | 0% |
| (Mahendra et al., 2018) | Word Sense Disambiguation | 2k | 100% | 0% |
| IndoCoref (Artari et al., 2021) | Coreference Resolution | 0.2k | 100% | 0% |
| NTP and Tweet Ordering (Koto et al., 2020b) | Discourse | 7k | 100% | 0% |

| Pretraining Corpora | | | | |
| Indo4B (Wilie et al., 2020) | - | 3.6B words | 100% | 0% |
| Indo4B-Plus (Cahyawijaya et al., 2021) | - | 4.0B words | 89.64% | 10.36% |

Table 8: Statistics of publicly available datasets, most datasets are covered on the existing Indonesian languages NLP benchmarks (Wilie et al., 2020; Koto et al., 2020b; Cahyawijaya et al., 2021).

### E Dialect Differences

In this section, we present more examples of lexical variation of other local languages. Maharani and Candra (2018) and Sarwadi et al. (2019) show lexical variation of Balinese and Sasak, respectively, where they ask locals to translate general/common words. Then, they compare the vocabulary across different locations (in this case, villages) to each other. Some of the examples can be seen in Table 9 and 10. Unfortunately, they did not provide quantitative results. Pamolango (2012) conducted a similar experiment in the Banggai district in South Sulawesi across 31 observation points for the Saluan language. While Pamolango (2012) did not provide full examples, they reported up to 23.5% lexical variation among 200 basic vocabulary items.

### F Local Language Classification

As shown in Table 11, some of the Javanese texts are misidentified as Indonesian, English, and Malaysian. Javanese and Indonesian (which is similar to Malaysian) share some words. We believe English mis-classification is due to the data size bias.
| English | Kedonganan | Jimbaran | Unggasan |
|---------|------------|----------|----------|
| I/me    | Tyang      | Tyang    | Aku      |
| You     | Béné       | Béné     | Engko    |
| Umbrella| Pajéng     | Pajéng   | Pajong   |
| Hat     | Capil      | Topong   | Cecapil, Tetopong |
| How     | Engken     | Engken   | Kengen   |
| Where   | Dijé       | Dijé     | Di joho  |
| All     | Konyangan  | Onyé     | Konyangan, onyang |
| Swallow (vb) | Gélék, ngélék | Gélék, ngélék | Ngélökang |
| Scratch (vb) | Gagas      | Gagas    | Gauk     |
| Cough (vb) | Kokoan    | Dékah    | Kokohlan |
| Dawn    | Plimunan   | Plimunan | Sémongan |
| Afternoon | Sanjé    | Sanjé    | Sanjano  |

Table 9: Lexical variation of Balinese across different villages in South Kuta district, Bali (Maharani and Candra, 2018)

| English | Pemenang | Jenggala | Genggelang | Kayangan | Akar-Akar |
|---------|----------|----------|------------|----------|-----------|
| Here    | Ité      | ité      | ité        | ité      | tinél     |
| There   | itó      | itó      | itó        | itó      | tinó      |
| You     | di?      | di?      | di?        | di?      |           |
| Husband | kur@nan  | sawa     | sawa       | sawa     |           |
| No      | de?      | de?      | de?        | de?      | sora?     |
| Paddle  | bose     | bose     | dayung     | dayung   | bose      |
| Spear   | tür      | tür      | tombak     | tombak   |           |
| Black   | bir@q    | bir@q    | bir@q      | bir@q    | pisak     |
| Red     | hon@q    | hon@q    | hon@q      | hon@q    | abaq      |
| White   | putiʔ    | putiʔ    | putiʔ      | putiʔ    | patak     |
| Worm    | gumbor   | longa    | gumbor     | gumbor   | gumbor    |

Table 10: Lexical variation of Sasak across different villages in North Lombok district (Sarwadi et al., 2019)

| Dialect/ | Style | Method | classified as |
|----------|-------|--------|---------------|
| Western- | Ngoko | Langid | jv  | id  | en  | ms  |
|          |       | FastText | 0.241 | 0.103 | 0.172 | 0.069 |
|          |       | CLD3    | 0.759 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.034 |
| Central- | Ngoko | Langid | 0.345 | 0.138 | 0.069 | 0.069 |
|          |       | FastText | 0.379 | 0.310 | 0.069 | 0.069 |
|          |       | CLD3    | 0.828 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.034 |
| Eastern- | Ngoko | Langid | 0.276 | 0.103 | 0.069 | 0.138 |
|          |       | FastText | 0.103 | 0.310 | 0.103 | 0.034 |
|          |       | CLD3    | 0.552 | 0.103 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| Eastern- | Krama | Langid | 0.345 | 0.241 | 0.034 | 0.172 |
|          |       | FastText | 0.379 | 0.310 | 0.069 | 0.034 |
|          |       | CLD3    | 0.897 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |

Table 11: Language identification mis-classification rate.