The Use of Phatic Particle '*Geh*' in Lampungnese's Indonesian Language

Laila Ulsi Qodriani
ani.teknokrat@yahoo.com

STBA Teknokrat Lampung

Abstract

Indonesia is one of the countries in the world that have very much cultural diversity. However, Indonesian language is still used as a daily communication medium by its people locally or nationally as a lingua franca. Related to that situation, Lampung is one of the provinces located in Sumatra Island in which its society nowadays uses Indonesian as their daily language beside their local language. In accordance, this paper raises a phenomenon that Lampungnese's Indonesian language currently is still influenced by the characteristics of their local language that can be identified as the identity of Lampungnese society in using Indonesian language. The characteristic appears in the use of phatic particle 'geh' in Lampungnese's Indonesian language from many varieties of the context and situation. This research is intended to investigate the use of phatic particle 'geh' in Indonesian daily conversation of Lampungnese as a marker of their cultural identity and its function to their language. The data of research are collected by recording and engaging some objects of research in everyday conversation through direct observation, then all data are analyzed using descriptive methods yet transcribed for the corpus to be studied. The analysis shows there are nine (9) functions of the phatic particle 'geh' in its distribution in the conversation, such as, stating persuasion, emphasizing distempered, emphasizing denial/disapproval, smoothing the command, emphasizing curiosity/surprise, emphasizing evidence, emphasizing questions, giving guarantees and expressing disappointment. At the end, this research will contribute to further knowledge about Lampungnese's language identity in using Indonesian language.
Key Words: Lampungnese's Indonesian language, phatic Particle.

Introduction

The relationship between language and culture is that language is a system of communication, and language has a meaning only in the culture as the container. Similarly, the close relationship with the language of culture, the language is often used as a goal to be able to understand more deeply the patterns and values of a society; language is considered the most powerful features of a particular social personality (Nababan in Mumu, 2005: 81). So we can conclude that the language can also be used as the identity of the speaker.

Indonesia is one of country that is rich in cultural diversity. It also does not deny the existence of diversity in the languages spoken by the population of Indonesia. In Indonesia, language development occurs fairly quickly. Considering Indonesia has more than 700 local languages and the language of unity which all had different dynamics and strategies of each in the face brunt of foreign languages and other forms of language development. In building the strategy for unifying the diversity, the Indonesian government has set all Indonesian people to use the national language and the official language of Indonesia. It is considered to be the most effective step in the deal with the diversity of languages that are owned by each region live in Indonesia, so that each of Indonesia's population can communicate with each other despite cultural backgrounds and different regional languages. Although it is understood and spoken by more than 90% of people in Indonesia, *bahasa Indonesia* is not the native language for most speakers. The majority of Indonesia citizens using one of more than 700 languages in Indonesia as their mother tongue. Indonesian speakers often use everyday version (*kolokial*) and / or mixing with other Malay dialect or mother tongue. Nonetheless, *bahasa Indonesia* is used very widely in schools, in the media, literature, software, official correspondence, and other various public forums, so it can be said that the *bahasa Indonesia* is used by all citizens of Indonesia.

The Indonesian situation fosters many variants: variants according to the user is referred to as dialects and variants by use of the so-called language diversity (Kridalakasana: 1991). Dialect distinguished as follows: (1) regional dialects, namely miscellaneous language used in a particular area so that it distinguishes the language used in an area with the language used in other areas even though they are from one language. (2) social dialect, the dialect used by a particular group of people or a specific society marks the level. (3) temporal dialect, which dialect used at a certain time. (4) *Idiolek*, the overall characteristics of one's language. Even though we all speak Indonesian, each of us has a distinctive personal trait in pronunciation, grammar, or word choice and variety. So

we can conclude that although the language used by the same, namely *bahasa Indonesia*, but the language itself is a reflection of the identity of its users, whether individuals, groups or regions that distinguish one another.

The differences of Indonesian language used in Indonesian people not only appear in form of a sentence or a word in their language choices but also in some phatic article that they use in their daily conversation. Conversation can be said to contain two elements, the informational and the phatic. The latter is part and parcel of the sociolinguistic repertoire of any society whereby some conventional formulaic expressions are used as a gambit to open or direct a conversation or to establish our distance from and express our feelings towards the other. The anthropologist Malinowski (1884-1942) coined the phrase 'phatic communion' to refer to this social function of language which arises in order to maintain rapport between people in line with the maxims of politeness. In other words, phatic communication is used to establish social relationships rather than impart factual information. In 1960, Jackobson, used the term "phatic function" to refer to the channel of communication that is established to maintain communication. Robins (1964: 30) used the term 'relevance and idle chatter' to refer to this aspect of human communication that reflects a courteous approach towards the other interlocutors and reflects one's ethnic background, kinship and social hierarchy. Coulmas (1979: 6) refers to phatic expressions as standard links between what people actually say and what sort of communicative functions their utterances serve to perform. Schneider (1988) introduced another term 'small talk' and developed grammars which characterize small talk in particular domains. Laver (1975) further analyzed small talk by describing the contexts in which it occurs while Cheepen (1988) studied topics typically used in such contexts.

In the Indonesian Sundanese people, located in Bandung, West Java they use the phatic particle '***mah***' as a marker of identity, "*saya mah bukan mahasiswa, tapi cuma penjual minuman di kampus sebelah*". Another example can be found in the people of Surabaya, East Java, which the majority of adding the phatic particle '***ta***' in the use of Indonesian "*emang beritanya bener begitu ta*?"; the use of phatic particle '***to***' in the majority of the Java language speakers "*lho jangan marah gitu to, saya kan gak sengaja*"; and the use of phatic particle '***bah'*** in Batak language speakers in Medan "*Bah, dasar gila dia. Masa aku diminta untuk jadi pemain utamanya*!". The use of the phatic particle of those Indonesian languages becomes the phenomenon of a cultural identity in form of language use. This may appear in the situation when the local language (as their native language) get in touch to their *bahasa Indonesia*. The language use becoming the identity of the users. In this case, Wijana (2006) concluded that the expert opinions of the various states there are three relationships between the structures of language with native speakers. The third kind of relationship are: (i) the relationship of language structure affects the society in which the structure of language determines the ways that speakers used in carrying out daily activities, (ii) public relations affect the language in which the culture of the people seen in the structure of the language it uses, and, (iii) the relationship may exist but can not exist at all between language and culture. While Worf (Silzer 1990:3) argues that every culture content can be expressed in language, culture and even language line as the interplay and influences each other and complement each other.

Related to that situation, this paper raises a phenomenon that Lampungnese's Indonesian language that currently is still influenced by the characteristics of their local language that can be identified as the identity of Lampungnese society in using Indonesian language. The characteristic appears in the use of phatic particle '*geh*' in Lampungnese's Indonesian language from many varieties of the context and situation.

Method

Respondents

The respondents of this study were the students in several higher school and universities in Bandar Lampung (STBA Teknokrat, STMIK Teknorat, UBL, and UNILA). The selection was based on random sampling.

Data Collections and Data Analyses

The researcher recorded the conversation of all the respondents by using voice recorder. The researcher was not involved in the conversation in order to have a natural conversation between the respondents. Further, the data are analyzed based on the manuscript of each conversation by selecting the content its phatic particle. Then, it deeply discussed using the theory of Robins (1964), Coulmas (1979), Schneider (1988), and Laver (1975).

Discussion

This paper is intended to investigate the use of phatic particle '*geh*' in Indonesian daily conversation of Lampungnese as a marker of their cultural identity and its function to their language. The data of the research are

collected by recording and engaging some informant of the research in everyday conversation through direct observation, then all data are analyzed using descriptive methods yet transcribed for the corpus to be studied. The use of '*geh*' particle can be distributed at the middle and end of the sentence, but it never used at the beginning of the sentence, as for some examples of the following functions:

3.1 Stating Persuasion
A: Kita ambil kartu perpusnya hari ini *aja* ya, biar sekalian jalan pulang.
B: Besok *aja* **_geh_**. *Gua gak* bawa slip bayaran hari ini.
A: *Yaudah kalo gitu*, tapi *kalo* besok siang *aja* ya *abis* PLU.
B: Sip!

C: Udah *sih* kita makan disini *aja males tau gua* itu *nyebrang-nyebrang*
   Jalannya.
D: Ayo **_geh_** Debi…*bentar aja* sih,*nyebrang dikit aja males*…ayo **_geh_**!
C: *beneran aja males*, panas *tau!*
D: Ayo **_geh_** Debi… ayo, *bentar aja.*
C: *yaudahlah yok lah.*

In such conversation, the particle '*geh*' is used at the end of a sentence to express persuasion; it is preceded by the persuasive word. Though it does not has the exact literal meaning of its pattern but in fact the use of the particle is thoroughly emphasizing the persuasion.

3.2 Emphasizing Distempered
E: Gila *aja* peraturannya *kaya' gini*, *masa'* **_geh_** aneh orang *gak* boleh
   pake' sendal masuk *situ!*
F: Ya namanya juga orang dusun, dusun **_geh_** ngajak-ngajak.
E&F: (tertawa terbahak-bahak)

The conversation above example uses two particle '*geh*' between speaker, but both are equally used it in the speech to emphasize distempered. It can be seen from the choice of words in front of the particle to clarify emotions, that is, '*masa'*' (words to express) and '*dusun*' (plebeian).

3.3 Emphasizing Denial/Disapproval
G: Kita ke Jogjanya tanggal 21 ya biar lama liburannya.
H: Jangan **_geh_**…kesananya tanggal 24 aja **_geh_**, masih belum bagi lapor ini.
G: Ya *gak* **_geh_**…tanggal 21 *aja*, lapornya *diambilin* papa nanti.
H: *Gak* mau *lah.*

Conversation above provides an overview of the use of particle '*geh*' after stating the prohibition and disapproval. Particle '*geh*' is an addition to emphasize refutation of previous statement, so that the speech can give the impression of smoother.

3.4 Smoothing the Command
I: Ini jangan *diputer* ya *make'*nya.
J: *Digimanain*? *Masa'* harus pelan-pelan?
I: Iya, *nah gitu* **_geh_** yang lembut jadi cewek
J: *Halah*, dasar!

In this context, speakers provide a way to use a tool on the hearer, so that when the hearer has made orders approving the order correctly speakers soften it by using words *'gitu'* followed by the particles 'geh'.

3.5 Emphasizing Curiosity/Surprise
P: Filmnya itu *sebenernya* bagus bukan karena ceritanya *lah.*
Q: Trus kalo bukan ceritanya yang bagus apanya **_geh_**?
P: Ya…yang bagus itu *kan* cuma karena yang *maenny*a ganteng *aja.*

Q: Iya *tah*? *Gak* juga *tuh*.

Speakers statement P is a declarative statement that invites curiosity on the hearer. In response to the statement given by P, hearer expressed curiosity by asking questions *apanya geh*?. Glance, it would seem that Q is an emphasis the statement of interrogative sentence by using the word question *apa,* but it can be seen the difference because the question words imbued by the suffix –*nya* (commonly used Indonesian users in informal situations) so that the word is being said does mean curiosity. In Lampungnese's Indonesian, the statement curiosity / surprise followed emphasized the particles *'geh'*, so the curiosity expressed by the sentence '*apanya geh*?'

3.6 Emphasizing Evidence
R: Yang ini agak susah *lho ngartiinnya kalo gak* diliat satu-satu dulu arti
   katanya.
S: Yang mana? *Lah* itu **_geh_** semua juga *tau* caranya harus begitu.
R: Iya *tah*? Hehehe

The use of Indonesian daily conversation, a declarative statement '*lah itu semua juga tau caranya harus begitu'* used in informal conversations that uses by some non-standard word which means to prove that the thing / way as it has been known by everyone so it has become a common thing. In Lampungnese's Indonesian speakers add particle '*geh*' after a demonstrative pronoun (object, thing, way) *itu*, which means emphasizing a proof that it is a common thing through statement '*lah itu geh semua juga tau caranya harus begitu'.*

3.7 Emphasizing Questions
V: Ayo kita *diskusiin* jawaban nomor 3 ini?
W: oke, kira-kira apa **_geh_** pasangan yang *benernya.*
V: *Kalo* kata *gua sih* yang C, karena *kalo* yang B itu cocok untuk nomor
   10, *bener gak*?
W: Oke

In the above examples the particle *'geh'* can appear in the following question words such as 'what', 'who', 'how', 'when', 'where', which is the emphasis of the question. In distribution, the particle *'geh'* could also follow the other question words like, who '*geh*', how '*geh*', when '*geh*', and where '*geh*'.

3.8 Giving Guarantees
X: Kapan *emang* si Ratna mau *dateng* kesini katanya?
Y: Dia bilang hari rabu.
X: Yang *bener*?
Y: Percaya **_geh_** sama saya, *kan* kemaren saya *denger* sendiri mereka ngobrol.

Particle *'geh'* can be used or the emphasis on core statements that we give to our speech. In the example above, Y emphasis on X to believe his statement that Ratna sure to come the next day so that Y uses the word 'believe' to be more convincing and followed by the particle '*geh*' become '*percaya geh'.*

3.9 Expressing Disappointment
S : Kenapa *diem aja* San?
T: Lagi *kesel tau* dia itu.
S : *Emang* kenapa San?
U : Tadi diusir keluar sama Mr. Atan, *mending* cuma
    marah, tapi dia *gak* mau terima tugas yang saya *kumpulin* tadi,
    ih dosen **_geh_** kaya gitu, *masa' ngambekan*.
Y: Eh, *liat donk* berita di *headline* ini, *masa'* polisi sindikat *nyuri*
    motor *sih, idih*, polisi **_geh_** begini.
Z: *Masa' sih*?

The two conversations above is a statement of disappointment because some things are not appropriate for anything. The first example shows disappointment U against lecturers who do not accept an assignment that he collected and the second example is the statement Y is upset with the news that a police officer involved in the theft syndicate. Both of these statements inserted by the particle '*geh*' after the objects 'teacher' and 'police', so we can conclude that the particles '*geh*' may be disclosed to emphasize objects by putting them after the disappointment of the object.

Conclusion

For the purposes of this study, its findings describes the use of particle *'geh'* speech contained in Lampungnese's Indonesian based on the distribution and accompanying context. Particle '*geh*' can appear in the middle and the end of the sentence, but the particle *'geh'* never appears at the beginning of the sentence. The analysis shows there are nine (9) functions of the phatic particle '*geh*' in its distribution in the conversation, such as, stating persuasion, emphasizing distempered, emphasizing denial/disapproval, smoothing the command, emphasizing curiosity/surprise, emphasizing evidence, emphasizing questions, giving guarantees and expressing disappointment. At the end, this research will contribute to further knowledge about Lampungnese's language identity in using Indonesian language.

References

Cheepen, C. 1988. *The Predictability of Informal Conversation.* London: Pinter Publishers.

Coulmas. F. (ed). 1979. *Conversational Routine: Explorations in Standardized Communication Situation and Prepatterned Speech*. The Hague/New York: Mouton.

Jackobson, R. 1960. Closing statement: Linguistics and Poetics. In T.A. Sebeok (ed.), *Style in language*. Cambridge, MA . MIT Press.

Kridalaksana H. 1991. "Pendekatan tentang Pendekatan Historis dalam Kajian Bahasa Melayu dan Bahasa Indonesia". Dalam Kridalaksana H. (penyunting). *Masa Lampau bahasa Indonesia: Sebuah Bunga Rampai.* Penerbit Kanisius, Yogyakarta.

Laver, J. 1975. Communicative functions of phatic communion. In A. Kendon, R. Harris and M. Key (eds.), *The organization of behavior in face-to-face interaction.* The Hague: Mouton, pp. 215-238.

Malinowski, B. 1923. The problem of meaning in primitive languages. In C. Ogden and I. Richards. *The Meaning of Meaning*. London: K, Paul Trench., Trubner and Company, pp. 296-336.

Moleong, Lexy J. 2013. *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif (Edisi Revisi).* Bandung: PT. Remaja Rosdakarya.

Mumu, Selviane E. 2005. " Ujaran Fatik dalam Percakapan Berbahasa Tountemboan". Dalam Hermina Sutami (penyunting). *Ungkapan Fatis dalam Pelbagai Bahasa*. Depok: Fakultas Ilmu Pengetahuan Budaya Universitas Indonesia.

Nababan, P.W.A. 1984. *Sosiolingistik: Suatu Pengantar.* Jakarta: Gramedia.

Robins, R.H. .1964. *General linguistics*. London and New York: Longman.

Schneider K. .1988. *Small Talk: Analysing Phatic Discourse*. Marburg Germany: Hitzeroth.

Wijana, I Dewa Putu dan Muhammad Rohmadi. 2006. *Sosiolinguistik: Kajian Teori dan Analisis.* Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.