



SEBUAH REVIU TERHADAP KAJIAN PARTIKEL PRAGMATIK DALAM BEBERAPA BAHASA DAERAH DI INDONESIA

A Review of Pragmatic Particle Studies in Some Vernacular Languages in Indonesia

Agwin Degaf^a, Irham^b, dan Zainur Rofiq^c

^{a,b,c}Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang

agwin.degaf@bsi.uin-malang.ac.id, irhamaladist@gmail.com, zainurrofiq@uin-malang.ac.id

Naskah Diterima Tanggal 8 Mei 2019—Direvisi Akhir Tanggal 26 Maret 2020—Disetujui Tanggal 8 Mei 2020
doi: <https://doi.org/10.26499/rnh/v9i1.1411>

Abstrak

Makalah ini mereviu beberapa kajian partikel pragmatik dalam bahasa Indonesia, di mana Indonesia menempati ranking ke dua sebagai negara penyumbang populasi bahasa terbanyak di dunia setelah Papua Nugini. Hal ini membuat kami menganggap bahwa reviu atas makalah-makalah yang membahas partikel pragmatik bahasa-bahasa daerah di Indonesia menjadi penting untuk dilakukan untuk melihat bagaimana para penulis membahas partikel pragmatik, metode apa yang digunakan, serta implikasi apa yang dapat dikontribusikan oleh kajian ini pada bidang (partikel) pragmatik. Selain itu, makalah ini juga bertujuan untuk memperkaya kajian lintas bahasa dalam bidang partikel pragmatik secara umum. Kami mengadaptasi model reviu sistemik oleh Macaro dkk (2017) yang meliputi process penentuan kata kunci, penyaringan judul, reviu atas abstrak, pembacaan secara menyeluruh atas teks, dan penarikan kesimpulan. Adapun korpus partikel pragmatik yang digunakan dalam studi ini meliputi bahasa sehari-hari, bahasa percakapan, dialog, dan monolog. Kami menemukan bahwa beberapa penulis menggunakan pendekatan berbeda-beda dalam mengkaji partikel pragmatik, seperti analisis percakapan, pragmatik, morfo-sintaksis, hingga ke fonologi. Bahasan atau diskusi dalam studi ini dapat menjadi sangat bermanfaat bagi para peneliti yang memiliki minat atau bekerja dalam partikel pragmatik pada bahasa-bahasa daerah di Indonesia. Kami juga menyarankan adanya lebih banyak lagi kajian-kajian mengenai bahasa-bahasa daerah agar identitas linguistik nasional (Indonesia) dapat bersaing dalam kancah global.

Kata kunci: Bahasa-bahasa daerah di Indonesia, partikel pragmatik, pragmatic, reviu sistemik

Abstract

This paper aims to demonstrate studies of pragmatic particles in Indonesian vernacular languages. Given the fact that Indonesia ranked second most populated language in the world after New Guinea, we would expect a huge number of studies discussing Indonesian local languages. Review to studies of pragmatic particles in Indonesian language is therefore considered salient to carry out to shed light on how different authors examine different particles, what kind of method they employ to describe meaning and functions, and what potential implication this study could contribute in this field. Besides, it also enriches the cross-linguistic study of pragmatic particles in general. Following Macaro et al's. (2017) guideline of systematic review, this study employed linear process of procedure by deciding keywords, screening title, reviewing abstract, examining full text, and drawing conclusion. The corpus of pragmatic particles employed in reviewed studies ranges from colloquial, spoken, dialogue, and monologue data. In regard with the approaches to reveal the pragmatic meanings, researchers employed conversation analysis approach, pragmatics, morpho-syntactic, and even phonological approach. The discussion in the present paper may be fruitful for researchers who are working on pragmatic particles or vernacular languages. We, after all, suggest that more studies in local languages should be outstripped to sustain national linguistic identity in the global arena.

Keywords: Indonesian vernacular languages, pragmatics, pragmatic particles, systematic review

How to Cite: Degaf, Agwin, Irham, dan Zainur Rofiq. (2020). Sebuah Reviu terhadap Kajian Partikel Pragmatik dalam Beberapa Bahasa Daerah di Indonesia. *Ranah: Jurnal Kajian Bahasa*, 9(1), 1—15.
doi: <https://doi.org/10.26499/rnh/v9i1.1411>

INTRODUCTION

Studies on pragmatic particles or pragmatic markers have spread out and filled many aspects of research in diverse domains. Researchers currently examine them from cross-linguistic perspectives, as well as corpus as method in understanding their meaning development. English pragmatic particle studies, for instance, have developed since 1970's (cf. Halliday & Hasan, 1976; Schourup, 1985; Schiffrin, 1987). Not surprisingly, some recent researchers also have started to study particles in different languages, like Japanese (Hayashi, 2010), Korean (Yoon, 2010), Singapore-English (Gupta, 1992), German (Abraham, 1991; König, 1991), Dutch (Foolen, 1995; van der Wouden & Foolen, 2015), and Indonesian (Ikrangara, 1975; Irham, 2018; Sari, 2007; Wouk, 199).

The term particles are not always agreed among several scholars, nor do they agree how to define them. Following Östman (1995), the term particle refers to a linguistic unit which brings multifunctionality “to mark or organize discourse unit, and to signal interaction and attitude” (p. 99). Cross-linguistic researchers often employed comparative approach between languages, for example, German and English (Muller, 2005), Norwegian and English (Johansson, 2006), and Indonesian and English (Ikrangara, 1975; Wouk, 1998) to gain detailed picture of understudied word(s) and identify acceptable and non-acceptable translation (Aijmer & Simon-Vanderbergen, 2003: 4). As the consequence, it is evident that researchers find obstacles to deal with words that have no equivalent translation in other languages. For instance, it is difficult to explain what Madurese particle *jâ* means since it has no lexical meaning but does have a *procedural meaning* (Sperber & Wilson, 1986, 2001). Therefore, the pragmatic meaning of *jâ* might vary depending on the context, grammatical position, and/or sequence of interaction in which it appears. For *jâ* in Madurese, Irham's (2018) paper can be of an insightful reference to look at its multifunctionality in the interactional purposes.

Pragmatic particles play an important role in achieving mutual understanding in conversations. They often “express speakers' attitude towards addressee” (Wierzbicka, 1991: 341) and give the hearer a communicative clue as to how to interpret utterance (Fraser, 1990; Foolen, 2011; Han, 2011). Brinton (1996) proposes several characteristics of pragmatic particles (she uses the term pragmatic markers) as follows.

- a) They are a dominant feature of spoken discourse.
- b) They are often short and phonologically reduced.
- c) The propositional meaning is often difficult to define.
- d) They are optional rather than obligatory, which means that their absence in conversation “does not render a sentence ungrammatical and/ or unintelligible” (Fraser, 1988: 22).
- e) They are predominantly multifunctional. (Adapted from Brinton, 1996: 33-35)

Brinton’s (1996) outline corroborated pragmatic particle’s definition as a word that does not have a lexical meaning but does have in-use meanings in the interaction. In addition, the meaning is frequently, if not always, multifunctional.

Indonesian vernacular languages, like Sunda and Madurese, have abundant of such mentioned category. In Madurese for instance, we can find the word like *kek*, *joh*, or *jâ*’ that has no semantic meaning, nor word class category. However, the environment where they appear defines the pragmatic meaning. Irham’s (2018) investigation to *jâ* depicted that the particle brings various pragmatic functions, such as *topic shift*, *prohibitive marker*, and *emphatic marker*. Thus, it is worth to further extend the study on some other particles in Madurese especially, and in Indonesian vernacular language in general. The similar case also applies in *bahasa Indonesia* with *kok*, *kek*, *dong*, *sih*, *ya*, and *kan* which are frequent to be found in conversations.

RESEARCH METHOD

Our rudiment objective is to adequately shed important light on pragmatic particles in Indonesian local languages and we thus center the investigation on types of particles being investigated, (local) languages being the subject of the study, approaches to examine function of the particle, and direction of pragmatic particles studies in Indonesian vernacular languages. In doing so, we refer to Macaro, Curle, Pun, An, & Dearden, (2017)’s guidelines for ‘systematic review’ (p. 40) that suggest a) more than one reviewer, b) transparent procedure, c) exhaustive and reliable searching, d) non-bias perspective, and e) rigorous syntheses.

In terms of review protocol, we carried out search of relevant articles discussing pragmatic particles in Indonesian language and one of local languages in Indonesia such as Javanese, Sundanese, Madurese, or Betawi. We included publications from reputable or emerging journals and thesis or dissertations that provide thoughtful insights towards the particles being examined. In regards with search strategy, we used keywords of *pragmatic particles*, *pragmatic markers*, *discourse markers*, or *discourse particles* and limited them

to Indonesian, vernacular, or local language contexts from which we also carried manual look at the paper to ensure the relevance of the keyword and focus of the review. In the other hand, we excluded papers that discuss pragmatic particles or make use of data of Indonesian speakers using non-Indonesian (vernacular) languages or non-Indonesian speakers speaking Indonesian or Indonesian local language(s) from the review. To assure this procedure, we implemented “linear process” (Macaro et al., 2017: 42) model:

- a) Deciding keyword
- b) Screening title
- c) Reviewing abstract
- d) Examining full text
- e) Drawing conclusion and reviewer’s comment

Each author acts as the reviewer and later performs cross-review process to justify quality evaluation and to avoid bias (Miles et al., 2014).

DISCUSSION

On the basis of the procedure described earlier, we thus presented pivotal studies on pragmatic particles in Indonesian colloquial language (Wouk, 1998, 1999, & 2001), Betawi (Ikranagara, 1975), Sundanese (Yuniar et al., 2013), and Madurese (Irham, 2015, 2018; Irham & Rofiq, 2015).

Indonesian colloquial language: Fay Wouk (1998, 1999, & 2001)

Wouk (1999) was the first to study Indonesian colloquial language. Her first publication was on the pragmatic particle *kan* and its function as a solidarity building element in conversations. The particle *ya* also appears to have the same function (Wouk, 1999, 2001). These pragmatic particles are the two most frequently used particles in Indonesian conversations. The pragmatic particle *kan* is “a shortened form of negative particle “*bukan*“ (Wouk, 1998: 379), which is often used as an agreement marker.

In investigating such range functions of the particle *kan* in the corpus, Wouk (1998) employed both a quantitative and a qualitative approach. The former gives evidence that the case is representative and worth investigating, while the latter’s objective is to develop a robust understanding of the pragmatic functions of the particle *kan*. Wouk adopted the event typology by Labov and Fanshel (1977) to understand the relation between the

speaker and the hearer in the conversation. The analysis also took intonation and turn unit of the particle *kan* into account.

Prior to Wouk's investigation, Wolff (1980) studied the particle *kan* and found that it has three main functions. It serves first of all as *agreement marker* and functions like *tag questions* in English. It is also an indication of conjoint knowledge, which is presumably on par with Holmes' (1986) *you know*. Lastly, it can also be used as a request for verification. Wouk (1998) reassesses these findings by studying Indonesian colloquial data. She found that the particle *kan* is mostly used as *emphatic marker* and to some extent as *topic introduction*.

Wouk's (1998) study also confronted Wolff's (1980) prediction that *kan* seems unlikely to appear in an A event¹. Wouk (1998) demonstrated that this particle can in fact occur in an A event and that this "indicates a conjoint knowledge" (p. 397), illustrated in (1) and (2) (adapted from Wouk 1998:397).

1. sebenarnya saya senang sekali lho, me-apa
really I like very much EMPH me-what
I really like me-whatchamacallit very much
2. jurusan seni rupa dulu **kan** mau daftar di ITB ya
subject art PAST kan want enroll in ITB yes
I wanted to enroll to the art department in ITB you know

Wouk mentioned that this was a conversation between three women who met each other for the first time. D's statement about the Art Department contained privileged information that was expressed by means of the pragmatic particle *kan* in line 2.

The particles *kan* and *ya/iya* can appear in sentence-final (the particle *kan* occurs in this position most frequently), sentence-initial (the particle *ya/iya* occurs in this position most frequently), and sentence-middle position (Wouk, 1998, 1999, 2001). Wouk (1998) provided a detailed picture of the distribution of *kan* in the data (illustrated in the table below). It can be used in final position in the main clause, dependent clause, noun phrases and temporal expressions.

¹ Labov and Fanshel (1997) offered event typology. An event is when speaker has privileged knowledge, B is when has privileged knowledge, AB is when both interlocutors shared knowledge, O when the knowledge is culturally available, and AD when both interlocutors have different view (See Labov and Fanshel, 1997 or Wouk, 1998).

Table 1
Position of *kan*

Position	Number
Internal	78
Subject predicate	44
Clause – PP	5
Linker – clause	18
Temp/Loc – Clause	6
Other	5
Final	135
Main clause	69
Dependent clause	27
NP	33
Temp/Loc	6
Initial	21
Intonation Unit	6
Total	240

Adapted from Wouk (1988: 387)

The different positions could bring different functions. More importantly, the event typology in which the particles appear determines their pragmatic meaning.

Wouk’s examination of the pragmatic particles *kan* and *ya/iya* has remarkable contributions to the field of cross-linguistic study on pragmatic particles. The use of semi-natural data (since she chose the topic of the conversations in the recording) leads to an analysis that reflects the occurrences and functions of the particles in daily conversation. By closely looking at the position of the particles together with event typology proposed by Labov and Fanshel (1977) in conversations, Wouk (1998, 1999, & 2001) could thoroughly demonstrate range of functions of the particle *kan* and *ya/iya* in the corpus.

The studies on Indonesian particles were extended by Sari (2007) who examined seven Indonesian particles; *kan*, *ya*, *kok*, *lho*, *dong*, *sih*, and *deh*, and by Kulsum (2012) who studied phrases of *iya deh* and *iya dong*. Sari (2007) focused on the intonation contours of those particles and employed Östman’s (2006) Pragmatics as Implicit Anchoring (PIA) model. Furthermore, she found that intonation contours where the particles are used may increase emotional involvement. This finding confirms Wouk’ (1999) solidarity function of *kan* and *ya* as solidarity building. To highlight, Sari’s (2007) study is might be suitable for those who are interested in investigating pragmatic particles from phonological perspective.

Pragmatic Particles in *Betawi*: Ikranagara (1975)

The language of Betawi also looks interesting which later attracts a scholar to examine pragmatic particles use in it. It was reported that Ikranaga (1975) composed a dissertation describing meanings and functions of *ko'*, *ke'*, *ah*, *kan*, *ye (ya)*, *sih*, *deh*, and *dong* in a play. To our understanding, her study is a pioneering research in Indonesian vernacular language for pragmatic particles. Ikranagara (1975) employed equivalent Indonesian-English translations for each use of the particle to demonstrate meanings and functions.

She focused on the type of sentence and the action of sentences where a particle is used. The particle *ko'*, for instance, expresses surprise when it is used in a statement. On the other hand, *ko'* indicates an unbelievable state when used in question. In the latter case, the most equivalent English translation is “how come” (Ikranagara, 1975:96). In addition, the particle *deh* in imperative sentences shows an instruction or a command.

Example of *ko'* (adapted from Ikranagara, 1975: 96)

3. ko' lu tao
PRT you know
(why) you know (I am surprised)

Example of *deh* (adapted from Ikranagara, 1975: 96)

4. iya deh
yes deh
yes (I urge to believe)

Those particles mentioned above are also related to the conversational principles proposed by Grice (1975) and politeness system. The particles used in the conversations often convey different degree of politeness. She stated that a “statement, command, or question with no particles in *Betawi* are neither rude nor polite” (Ikranagara, 1975: 103). The presence (or absence) of these particles, however, provides a clear relationship status between speakers and hearers. Therefore, in top-down relationship, the use of *deh* - in imperative sentence, is more acceptable than in button-up relationship. In such case, speaker shows more *power* or authority toward hearers.

In terms of conversational principles where utterances should adhere, pragmatic particles often violate these principles. For example, speakers-addressee should not share the similar knowledge so that intended meanings which speakers aim to convey can be reached (Lakoff, 1972). In this case, the particle *kan*, does not obey this principle in a way that *kan* shares a conjoint knowledge and establishes agreement. Adapted example from Ikranagara (1975: 99) is illustrated below.

5. Ma' buyung kan kerje disana
Mother buyung PRT work there
Buyung's mother work there (you know that)

The meaning of *kan* in the excerpt above is similar to tag-question in English which shows mutual agreement between speakers and hearers. They, moreover, have knowledge that *Buyung's mother works there*. For that reason, the particle *kan* is not used to inform the hearer but rather to seek agreement

To recapitulate Ikarangara's (1975) findings, pragmatic particles in *Betawi* express "speakers' feeling about proposition" (p. 106). Although these particles do not directly determine the degree of (im)politeness in *Betawi*, speaker-hearer relationship can be understood from the specific choice of particles in the conversation. Analyzing pragmatic particles and the politeness system of a language is intriguing work and may lead to different conclusions across languages and cultures.

Pragmatic Particles in Sundanese: Yuniar, Sujatna, Heriyanto (2013)

Another Indonesian vernacular language which has been studied is Sundanese, the second mostly used language after Javanese. The speakers are approximately more than 35 million (Ethnologue, 2015). Yuniar, Sujatna, & Heriyanto (2013) examined Sundanese particles *téh*, *mah*, *da*, and *wé* in *Dongeng Kang Ibing*. Regardless of their less comprehensive analysis, their study may be intriguing since it offers insights and extends cross-linguistic study of pragmatic particles in South East Asian languages especially. They confirmed that those particles, in general, function to help hearers understand the speaker's intended message. Like particle *kan*, particles *téh*, *mah*, *da*, and *wé* also signal shared conjoint knowledge between interlocutors. Moreover, in interaction, these particles mark a "response signal" (Yuniar et al., 2013: 170). For that reason, they are convinced that particles *téh*, *mah*, *da*, and *wé* carry no difference function in either narrative or mundane conversations.

In regard to sentence position, Yuniar et al. (2013) stated that the particle *téh* occurs in post-verbal position with which it triggers emphatic meaning to the verb. In addition, *mah* may appear after a noun to accentuate the meaning of noun(s). For *wé*, it can be used to "introduce the next sequential of the story" (Yuniar et al., 2013: 172). Under this condition, *wé* shares similar function as *now* does- to introduce topic (Aijmer, 2002).

Pragmatic Particles in Madurese

Regardless Madurese language has been studied since 1890' signed by Kiliaan's (1897) work on Madurese-Dutch dictionary (and grammar), Madurese micro linguistic units, such as *jâ'*, and *jeh, la* remain unexplored. Earlier studies tend to focus on morphological and phonological feature (Stevens, 1968; Uhlenbeck, 1964) or grammatical aspects (Davies, 2010). We note that Sofyan (2007), along with Davies (2010), devoted a small discussion of Madurese particles like *la* which functions to mark perfective aspect in Madurese grammar.

To address this issue, we take Irham and Rofiq' (2015) example in which *la* does not necessarily indicate perfective. The past meaning, for example, only works whenever the particle *la* is used together with a past temporal adverb like *baari'*. Below is the example to illustrate perfective aspect and past tense.

6. Aji *la* *mangkat ka Sorbâjâ baari'*
 Aji PRT go to Surabaya yesterday
 Aji went to Surabaya yesterday

Another Madurese particle that can mark past events is *mareh*. This particle is often preceded by *la* to provide emphasis on the completed action. Irham and Rofiq (2015) exemplified the use of the particle *la* and *mareh* such as in the following example.

7. Andi *la tedhung*
 Andi PRT sleep
 Andi has slept
8. Andi *mareh tedhung*
 Andi PRT sleep
 Andi has slept
9. Andi *la mareh tedhung*
 Andi PRT PRT sleep
 Andi has slept
 (Adapted from Irham & Rofiq, 2015: 11)

Particle *la* and *mareh* occur in pre-verbal position, right before the verb “*tedhung*” which indicates “perfective” meaning. In excerpt 7, speakers claim that *Andi has just slept, and is still sleeping in the time of speaking*. Unlike in example 7, the meaning of *mareh* in example 8 shows that activity of *sleeping* has been completed. We argue that this meaning is comparable to Javanese *wis* which is often translated as “already” or mark past/perfective (Klok & Matthewson, 2015). For that rationale, we can assume that, at the time of speaking, Andi may awake ‘sleeping’ has completed. In example 9, particle *la* and *mareh* emphasize that Andy has already completed sleeping (Irham &

Rofiq, 2015: 11). In addition, they also added that *la* and *mareh* may occur in pre-reduplication adjectives or pre-causative position as in example 10 and 11.

10. Andi la ma-labu ale'en
Andi PRT CAUSS. fall brother.POSS
Andi has made his brother fell

11. Andi la go-ma-jago ke kaka'en
Andi PRT RED. CAUSS. arrogant to brother.POSS
Andi has been arrogant to his brother
(meaning has made an impolite act)

Further study on the Madurese pragmatic particles was conducted by Irham (2015 and 2018). He employed Fraser's (1996, 1999, 2006) classification of pragmatic markers: elaborative markers such as *firstly*, contrastive markers such as *but*, temporal markers such as *at that moment*, inferential markers like *as a result*, assessment markers such as *I think*, emphatic markers such as *indeed*, conversational management markers such as *well*, and other markers such as *frankly*, *you know*, or *certainly*. However, these categories do not all appear in the corpus. *Solidarity building* markers, such as the word *cong* "son" or *na'-kana* "children" were surprisingly found in his study. He thought that these last two particles were derived from Madurese kinship concept, and have functioned as to invite the audiences to listen to the story as if they were a member of the family, treating the audiences as if they were his (the story teller's) son (Irham, 2015).

Based on Fraser's categorization, he finally came up with six clusters of discourse markers; emphatic markers (*jâ', jeh, la*), elaborative markers (*aherra*), inferential markers (*daddi*), contrastive markers (*tape, namong*), temporal markers (*pas, laju, saellana*), and markers of solidarity building (*[ka]cong, kana'*) In the following table, the distribution of the pragmatic particles is summarized.

Table 2
The distribution of pragmatic particles in Madurese Oral Narrative

Category	Member	English Equivalent translation
Emphatic marker	<i>jâ'</i>	
	<i>Jeh</i>	
	<i>La</i>	
Elaborative marker	<i>Aherra</i>	Finally
Inferential marker	<i>Daddi</i>	So
Contrastive marker	<i>Tape</i>	But
	<i>Namong</i>	However
Temporal marker	<i>Pas</i>	Then
	<i>Laju</i>	Then
	<i>Saellana</i>	After that
Solidarity building	<i>[ka]cong</i>	Son
	<i>kana'</i>	Son

Adapted from Irham (2015: 15)

Irham (2018) extended his study on Madurese pragmatic by focusing on *jâ'*. In his latest paper, he said that the particle can be used either declarative sentence or imperative sentence. The possibility to appear in interrogative sentences remains uncovered. Besides, he also formulated three pragmatic functions of the particle when it is used in the interaction (see Fitriani, 2015; Irham, 2018). He concluded that the particle *jâ'* in Madurese brings no semantic meaning but pragmatic one.

In addition, his recent approach to pragmatic particles has enriched milieu of the study in the sense that he could thoroughly incorporate wider perspective from grammar, conversational analysis, to pragmatic speech acts. Unlike Wouk (1998, 1999, & 2001) which centered on sociolinguistics, or Ikranagara (1975) which tended to refer to English equivalent translation, Irham (2015 & 2018) has brought alternative or additional perspective to examine meanings and functions of pragmatic particles in general and in Indonesian local languages in particular.

To further substantiate the discussion in the present study, we are confident that there is a paucity of studies in pragmatic particles in Indonesian (local) languages. Such discontinued trend could be seen from long period gap from Ikranagara (1975) to Wouk's seminal works in late 1990s to early 2000's. Wouk continued her works in Eastern languages of Indonesia, for instance, Sasak (2008) and Bima (2016) which are syntax closer, turn organization, and other related socio-pragmatic elements. It is also evident that most articles discussing pragmatic particles in languages of Indonesia were written by non-Indonesian scholars. It does not mean; however, Indonesian linguists are left behind but maybe some of their publications were in *bahasa Indonesia* which are then limited in terms of access. We therefore suggest Indonesian scholars to conduct more studies in Indonesian languages and publish in national/international reputable journals where English is used as medium of writing. By doing so, we could maintain and introduce our (national) *linguistic identity*.

Regarding the second concern we problematize, the research approach to pragmatic particles, many of the authors have employed diverse perspectives with different objectives. Ikranagara (1975) and Yuniar et al. (2013) seem to be benefited from *English equivalent translation* and descriptive method in describing meaning and functions of investigated pragmatic particles. They offer quite many particles being examined that are helpful for following researcher to start with. Wouk (1998, 1999, &

2001), on the other hand, was highly advantageous of socio-pragmatic, intonation, and prosodic analysis to meticulously elucidate different functions of particle *ya* and *kan*. This approach could also be seen in Sari' (2007 & 2008) papers which extend particles formerly analyzed by Ikranagara (1975) by focusing on their intonation contours. Her later study tried to examine pragmatic particles in language teaching which provides salient implication to the study of pragmatic particles in foreign language. Irham's (2015 & 2018) papers enriched earlier studies in terms of potential approach to study pragmatic particles. He substantiated (socio)pragmatic model along with conversational analysis. In addition, he has demonstrated diverse meanings of pragmatic particles not only in spoken but also in written corpus (Irham, 2018).

To re-emphasize, this part has accommodated studies on pragmatic particles in Indonesian languages which remain fall limited in number. Extant studies are exploring much on dominant local languages in Indonesia such as Sundanese, Madurese, or Betawi. More studies to less dominant local languages could be conducted to provide adequate avenue in academia. This review, however, also has limitation since papers published within the last two years were not included. Besides, the exclusion reliability is also not without question since we did screening on the basis of title and abstract, which might lead into uncertainty and ambiguity. Nonetheless, we have provided transparent procedure to diminish authors' bias and subjectivity.

CLOSING

We have discussed and reviewed some studies on pragmatic particles in some Indonesian local languages. The study of pragmatic particles is an interesting topic, especially in languages with a collectivistic culture like Indonesian. The studies by Wouk (1998, 1999, & 2001), Ikaranagara (1975), Yuniar et al. (2013), and Irham (2015, 2018) regard pragmatic particles as a small unit of word, often monosyllabic, (*ko'*, *deh*, & *sih* in Ikranagara (1975), *kan*, *ya/ya* in Wouk [1998, 1999, & 2001], *téh*, *mah*, *da*, and *wé* in Yuniar et al. (2013), and *jâ'* in Irham (2018) that have no lexical meaning but has a pragmatic function in conversations. The first two studies employ a socio-pragmatic English equal translation approach to investigate and understand the pragmatic function of the particles. Thus, the speaker-hearer relation is important. The latest study employed conversation analysis and investigated the pragmatic meanings from which the particles

were used in the interaction. The rests of Indonesian vernacular language are also worth researching. Therefore, Indonesian linguists, should pay more attention to them and create a distinctive feature toward Indonesian linguistic research.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abraham, W. (1991). Discourse Particles in German: How does Their Illocutive Force Come about? In Abraham, W (Ed.). *Discourse Particles*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 203-252. <https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.12.08abr>
- Aijmer, K., & Simon-Vandenberg, A. (2003). The discourse particle *well* and its equivalents in Swedish and Dutch. *Linguistics*, 41(6), 1123-1161. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ling.2003.036>
- Brinton, L. J. (1996). *Pragmatic Markers in English: Grammaticalization and Discourse Functions*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110907582>
- Davies, W. D. (2010). *A Grammar of Madurese*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110224443>
- Fitriani, R.S. (2015). Kesantunan Tuturan Imperatif Siswa SMK Muhammadiyah 2 Bandung: Kajian Pragmatik. Politeness of Imperative Acts of SMK Muhammadiyah 2 Bandung” A Pragmatic Study Indonesian. *Ranah: Journal Kajian Bahasa*, 4(1), 34–46. <https://doi.org/10.26499/rnh.v4i1.23>
- Foolen, A. (2011). Pragmatic Markers in Socio-pragmatic Perspective. Gisle Andersen & Karin Aijmer (eds.) *Pragmatics of Society*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, 217-242. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110214420.217>
- Foolen, A. (1995) Dutch Modal Particles: The Relevance of grammaticalized Elements. In: Thomas F. Shannon & Johan P. Snapper (Ed.). *The Berkeley Conference on Dutch Linguistics 1993*, 57-70.
- Fraser, B (1988). Types of English Discourse Markers. *Acta Linguistica Hungaria*, 38, 383-395.
- Fraser, B. (1990). An approach to discourse markers. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 14(3), 383–398. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166\(90\)90096-V](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(90)90096-V)
- Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and Conversation. In Cole, P., & Morgan, J. L. (Ed). *Speech Acts*. New York: Academic Press, 41-58. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004368811_003
- Gupta, A. F. (1992). The pragmatic particles of Singapore colloquial English. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 18(1), 31–57. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166\(92\)90106-L](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(92)90106-L)
- Han, D. (2011). Utterance production and interpretation: A discourse-pragmatic study on pragmatic markers in English public speeches. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(11), 2776–2794. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2011.04.008>
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.
- Hayashi, M. (2010). An overview of the question-response system in Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42(10), 2685–2702. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2010.04.006>
- Holmes, J. (1986). Functions of "You Know" in Women's and Men's Speech. *Language in Society*, 15(1), 1-21. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500011623>
- Irham. (2015). *Pragmatic Particles in Madurese: A Corpus Study of Jâ' in Oral Narrative and Conversations*. Unpublished Thesis. Radboud University Nijmegen, the Netherlands.
- Irham, I. (2018). Evaluating the Pragmatic Particle Jâ' in A Madurese Spoken Corpus. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v7i3.9814>
- Irham & Rofiq, Z. (2015). Tense and Aspect in Madurese: Projecting Davies' work on Grammar of Madurese. Published in the proceeding of *International Conference on Interdisciplinary Social Science Studies*. London, (pp. 5-12),
- Ikranagara, K. (1975). Lexical Particles in Betawi. *Linguistics*, 13(165), 93-108. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ling.1975.13.165.93>

- Johansson, S. (2006). How well can *well* be Translated? On the English discourse particle *well* and its correspondence in Norwegian and German. In K. Aijmer, & A. Simon-Vandenberg (Eds.), *Pragmatic markers in contrast. Studies in pragmatics 2* (pp. 115-137). Amsterdam, the Netherlands: Elsevier.
- Klok, J. V. & Matthewson, L. (2015). Distinguishing already from perfect aspect: A case study on Javanese *wis*. *Oceanic Linguistics*, 54, 1, 172-205. <https://doi.org/10.1353/ol.2015.0007>
- König, E. (1991). Identical Values in Conflicting Roles: The Use of German *Ausgerechnet*, *Eben*, *Genau*, and *Gerade* as Focus Particles. In Werner Abraham (Ed.). *Discourse Particles*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 11-36.
- Kulsum, U. (2012). *Iya deh* atau *Iya Dong*?: Membandingkan Partikel *Fatis deh* dan *dong* dalam Bahasa Indonesia *Iya deh* or *Iya dong*?: Comparing Phatic Particles *deh* and *dong* in Indonesian. *Ranah: Journal Kajian Bahasa*, 1, 40–55. <https://doi.org/10.26499/rnh.v1i1.15>
- Labov, W., & Fanshel, D. (1977). *Therapeutic Discourse: Psychotherapy as Conversation*. New York: Academic Press.
- Macaro, E., Curle, S., Pun, J., An, J., & Dearden, J. (2018). A systematic review of English medium instruction in higher education. *Language Teaching*, 51(1), 36–76. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444817000350>
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook*. Los Angeles: Sage publication.
- Müller, S. (2005). *Discourse markers in native and non-native English discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.138>
- Östman, J-A. (1995). Pragmatic particles twenty years after. Organization in discourse. Proceedings from the Turku conference. In B. Warvik, S-K Tanskanen, & R. Hiltunen (Eds.). *Anglicana Turkuensia*, 14, 95-108.
- Östman, J-A. (2006). Constructions in cross language research: Verbs as pragmatic particles in Solv. In K. Aijmer, & A. Simon-Vandenberg (Eds.), *Pragmatic markers in contrast. Studies in pragmatics 2* (pp. 237-257). Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Sari, F. (2007). *Pragmatic particles: A cross-linguistic discourse analysis of interaction*. Unpublished dissertation, the University of Alabama. USA.
- Schiffrin, D. (1987). *Discourse Markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511611841>
- Schourup, L. C. (1985). *Common Discourse Particles in English Conversation*. New York: Garland.
- Sofyan, A. (2007). Beberapa Keunikan Linguistik Bahasa Madura. *Humaniora*, 19(3), 232-240.
- Stevens, A. M. (1968). *Madurese Phonology and Morphology*. New Haven: American Oriental Society.
- Uhlenbeck, E. M. (1964). A critical survey of studies on the languages of Java and Madura: Bibliographical series 7. Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-011-8790-9>
- van der Wouden, T., & Foolen, A. (2015). Dutch particles in the Right Periphery. In Hancil, S., Haselow, A., and Post, M. (Ed.). *Final Particles*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, 221-247
- Wierzbicka, A. (1991). *Cross-cultural Pragmatics. The Semantics of Human Interaction*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Wolff, J. U. (1980). *Beginning Indonesian: Part 1*. Ithaca, N.Y: Cornell University, Southeast Asia Program.
- Wouk, F. (1998). Solidarity in Indonesian Conversation: The Discourse Marker *kan*. *Multilingua*, 17(4), 379-406. <https://doi.org/10.1515/mult.1998.17.4.379>
- Wouk, F. (1999). *Gender and the use of pragmatic particles in Indonesian*. *Sociolinguistics*, 3(2), 194-219. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9481.00072>
- Wouk, F. (2001). Solidarity in Indonesian conversation: The discourse marker *ya*. *Journal of Pragmatics*. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166\(99\)00139-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(99)00139-3)
- Wouk, F. (2008). The syntax of intonation units in Sasak. *Studies in Language*, 32. <https://doi.org/10.1075/sl.32.1.06wou>

- Wouk, F., & Arafiq. (2016). The Particle kai in Bimanese. *Oceanic Linguistics*, 55, 2, 319-349. <https://doi.org/10.1353/ol.2016.0016>
- Yoon, K. E. (2010). Question-Response Sequences in Conversation across Ten Languages. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42(10), 2782-2798. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2010.04.012>
- Yuniar, D., Sujatna, E.T., & Heriyanto. (2013). Discourse Markers in Sundanese Oral Narrative. *LiNGUA*, 8 (2), 170-173.