

# KOK AND KENAPA: THEIR CO- OCCURENCES WITH PRAGMATIC MARKERS IN COLLOQUIAL JAKARTA INDONESIAN

*by* Rika Mutiara

---

**Submission date:** 30-Mar-2020 06:36PM (UTC+0700)

**Submission ID:** 1285234057

**File name:** ITH\_PRAGMATIC\_MARKERS\_0D\_0AIN\_COLLOQUIAL\_JAKARTA\_INDONESIAN.pdf (4.02M)

**Word count:** 3169

**Character count:** 16336

9

## KOK AND KENAPA: THEIR CO-OCCURENCES WITH PRAGMATIC MARKERS IN COLLOQUIAL JAKARTA Indonesian

**Rika Mutiara**

Esa Unggul University  
rika.mutiara@esaunggul.ac.id

### ABSTRACT

1 *Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia* (KBBI) defines *kok* as a marker that has similar meaning with *mengapa* and *kenapa*. *Kok* in a question tend to co-occur with other pragmatic markers (Mutiara, 2017; Sneddon, 2006). This study aims at investigating whether *kenapa* also co-occurs with pragmatic markers. In the co-occurrences, it analyzed different types of markers that co-occur with *kok* and *kenapa* and the interpersonal and textual functions of those markers. Corpus-assisted discourse study was conducted to analyze the data taken from CHILDES (Child Language Data Exchange System). It was found that both *kok* and *kenapa* co-occur with other markers. There are more markers that co-occur with *kok* than *kenapa*. Interpersonal functions can be seen more obvious in the co-occurrences of *kok* and markers. Some of the markers that collocate with *kok* carry exclamation sense. It shows speakers' shock. This case cannot be found in the co-occurrences of *kenapa* and markers. It seems that the speakers did not expect to see the facts. Markers occur to show speakers' feelings. The speakers questioned phenomenon and show their feelings towards it. Expressing feeling is a part of speakers' way to direct the audience to answer the questions. Moreover, in the co-occurrences of *kok* and markers, some markers such as *eh* and *lho* tend to appear repeatedly such as in *eh, eh, kok pake kaki? And lho lho lho lho kok di lante?* The speakers signed to the interlocutors that they should not do particular actions and their behaviours are inappropriate.

Keywords: pragmatic markers, co-occurrence, *kok*, *kenapa*

### INTRODUCTION

Pragmatic markers are divided into discourse markers, stance markers, and interjections (Aijmer & Rühlemann, 2014). Biber, Johansson, Conrad, & Finegan, 1999 stated that discourse markers are "loosely attached to the clause and connected with ongoing interaction." Stance markers have functions to deliver speakers' attitudes and evaluation (Gray & Biber, 2014). The difference of interjections with the others is they have exclamation sense (Norrich, 2014). All types of markers are essential parts of discourse in colloquial including colloquial Jakartan Indonesian (Sneddon, 2006). This language variation is spoken in Jakarta, the capital city of Indonesia. Overall, there are two functions of markers namely interpersonal and textual functions (Halliday in Aijmer 2014). Interpersonal function includes hedging (softening), expressing solidarity, and signaling attitudes (stance). The functions cannot be separated with interpersonal aspects among participants of the dialogue. Interactions among participants and the message are built by applying markers (Biber, et al., 1999). Textual functions cover some issues i.e. attract hearers' attention, signal a frame, make boundary in the discourse, and shift topics.

In conversation, the use of markers helps the speakers to deliver the messages. They lead the interlocutors to understand what the speakers mean (Aijmer & Rühlemann, 2015; Han, 2011; Schiffrin, 2003). They maximized the message delivery. Therefore, markers play an important role for the continuity of discourse.

Some studies of markers in Indonesian have been conducted. The main function is to create and raise solidarity between the participants in the conversations (Sari 2011; Wouk, 1998). According to Wouk (1998) who explored marker *kan*, it works by giving effect to interlocutors' emotions. While Sari (2011) mentioned that Indonesian culture which gives importance on solidarity influences the nature of conversations including the use of markers. Miyake (2015) studied *sih* and *kok*. Marker *sih* is used to carry negative sense in questions. It also can be used to compare two items. She, moreover, discussed that *kok* gives sense of something happen in unexpected way. The finding of *kok* is relevant with the study of Mutiara (2017).

The present study concerns on marker *kok*. There are two functions of *kok* namely to question and emphasize (Sneddon, 2006). For *kok* which functions to question, *Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia* (Indonesian-Indonesian dictionary), stated that it is the synonym of *kenapa* or *mengapa* (why). The dictionary defines *kenapa* as a question word to ask for causes or reasons. It is also labeled as a word that belongs to colloquial.

Previous research on marker *kok* found that it might occur with other markers namely *eh*, *lho*, *lha*, *yah*, *wah*, and *ih* (Mutiara, 2017). Two markers that are in one intonation unit might occur and they produce more nuances of meaning (Sneddon, 2006). Sneddon described some cases such as the occurrences of *kok* and *sih*. In addition, three markers might be found in one intonation unit to form *yah ha kok ...* and *wah lho kok ...* (Mutiara, 2017). It can be said that as a discourse marker *kok* co-occur with other discourse markers and interjections.

Such kind of occurrences composes more complex meaning. In relation to the concept that *kok* is a synonym to *kenapa*, it is intriguing whether the case of co-occurrences with markers also can be found with *kenapa*. This study preferred to contrast *kok* with *kenapa* rather than *mengapa* because *kenapa* is labeled as a word in colloquial Indonesian. It discussed whether *kenapa* co-occurs with markers. If so, the differences of markers and their functions that co-occur with *kok* and *kenapa* were investigated.

## METHODOLOGY

Corpus assisted discourse study was applied to answer the research questions. Since it is a corpus study, building the corpus is the first step. The data were taken from CHILDES (*Child Language Data Exchange System*) which is available to be downloaded on the website. This is a spoken corpus of colloquial Jakartan Indonesian that contains dialogues of child and child and child and adult interactions. Some dialogues from CHILDES were taken to build a new corpus. The size of the corpus is around 370,000 words. To get the markers that co-occur with *kok* and *kenapa*, the list of collocates that are 4 words to the left and right was searched by using AntConc. The collocates that were not markers were dismissed from the list. Then, the markers with at least have ten occurrences were analyzed. Concordance lines were studied to find the functions of the co-occurrences. It was done to consider the context of dialogue. Aijmer and Rühlmann (2015) mentioned that meanings of markers can be found by studying context. Analyzing the meaning is necessary to see the functions. The functions were categorized by theory developed by Halliday in Aijmer and Rühlmann (2015) i.e. interpersonal and textual functions.

## ANALYSIS

The markers mostly occur on the left side. On the left side of *kok* there are some markers namely *lho*, *ya*, *eh*, *sih*, *oh*, *yah*, *lha*, and *ih*. *Sih* is the only marker on the right side of *kok*. On the left side of *kenapa*, there are some markers namely *eh*, and *oh*. While on the right side, there are *sih* and *kok*. In terms of frequency, it was found that the number of markers that co-occur with *kok* whether they are on the left or right sides is higher than *kenapa*.

It was found that eight markers occur on the left side of *kok* while one marker appears on the right side of it. All sub-functions of interpersonal functions i.e., softening, expressing solidarity, and signaling attitudes can be found. For textual function, attracting hearers' attention is the main function especially the repetitions of marker. The following table shows the frequencies of *kok* and other markers.

Table 1. The co-occurrences of *kok* and markers

Left side		Right side	
Markers	Frequency	Marker	Frequency
<i>lho</i>	128	<i>sih</i>	223
<i>ya</i>	89		
<i>eh</i>	58		
<i>sih</i>	44		
<i>oh</i>	36		
<i>yah</i>	19		
<i>lha</i>	27		
<i>ih</i>	11		

Markers *lho* occur to question a phenomenon that is considered weird for the speakers as in *lho, kok di sekolah ada jemuran?* It might appear to show that what happens is below speaker's expectation such as *lho, kok cuman begini?* Repetition of *lho* can be found up to three to four times in one utterance as in *lho, lho, lho, kok diberantakin?* and *lho, lho, lho, lho, kok di lante?* In both cases, the speakers found unexpected behaviors. Then, the speakers show higher sense of shock. By doing so, it is expected that the ones that produced such behavior would change it.

Markers *ya* bring sense of disappointment. The unexpected things make the speakers disappointed as in *ya, kok gitu?* and *ya, kok dilepas Ica? Yah* carries a similar function to *ya* as in *ya, kok lepas sambungannya, kan tabrakan?* Hearing that the speakers are disappointed makes the interlocutors do something to reduce disappointment. For instance, in the utterance of *ya kok dilepas Ica*, the speakers indirectly stated that it is wrong to do it. The interlocutor, Ica, realized it and would stop doing the unexpected actions. Similar to *lho*, *ya* and *yah* were used to show speakers' attitudes.

Marker *eh* has some meanings. One of them is to make the interlocutor realize that something is wrong. It carries sense of protesting such as in *eh, kok mamas melulu?* In that case, the speaker said that it is not fair. Furthermore, it is also done to make the interlocutors realize that they misbehaved. The utterances were produced by adults to children as in *eh, kok pake gigi?* and *eh, kamu kok tidak sopan sama kaka?* It can be seen that the speakers make negative assessment towards phenomena that they observed. *Eh* can be repeated twice or three times in one utterance as in *eh, eh, kok dimakan?* and *eh, eh, eh, kok dipotong?* The repetitions are intended to give stronger notices to the interlocutors. It is used to carry speakers' attitude of dislike.

When *sih* occurs on the left side of *kok*, *sih* is a part of another clause that appears preceding the syntactical structure in which *kok* occurs. In the example *siapa sih yang mutusin, kok miring?*, *sih* is a part of the clause *siapa sih yang mutusin*. Then, *kok miring* comes. The two structures form one utterance. In one utterance, thus, there are two questions. The speakers' mind was processing several questions at the same time. Other examples are *power rangernya yang mana sih kok banyak banget?* and *punya siapa sih kok pada kagak tau?*. Among sequences of questions, the speakers tried to make impression that they do not attack the interlocutors with several questions at the same time by using *sih*. *Sih* creates sequences of questions flows smoothly (Sneddon, 2006). Besides, *kok* carries the sense of unexpectedness (Mutiara, 2017). The unexpected things tend to be negative. It is in line with what is mentioned by Miyake (2015). To convey such message, *sih* is used. Hedging and signaling attitudes can be seen in the use of this marker.

Markers *oh* show the speakers got new information. After he realized some information, the speaker asked a question about the new information that is *oh punya dia kok kamu minum?* Furthermore, it is possible for the utterance to have another question word even though marker *kok* has a function as a question word there as in *oh kok nggak mau kenapa?* Repetition of the function of question word realized by *kok* and *kenapa* represent speakers' urgency to get the reasons because it intensifies the intriguing tone. In the co-occurrences, the speakers noticed new issue and asked information related to the issue. Then, the conversation was directed to that issue. Repetition of *oh* also can be found as in *oh, oh, kok pake ditutupin?* Marker *oh* represents that the interlocutors get the message and they now have same knowledge as the speakers. It can be seen as interlocutors' effort to respect message informed by the speakers. The interlocutors show politeness as a way to maintain relationship. Solidarity function is apparent.

Marker *ih* carries the sense of protesting as in *ih, kok begitu sih?* It might function as a tool to correct child's behavior as in *ih, kok berisik amat makannya?* Repetitions of *ih* can be found as in *ih, ih, kok marah marah?* It shows speaker's feeling of disgusting towards one issue raised. *Ih* is used to signal attitudes.

In general, marker *lha* delivers the sense of shock. Besides, it shows sense of confusing as in *lha, kok aku naek di mana?* Signaling attitude is obvious in the use of marker *lha*.

In the co-occurrences of *kok* and *sih* in which *sih* occurs on the right side of *kok*, *sih* occurs to show a kind of negative feeling. It can be a way to deliver the sense of protesting. He was not satisfied with what he saw. The speaker, thus, asked *kok begitu sih?* Then, the interlocutor answered *nanti dulu belum jadi*. The answer was to minimize speakers' protest by giving explanation. It might appear to show the negative feeling of dislike as in *kok aku sih?* It also can be used to smooth the conversation as in *tante kok bagus sih ininya?* Showing attitudes and softening play roles here.

There are two markers on the left side of *kenapa* and two markers occur on the right side of it. The interpersonal functions can be seen even though speakers' attitudes are not as various as in the case of co-occurrences of *kok* and markers. Attracting hearer's attention and signaling a frame are the salient textual functions. The frequencies of markers can be seen in the table below.

**Table 2. The co-occurrences of *kenapa* and markers**

Left side		Right side	
Markers	Frequency	Markers	Frequency
<i>eh</i>	38	<i>sih</i>	67
<i>oh</i>	15	<i>kok</i>	44

The co-occurrences of *kenapa* and other markers can be seen in the examples: *eh, kenapa mamah rambutnya keriting?* By using *eh* the speaker attract hearer's attention to focus on the cause as can be seen in the following dialogue:

A: *Ih, mama rambutnya keriting, ih.*

B: *Eh, kenapa mamah rambutnya keriting?*

It was used to make the interlocutor focus on why it happened. Repetition of *eh* also can be found as in *eh, eh, eh, kenapa tuh?* Textual function which is signaling a frame can be seen here. The speakers directed interlocutor to the reasons of the existence of phenomena.

In the co-occurrences of *kenapa* and marker *oh*, markers *oh* can occur with *kenapa* as a bundle as in *oh, kenapa* as in *oh, kenapa dia naik taksi?* In the other case, *oh* forms a chunk with *kok* as *oh kok ...*. This structure also functions to ask a reason. Then, it is followed by a question word *kenapa*. The example for this case is *oh, kok nggak mau kenapa?* Both *kok* and *kenapa* are used to ask for reasons. Marker *oh* shows that the speakers get new information. Both the giver and receiver of information now has same knowledge. The use of marker *oh* that co-occur with *kenapa* is similar to its co-occurrences with *kok*. *Oh* shows solidarity function.

When the speakers produced *kenapa sih ...?*, the speakers also made a number of questions preceding or following the question with *kenapa sih ...?* as follows:

A: *Kenapa kamu? Kamu takut gemuk ya? Kenapa sih? Kan, kamu nggak gemuk, Ca.*

The speakers produced two questions before uttering *kenapa sih?*. Also, the questions might not come in sequences as in the following dialogue:

A: *Kenapa sih takut sama guguk?*

B: *Takut.*

A: *Emang kenapa?*

As has been discussed that marker *sih* has a role in softening sequences of questions, it happens for co-occurrences of *kenapa* and *sih*.

*Kenapa kok* occurs as in *kenapa kok dia nggak mau?* and *kenapa kok marah?* Furthermore, marker *sih* might occur in their co-occurrences such as in *kenapa sih kok males* and *kenapa sih kok takut sama polisi?* Both *kenapa* and *kok* play roles in asking reasons. As one of the functions of marker *kok* is to deliver feeling of shock, it also happens for this case. The co-occurrences of *kok* and *kenapa* cause the double sense of questioning accompanied by feeling shock.

## CONCLUSION

Like *kok*, *kenapa* co-occurs with markers. Markers that co-occur on the left side of *kok* are more various compared to *kenapa*. The markers that collocate with *kok* tend to carry interpersonal function especially signaling attitudes. There are different types of attitudes. Markers that carry strong sense of emotions of the speakers such as *lho* and *yah* were not found to co-occur with *kenapa*. In conclusion, speakers' feelings can be seen more clearly by using *kok* because there are various markers that function to show emotions co-occur with *kok*. This case does not happen in co-occurrences of *kenapa* and other markers. Several markers namely *eh* and *oh* co-occur with *kok* and *kenapa* on the left side and *sih* on the right side. These markers have similar functions in their co-occurrences with *kok* and *kenapa*.

## REFERENCES

- Aijmer, K. (2014). Pragmatic markers. In K. Aijmer & C. Rühlemann, *Corpus pragmatics: A handbook*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Aijmer, K. & Rühlemann, C. (2014). Corpus pragmatics: Laying the foundations. In K. Aijmer & C. Rühlemann, *Corpus pragmatics: A handbook*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Anthony, L. (2014). AntConc (Version 3.4.3) [Computer Software]. Tokyo, Japan: Waseda University. Downloaded from <http://www.laurenceanthony.net/Antconc>
- Biber, D., Johansson, S., Conrad, S. & Finegan, E. (1999). *Longman grammar of spoken and written English*. London: Longman.
- Gray, B. & Biber, D. (2014). Stance markers. In K. Aijmer & C. Rühlemann, *Corpus pragmatics: A handbook*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Child Language Data Exchange System. (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://childes.talkbank.org/browser/index.php?url=EastAsian/Indonesian/Jakarta/>
- Han, D. (2011). Utterance production and interpretation: A discourse-pragmatic study on pragmatic markers in English public speeches. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43, 2776-2794.
- Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia*. (2016). Retrieved from <https://kbbi.web.id/>
- Miyake, Y. (2015). Pragmatic particles and information structure in colloquial Indonesian dialogue. In Linguistics Dynamics Science Project 2 (Eds.). Proceedings of the Second International Workshop on Information Structure of Austronesian Languages (pp. 103-114). Tokyo, Japan.
- Mutiara, R. (2017). Particle *kok* in child language: Stance and positions. In Yanti (Ed.), *Celebrating corpus tools*. Proceedings of the the 4th Atma Jaya Conference on Corpus Studies (pp. 11-15). Jakarta, Indonesia.
- Norrich, N. (2014). Interjections. In K. Aijmer & C. Rühlemann, *Corpus pragmatics: A handbook*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sari, F. (2011). A cross-linguistic dimension of the pragmatic particle *ya*. *Linguistik Indonesia*, 29 (1), 53 – 68.
- Schiffrin, D. (1992). *Discourse markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Seddon, J. (2006). *Colloquial Jakartan Indonesian*. Australia: The Australian National University.
- Wouk, F. (1998). Solidarity in Indonesian conversation: The discourse marker *ya*. *Journal of Cross-Cultural and Interlanguage Communication*, 17 (4), 379-406.

## Biodata:

Name : Rika Mutiara  
 Institution : Esa Unggul University  
 E-mail address : [rika.mutiara@esaunggul.ac.id](mailto:rika.mutiara@esaunggul.ac.id)  
 Education : MA in Applied English Linguistics  
 Research interests : Discourse analysis, corpus linguistics, language acquisition

# KOK AND KENAPA: THEIR CO-OCCURENCES WITH PRAGMATIC MARKERS IN COLLOQUIAL JAKARTAN INDONESIAN

## ORIGINALITY REPORT

15%

SIMILARITY INDEX

14%

INTERNET SOURCES

4%

PUBLICATIONS

6%

STUDENT PAPERS

## PRIMARY SOURCES

1	<a href="http://digilib.esaunggul.ac.id">digilib.esaunggul.ac.id</a> Internet Source	10%
2	Rachele De Felice, Gregory Garretson. "Politeness at Work in the Clinton Email Corpus: A First Look at the Effects of Status and Gender", Corpus Pragmatics, 2018 Publication	1%
3	<a href="http://chs.harvard.edu">chs.harvard.edu</a> Internet Source	1%
4	Submitted to University of Edinburgh Student Paper	1%
5	<a href="http://opus4.kobv.de">opus4.kobv.de</a> Internet Source	1%
6	Submitted to Leiden University Student Paper	<1%
7	Tony McEnery, Costas Gabrielatos. "English Corpus Linguistics", Wiley, 2006	<1%

---

8	<a href="http://www.zurnalai.vu.lt">www.zurnalai.vu.lt</a> Internet Source	<1%
9	<a href="http://eprints.unm.ac.id">eprints.unm.ac.id</a> Internet Source	<1%
10	Submitted to University of Lancaster Student Paper	<1%
11	Michael Westphal. "Question Tags in Philippine English", Corpus Pragmatics, 2020 Publication	<1%
12	<a href="http://www.scielo.br">www.scielo.br</a> Internet Source	<1%
13	Submitted to Yeditepe University Student Paper	<1%

---

Exclude quotes Off

Exclude matches Off

Exclude bibliography Off