

Gorom Language's Phonological Differences Viewed from Age and Occupation Factors: Socio-dialectology Study

Iwan Rumalean

Universitas Pattimura
Ambon, Indonesia

iwanrumalean@yahoo.com

Kisyani Laksono

Universitas Negeri Surabaya
Surabaya, Indonesia
kisyani@unesa.ac.id

Bambang Yulianto

Universitas Negeri Surabaya
Surabaya, Indonesia
bmb_yulianto@yahoo.co.id

Abstract—This study was aimed to explore the phonological differences of Gorom language viewed from age and occupation factors, by using socio-dialectology approach. Adult and children speakers belong to age factor while farmers and civil servants speakers belong to occupation factor. This study used 24 Gorom community leaders as the data sources. There were 6 observation areas, which were determined by the vertical downward model. The data of this study was 880 basic vocabularies of Gorom language. They were obtained through interview and field note listing and were analyzed by using the matching method. The data analysis showed that there were phonological variation of Gorom language sounds [wa] ~ [U], [k] ~ [ʔ], [r] ~ [l], [b] ~ [i], and [d] ~ [t]. Farmers used different phonological forms with the civil servants, and adult speakers used different phonological forms with children as well. The results of this study can be used by teachers and lecturers in language teaching and learning, especially in teaching vocabulary.

Keywords—phonological differences, Gorom language, age and occupation factors, socio-dialectology.

I. INTRODUCTION

The study of Gorom language's phonological differences used socio-dialectology approach. This approach integrated into geography, sociology, linguistics, and dialectology [1]

The phonological differences in the dialectological study of the phonemic level such as gloss <TETAPI> in the Gorom language consisted of five variants i.e., (1) [mule], (2) [muale], (3) [muge], (4) [muage] and (5) [muje]. The 1st and 2nd variants were used in Tinarin administrative village, Gorom Timur sub-districts, and all countries in the western part of Manawoku Island, Pulau Gorom sub-district. The 3rd variant was used in Miran village, Kilkoda village and Kotasiri village in Gorom Timur sub-district. The 4th variant was uttered in Wawasa administrative village, Pulau Gorom sub-district. The 5th variant was uttered in Amarwatu village, Gorom Timur sub-district. The use of font and phonemes in the different variant in dialectology is called phonological differences [2]. For example, the phoneme /r/ is pronounced

differently in Italian and French. The consonant /r/ in Italian is recited as a dental-trill consonant, while in French, it is pronounced as uvular-trill [3].

The study of phonological differences includes phonemics and phonetics. It is distinguished by lexical differences [4]. The phonological differences are related to sound correspondence, while the lexical differences are related to form of word meaning (semantics) [5]. In addition, phonological differences are also related to phonological processes that can occur in all sound-language changes. The change may be in the basic or derivative words due to phonological or morphological processes [6].

The use of Gorom language also varied in communities in one village with other villages. For instance, the villagers of Ondor in Pulau Gorom sub-district pronounced the word [ikan] which means 'fish'. Communities in Pulau Panjang and East Gorom sub-districts pronounced it as [iʔan]. The word [salidir] which means 'nail' was uttered in Kataoka village and its surroundings. In Miran and Kilkoda villages and surrounding areas, it is pronounced as [lidir].

Furthermore, as a local wisdom, Gorom language enriches the Indonesian vocabulary. Therefore, it needs to be preserved as mandated by Law No. 24 of 2009 Chapter III Article 35-39 on the flag, language and national symbol and national anthem [7]. In addition, one of the dialectology roles is as a nation-state unity if it is well managed [8]. If it is not managed properly, it creates conflicts between speakers that ultimately impact on national instability [9].

II. METHOD

The data of this research was 880 basic vocabularies of Gorom language. The data were taken from 24 people; 4 people for each observation area, consisting of 1 adult, 1 child, 1 farmer, and 1 civil servant speakers. The data sources were obtained from the local village leader (King). If the leader cannot recommend the source of data, the researcher seeks for

himself through discussions with local community leaders such as rural leaders and educational leaders [10].

This research was conducted in Gorom Timur, Pulau Panjang, and Pulau Gorom sub-districts, Seram Bagian Timur Regency. The location of this study can be seen in the following figure.



Figure 1, Map of Gorom Islands [11]

There were 6 observation areas in this study which were determined by using the vertical downward model. The observation areas were started from the northern to the eastern hemisphere of Gorom Islands. Thus, the 1st observation area was Dada administrative village, Pulau Gorom sub-district, the 2nd area was Lalasa village, Pulau Panjang sub-district, the 3rd area was Ondor village, Pulau Gorom sub-district, the 4th area was Miran village, Gorom Timur sub-district, the 5th area was Wawasa administrative village, Pulau Gorom sub-district, and the 6th observation area was Amarwatu village, Gorom Timur sub-district. Those areas can be seen in the following figure [12].



Figure 2, Map of Observation Areas

Two techniques of collecting data were used in this research, i.e. 1) interview and 2) field note listing. Those techniques were used to obtain (a) informants' personal information, and (b) basic vocabularies of Gorom language which were translated from Indonesian vocabularies [13]. The data analysis of this study had been started from research planning up to the completion of data collection process (snowball-sampling). The analysis of Gorom language differences was conducted by differentiating its syllables and patterns. Through this model of analysis, it can be seen that

there is a pattern of phonological differences in Gorom language [14].

III. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

1) Result

Based on the analysis of 880 basic vocabularies of Gorom language, it was found that not all basic vocabularies consist of phonological differences. In addition, the phonological differences found consisted of 1) phonological variation, and 2) phonological correspondence. This study was focused on the exploration of phonological variation, written by using (~) symbol. Correspondence and lexical forms were not discussed in this study. Phonological variations were found in sounds [wa] ~ [U], [k] ~ [ʔ], [r] ~ [l], [b] ~ [i], [r] ~ [l], and [d] ~ [t].

The sound [wa] ~ [U] was found on gloss *Lelaki* (man) and gloss *Perempuan* (woman). Gloss *lelaki* was presented through [warana] ~ [Urana] variants. Gloss *perempuan* was presented by [wawina] ~ [Uwina] variants. The sound [k] ~ [ʔ] was found on the gloss *Tukang Kayu* (carpenter), and it was presented through [tuka | kayira] ~ [tuʔan ʔayira] variants. The sound [r] ~ [l] was found on the gloss *matahari* (sun), and it was presented through [Altala/Urtala] ~ [Artala/Urtala] variants. The sound [b] ~ [i] was found on the gloss *Tembok* (wall), and it was presented by [betoʷana] ~ [bitoʷana] variants. The sounds [d] ~ [t] was found in gloss *Berak* (defecate), and it was presented through [damaʷin] ~ [tamaʷin] variants. Phonological variations, observation areas, and speakers can be seen in the following table.

TABLE I. PHONOLOGICAL DIFFERENCES OF GOROM LANGUAGE BASED ON OCCUPATION FACTOR

Gloss	Occupation Factors	Variant and Observation Area	Variant and Observation Area
Man	farmers	warana: 1, 2, 4, 5, 6	Urana: 3
	civil servants	warana: 1, 2, 4, 6	Urana: 1, 2, 3, 5
Woman	farmers	wawaina: 1, 2, 4, 5, 6	Uwina: 3
	civil servants	wawaina: 1, 2, 4, 5, 6	Uwina: 3
Carpenter	farmers	tuʔan aʷira: 1, 2, 5, 4, 6	tukang kaʷira: 3
	civil servants	tuʔan aʷira: 1, 2, 5, 4, 6	tukang kaʷira: 3
Sun	farmers	Altala/Urtala: 1, 2, 3, 5	Artala/Urtala: 4, 6
	civil servants	matahari: 1, 2, 3, 5	matahari: 4, 6
Wall	farmers	betoʷana: 2, 4, 5, 6	bitoʷana: 1, 2, 3, 4
	civil servants	tembok: 1, 2, 4, 5, 6	tembok: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5
Defecate	farmers	damaʷin: 1, 2, 3, 5	tamaʷin: 4, 6
	civil servants	damaʷin: 1, 2, 3, 5	tamaʷin: 4, 6

TABLE II. PHONOLOGICAL DIFFERENCES OF GOROM LANGUAGE BASED ON AGE FACTOR

Gloss	Age Factors	Variant and Observation Area	Variant and Observation Area
Man	Adult Children	warana: 1, 2, 4, 5, 6 warana: 1, 2, 4, 6	Urana: 3 laki-laki: 3
Woman	Adult Children	wawaina: 1, 2, 4, 5, 6 wawaina: 1, 2, 4, 5, 6	Uwina: 3 nona: 3
Carpenter	Adult Children	tu'an a'ira: 1, 2, 5, 4, 6 tukang a'ira: 1, 2, 5, 4, 6	tukang ka'ira: 3 tukang kayu: 3
Sun	Adult Children	Altala/ Ultala: 1, 2, 3, 5 matahari: 1, 2, 3, 5	Artala/Urtala: 4, 6 matahari: 4, 6
Wall	Adult Children	beto'ana: 2, 4, 5, 6 temboka: 1, 2, 4, 5, 6	bito'ana: 1, 2, 3, 4 temboka: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5
Defecate	Adult Children	dama'in: 1, 2, 3, 5 dama'in: 1, 2, 4, 5, 6	tama'in: 4, 6 bera: 3

2) Discussion

Phonological differences can be described based on social and linguistic factors.

Gloss *LELAKI* was presented through three variants, i.e. [warana], [Urana], and [laki-laki]. Based on social factor, the farmers and adult speakers in the 1st, 2nd, 4th, 5th, and 6th observation areas uttered the sound [wa] in [warana] variant varies with [U] on [Urana] variant uttered by farmers and adults speakers in the 3rd area. The civil servants and children speakers in the 1st, 2nd, 3rd, and 5th observation areas presented gloss *LELAKI* over three variants, namely [warana], [Urana], and [laki-laki].

Gloss *PEREMPUAN* was presented through three variants, i.e. [wawina], [Uwina], and [nona]. The civil servants and children speakers in the 5th and 6th observation areas presented the gloss *LELAKI* through [warana] variant, and the gloss *PEREMPUAN* was presented through [wawina] variant. Therefore, the civil servants and children speakers uttered each of the two variants in presenting the glosses *LELAKI* and *PEREMPUAN*. The civil servants and children speakers in the 4th and 5th observation areas presented one variant.

On linguistic, sounds [wa] and [U] were two different forms. The form [wa] played as a syllable, and [U] was as a font. Variations that occur in [warana] and [Urana] and [wawina] and [Uwina] variants were named the beginning of the syllable variation which belongs to external variation. Thus, [wa] in [warana] and [wawina] variants were as syllables of onset + nucleus (w + a), and included as open syllables with the vowel-consonant pattern.

Phoneme [U] in [Urana] and [Uwina] variants held the position as rhymes. In this case, /U/ stood alone as a syllable, and as a vowel (nucleus). Therefore, it was called an open syllable. This syllable was called phoneme of one syllable which patterns as a vowel. When it was viewed on the basis of the articulator producing the phoneme /U/, then /U/ included into the high-back-neutral vowel phoneme.

Historically, [warana] variant is not cognate with related languages such as Ambonese Malay or Proto-Austronesian. The [Uwina] variant is found its cognate in Proto-Polynesian i.e. *fafine* 'female', [15]. Although Gorom language is not

derived from Proto-Polynesian, it is derived from the Austronesian, Austronesian sub-clumps, the Eastern Seram group [16].

Gloss *TUKANG KAYU* was presented through three variants, i.e. [tuka | ka'ira], [tuka | kayu], and [tu'an a'ira]. The [tuka | ka'ira] variant was spoken by the farmers, adults, and civil servants speakers in the 3rd observation area. The [tuka | kayu] variant was pronounced by the children speakers in the 3rd observation area. The [tu'an a'ira] variant was uttered by social groups in the 1st, 2nd, 4th, 5th, and 6th observation areas. The [tukang kayu] variant was spoken by children in all six observation areas.

Gloss *MATAHARI* was presented through five variants, i.e. [Altala], [Ultala], [Artala], [Urtala] and [matahari]. The [Altala] variant was spoken by farmers and adult speakers in the 1st, 2nd, and 3rd observation areas. The [Ultala] variant was pronounced not only by farmers and adult speakers in the 1st, 4th, and 6th observation areas but also by the civil servant's speakers in the 5th observation area. The [Artala] variant was uttered by the farmers and adult speakers in the 2nd, 3rd, 4th, 5th, and 6th observation areas. The [Urtala] variant was spoken not only by the farmers and adults speakers in the 4th and 6th observation areas but also by the civil servant's speakers in the 4th and 6th observation areas. The [matahari] variant was uttered by the children in all observation areas.

Gloss *TEMBOK* was presented through three variants, i.e. [bito'ana], [beto'ana], and [tembok]. The [bito'ana] variant was produced by farmers, adult, and civil servants speakers in the 1st, 2nd, 3rd, and 4th observation areas. The [beto'ana] variant was pronounced by farmers and adults speakers in the 2nd, 4th, 5th, and 6th observation areas. The [tembok] variant was uttered by the children in all observation areas.

Gloss *BERAK* was presented through three variants, i.e. [dama'in], [tama'in], dan [bera]. The [dama'in] variant was spoken by farmers, civil servants, adults, and children speakers in the 1st, 2nd, 3rd, and 5th observation areas. The [tama'in] variant was spoken by farmers, civil servants, adults, and children speakers in the 4th and 6th observation areas. The [bera] variant was uttered by children in the 3rd observation area.

On linguistic, sounds [r] ~ [l] occurred in [Artala] and [A'tala] and [Artala], [Urtala] and [U'tala] variants. Sounds [e] ~ [i] found in [[beto'ana] and [bito'ana] variants. Sounds [d] ~ [t] occurred in [dama'in] and [tama'in] variants. Sounds [a] ~ [u] found in [tama'in] or [tuma'in] variants. Viewed from the motive and formative, it can be explained that, [tu'an], [tuka |], [beto'ana], [bito'ana], and [bera] variants are from the Indonesian language. In short, those variants are derived from innovation processes. The [Artala], [Urtala], [Ultala], [Urtala], [dama'in], [tama'in], and [tuma'in] variants were not found in Proto-Austronesian, Prorto-Polynesian, Proti-Malay-Polynesian, and Ambonese Malay language. Therefore, those are Gorom language variants.

Based on these explanations, age and occupation are the factors that define phonological differences, especially the phonological variations of the Gorom language. Farmers speakers produced different phonological variations with the

civil servants. Adult speakers produced different phonological variations with the children as well [17].

The results described above are in line with the study on gangster members in New York City, the United States performing the elisis process. Elisis is an -ed form to mark the past tense at the end of the word. For example, the word 'missed _ miss' in the sentence 'He **missed** the bus yesterday _ he **miss...** the bus yesterday'. Another example, the word 'passed _ pass' in the sentence 'It pass him instead of It passed him'. The teenage gangster members in New York City mostly produce the dual adult negation form of the same social class, [18]. The middle-aged are most familiar with and have acknowledged on language norms, so they produce more standard forms. In contrast, few teenagers use vernacular forms while the middle-aged uses standard and prestige forms. From the age factor, Holmes found that the peak language achievement is at the age of 30 to 50 years old, where they have been pressured from the language community to adjust to the language norms.

In addition, social factor – especially ethnic and gender – are dominant in the use of phonemes differently. Lombok ethnic, for example, stands out in causing pronunciation variations of the phoneme /f/ when compared with Muna and Batak ethnics. Muna and Batak ethnics are dominant in retaining the original phoneme sound /f/ instead of /v/ [19]. This is acceptable because Taembo's research uses cross-ethnic data sources.

In accordance, the results of research on how to understand the use of standard and non-standard dialects can be studied in ethnic point of view. Each ethnic has a feature of speech that describes the speaker's phonetic characteristics [20]. The study of phonological variation of Gorom language used one ethnic, Gorom ethnic, as its data source.

Based on the above explanation, social factors – especially the age and occupation – also determine the phonological differences of Gorom language.

IV. CONCLUSION

The age and occupation factors in the six observation areas in Gorom Islands differed in using the Gorom language's phonological differences in Pulau Gorom, Gorom Timur, and Pulau Panjang sub-districts, Seram Bagian Timur Regency – Moluccas Province.

Not only farmers and civil servants but also an adult and children speakers use different phonological variations. In addition, farmers and adult speakers use the same phonological variation. Moreover, civil servants and children speakers use the same phonological variation as well.

The phonological differences are especially the variations on the sounds [r] ~ [l] in [Artala] and [Altala], [Urtala] and [Ultala], the sounds [e] ~ [i] in [beto^wana] and [bito^wana], and the sound [d] ~ [t] on [dama^vin] and [tama^vin] or [tuma^vin]. Their motive and formative belong to Gorom language's variants. The [tu[?]an], [tuka |], [beto^wana], and [bito^wana] variants are related to Indonesian word *tukan* and *beton*.

The phonological differences of Gorom language are found in the phonological variation (~) that occurs in the sound [wa] ~ [U], [k] ~ [ʔ], [r] ~ [l], [b] ~ [i], [r] ~ [l], and [d] ~ [t].

REFERENCES

- [1] N. Yannuar, K. Azimova, and D. Nguyen, "Perceptual dialectology: northerners and southerners' view of different American dialect". *Journal K@ta* 16(1), pp. 8–14. 2014.
- [2] D. R. Preston, "Language, People, Salience, Space: Perceptual Dialectology And Language Regard, 2010
- [3] W. Bisang, "Dialectology and typology—An integrative Perspective". *ResearchGate*. Article 2004.
- [4] B. Yulianto, *Fonologi Generatif Teori dan Aplikasinya*. Surabaya: Lembaga Penelitian Universitas Negeri Surabaya, 2012.
- [5] Kisayani, *Bahasa Jawa di Jawa Timur Bagian Utara dan Blambangan*. Pusat Bahasa. Departemen Pendidikan Nasional, Jakarta, 2004.
- [6] B. Yulianto And T. Totong, *Fonologi*. Surabaya: Jurusan Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia FPBS-IKIP Surabaya, (1989).
- [7] R. King, C. L. LeBlanc, and D. Rick. Grimm, "Dialect Contact and the Acadian French Subjunctive: A Cross-Varietal Study". *Journal of Linguistic Geography*. Abstract, 2018.
- [8] Kemendiknas, *Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 24 tahun 2009 tentang Bendera, Bahasa, dan Lambang Negara serta Lagu Kebangsaan*. Jakarta: Badan Pengembangan dan Pembinaan Bahasa Kemendiknas, 2011.
- [9] G. C. Flores, "Language Ideologies, Intervarietal Conflict and Their Repercussions on Language and Society: The Case of The Hispanic Dialect Complex". *Dialectologia et Geolinguistica*. Abstract, 2018.
- [10] A. Peter, The Construction of Linguistic Borders and The Linguistic Construction of Borders. *Dialects Across Borders: Current Issues in Linguistic Theory*. (editor: Markku Firppula, Juhani Klemola, Marjatta Palander, Esa Panttilä). Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, Volume 237. pp. 4. 2002.
- [11] I. Rumalean, "Leksikon Sapaan Isolek Gorom (LSIG) di Kabupaten Seram Bagian Timur: Kajian Dialek Sosial". *Bahasa dan Sastra dalam Konteks Global, e-Prosiding Seminar Nasional*. Jember-Jawa Timur-Indonesia: PS-PBSI-FKIP Universitas Jember, 2017.
- [12] M. Weiling, J. Nerbonne, and R.H. Baayen, "Quantitative Social Dialectology: Explaining Linguistic Variation Geographically and Socially". *PLoS ONE*. Abstract, 2011.
- [13] K. Syrjänen, *Tracing The History Of Dialectological Research in Finland*, 2012
- [14] L.C.D'iaz, S.S. Quintas, R.M. Crujeiras, A.R. Casal, X. Sousa, E.J.R.R. Viqueira, "A Method for Processing Perceptual Dialectology Data". *ResearchGate*. Article Conference Paper, 2015.
- [15] H. Ross, Proto-Austronesian (PAN) Languages. *Wikipedia-Encyclopedia Indonesia*, 2009. pp.1-4.
- [16] D.J. Parera. *Kajian Linguistik Umum Historis Komparatif dan Tipologi Struktural*. (edisi kedua). Jakarta: Erlangga, 1991.
- [17] I. Theodoropoulou., and J. Tyler. "Perceptual dialectology of the Arab world". *Al- 'Arabiyya: Journal of the Association of American Teachers of Arabic*, 2014. pp. 21-39.
- [18] H. Janet, *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. London: Longman, 1994.

- [19] M. Taembo, “Kajian Dialek Sosial Fonologi Bahasa Indonesia”. *Journal Kandai*. E-Jurnal Kantor Bahasa Sulawesi Tenggara-Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan, 2016. pp. 6—8.
- [20] W. Baker., D. Eddington, and L. Nay, “Dialect Identification: The Effects of Region of Origin and Amount of Experience”. *Sage Journal of Language and Cosial Psychology*, 2011.