CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

In this section, the writer would like to explain further about the theory that would be used for the research. The main theory that is used in this research includes language socialization theory that was introduced by Ochs and Schieffelin (1986). While secondary theory is the theory about family value that is introduced by Jones and Morris (2005), and the language maintenance that is introduced by Mesthrie (1999).

2.1. Language Socialization

Language socialization is a branch of linguistics anthropology study. Unlike the other branch of anthropological linguistic study, language socialization is focused on how children are socialized through the use of language as well as how socialized to use the language in a community (Ochs and Schieffelin, 1986). Language socialization unites cultural patterns and the role of language as an integrated system to how children grow up to become members of families and community" (Ochs and Schieffelin, 2011). So that, in the language socialization study, the aspects such as children, language, and cultural term in a society cannot be separated because one object will support the others.

Further, Ochs and Schieffelin (1986) declared that "language socialization studies the social and communicative positioning of children and other novices in

different activity settings and the abilities of such positioning for situational and cultural competence". They also argued that the study of language socialization examines how children and other novices apprehend and enact the context of the situation in relation to the context of culture. It examines how young children through interactions with older and/or more experienced persons, acquire the knowledge and practices, therefore they become the member of the community that should be considered as a competent member (Garret and Lopez, 2002).

Although language socialization seems the same with language acquisition in which both use children as the object of the study, but if both of them are distinguished in term of the goal of study, they are actually not the same. The goal of language acquisition is the understanding of what constitutes linguistic competence in the different developmental point or age. While the goal of language socialization study is the understanding how a novice in a society becomes more considerable in his social groups and in the role of the language process (Ochs and Schieffelin, 1986). Further, Ochs and Schieffelin (2011) argues that language socialization is a study which regards that language is a fundamental children equipment in acquiring social, cultural, knowledge and sensibilities development in a society. That is the domain which is not captured by language acquisition study.

One of the most important of language socialization observations is the observation of the process of language socialization itself (Ochs and Schieffelin, 1986). In language socialization, novice is not considered as a passive one in

acquiring cultural knowledge in a society but, rather considered as an active agent in interaction with other members of a community. In language socialization, every process of interactions is considered as a potential event to socialize the language toward novices where the experiences, beliefs and values are included and influenced in the language that is delivered by the more potential members. Further, Ochs and Schieffelin (1986) argued that language socialization process is a lifespan process. It means that, the process of language socialization occurs as long as there is still the interaction in a social group or a community.

Briefly, it appears that language socialization is a branch of linguistics anthropological study which concerns with the phenomenon of how children acquire their linguistic competences which are achieved from their interactions within the family and community. It seeks about the value, cultural knowledge, and beliefs that are delivered by the caregivers or elder members in the language toward novices.

2.2. Family Values

Jones and Morris (2005) stated that home and family is one of the central media in transmitting language to the next generation. Further, Williams and Morris (in Jones and Morris, 2005) showed that family is one media that is used by family to shape the future language use of children; it is more than just language that is used by family and their children.

A family value is correlated with the language policy. Generally, both of them are describing about the policy in using and socializing language. Practically, parent value and language policy not only deals with the variety of language and the language itself, but also considers the use of good and bad language that encourages people to use it or ignore it. Further, language policy and family value are not explicitly established by formal, legislatively assembled, written constitution, or government's policy, but they are established from the nature of language practices and beliefs of their language (Spolsky, 2004).

The role of family values is obviously important for the maintenance of language because the values that are held by the family will influence the parent's decision in socializing language to their children. Finally in the social group level, the role of family values will determine whether the local language will survive or loss (Spolsky, 2004).

In addition, Jones and Morris (2005) stated that there are two divisions exist on Family values; the first is valuing language as identity, and second as a community language. In their description of language as an identity, Jones and Morris argued that families who have that value are usually the native members of community. They believe that language is an identity or the existence of a community. Therefore every parent think language is important to be socialized to their children therefore it will become as community language retention in the future. Second, families that value language as the community language are typically consist of families who are not

native member of the community both from father's or mother's origin. But so, they respect the existing of local language in the community and teach it to their children as a form of loyalty to the community they live in.

2.3. Language Diversity

Language diversity is a state where there are differences in languages and in the language itself, in a particular community (Duranti, 1997. p.51). This distinction is based on differences of ideology and point of view of each individual toward the world. Those differences will motivate the differences in certain local language in the form of sounds, grammar, and vocabulary. In the last, because of each parent's ideology of a language is different, the language policy socialized to children they too would be different (Spolsky, 2005). With the passing of time and the changes in the language differences also continue to emerge. Then, they will compete with other languages which are differentiated by jobs, social class and gender. Finally, there will be a multilingual community, who rather to use more than one language. Therefore, the more heterogeneous one community, both in the education, origin, and type of their livelihoods, the greater potential of language diversity happened.

2.4. Language Contact

In defining language contact, Mufwene (2004) argued that:

Language contact is an interdisciplinary series bringing together work on language contact from a diverse range of research areas. The series

focuses on key topics in the study of contact between languages or dialects, including the development of pidgins and creoles, language evolution and change, code-switching and code-mixing, bilingualism and second language acquisition, borrowing, interference, and convergence phenomena.

Language contact usually occurs because there are two or more languages on a region contacting each other. For example, the language contact between French and English languages which occurred in England. Language contact that occurred in the region makes the existing of academic language in English is dominated by French language than English at that time the native language of England (Mufwene, 2005).

Further, Appel and Muysken (2005) argued that Language contact is a theory which focuses on the contact between two or more languages. It shows the influences of one language in the developing, borrowing and changing other language that is contacted. Language contact leads two language are influencing each other such as borrowing vocabularies by one language from another language.

2.5. Language Maintenance

Language maintenance is generally defined as the effort of a local community in maintaining their local dialect. As cited in Zhang (2008), Mesthrie said that language maintenance is a local community's attempt to defend the local dialect from lost and being contaminated by the new culture that comes from outside. Usually, language maintenance is correlated with the family's effort in maintaining local dialect encountering a new language that comes from outside named as acculturation

One of the factors that influence the maintenance of language in one community is the role of family. First, the family is the central media of language socialization (Jones and Morris, 2005). It is the first place for a novice to get an interactive event and to get knowledge of how he or she uses the language. Therefore, every lesson about language delivered in the family will influence children's role in using language in a community. Second, besides becoming the center of first children's interaction, family also has their own value and beliefs about the language that they use. So that, the role of family values will determine which language that will be used by their children. This phenomenon had been revealed by Hamida (2011). She said that every family has their values about the language which influence their way of seeing the language. It makes some of families socialize and maintain local dialect and some of them rarely use, and some of them even neglect it. While the other things that can support the language maintenance are arranging intermarriage within the community members, and valuing local dialect as highly valued language in the community (Holmes, 2008).

2.6. Tengger Community

Tengger community resides along and surrounds along Bromo Mountain from Probolinggo, Pasuruan, Lumajang, and Malang. The one that was observed by the writer in this research is the Tengger community who resides in Ngadisari, a part of Sukapura sub district, and one of a village in Probolonggo regency, East Java. Besides Ngadisari, there are also other villages in Sukapura such as Ngepang,

Sukapura, Patal, Jetak, and the Wonotoro Village. Among other villages, Ngadisari village is included the oldest villages in Sukapura. Tengger village is located in the highlands with an altitude of 1,800 meters above sea level. The distance from Ngadisari to Mount Bromo is also about five kilometers (Waluyo, 1997). Therefore, the air temperature in the village during the rainy season reach 0^0-20^0 C, while in the dry season reaches 0^0-8^0 C (Santoso et al, 2012). With relatively high rainfall in that area about 530mm makes Tengger people depend their processing of agricultural land on the rain all year. Those geographical conditions above force Tengger people to adjust their daily activities with the rhythm of the weather and the type of place where they live. For example, the condition of cool temperature in Ngadisari makes Tengger people perform their activities firstly start at 08.00 until 17.00 hours (Santoso et al, 2012). They also have to use warm clothes and extra clothing called sarung to protect them from the cold in their place of work, particularly in the farming area. The schedule of that activity time is usually used in processing of agricultural land, whereas for school activities or public office, it is begun as elsewhere which is started from 07.00 and ended at 13.30 o'clock.

Ngadisari land area reaches 775,300ha. Beside the area of settlement, Ngadisari also consists of a plantation area around 456ha, village asset 1 ha, and protected forest covering an area of 276.357ha which is managed by Taman Wisata Bromo Semeru (Waluyo, 1997). The land division which was described previously indicated that the plantation field takes the biggest proportion in this village. So that, it can be

concluded that most of the Tengger people in Ngadisari choose to work in the field of plantation than in other jobs such as teachers or office workers.

As for the types of plants that are commonly grown by farmers in Tengger are cabbage, potato, and onion leaves. In working on the farm, Tengger farmers usually employ farm laborers which are brought in from Pasuruan. The income from their field is already fulfilled their needs in daily life. It could be due to the Tengger people' choice to live a simple life principle so that they do not require a lot of expenses in fulfilling their wishes and needs in their daily needs.

Tengger community is a community who belongs to a class of Javanese society. They are still abiding and upholding the values that are inherited from their ancestors till now (Santoso et al, 2012). They neatly always celebrate a number of ceremonies ranging in each year in Tengger such as kasodo, entas-entas, karo, etc well. Community members who follow each celebration in Ngadisari are not only followed by old people that we usually see in other area but also children, adolescents, and adults. Even, every night, some children of Ngadisari whose age start from seven years old, always follow the learning of mantra which is usually held at the temple.

Waluyo (1997) argued that the religion which was professed by Tengger people before 1973 was called as Budo religion. In essence, that religion is so much different from the religion of Buddha (Siddhartha Gautama). It is due to that Budo is a religion that was inherited by Tengger's ancestors who came from Majapahit while Buddha is

a religion that was derived from India. Then from 1973, according to the village's leaders meeting results, it was determined that the religion which is professed by Tengger people is Hindu Dharma (Waluyo, 1997, p 18-19).

Nowadays, Tengger community is a Hindu religious community who has high level of obedience to their Lord. In accordance with the principle called as marang guru which means adhering to the Almighty God (Santoso et al, 2011), Tengger people always preserve and maintain their relationship with their God. This fact is reflected in the enthusiasm of Tengger people in following every religious ceremony. Almost of all members of Tengger community, both from women and men, and from young to elder members, attend the ceremony and run the agenda solemnly. They convinced that believing in God and obeying hyang *widi's* order is a must and has to be there in every human's heart (Santoso et al, 2012). Both of these law also make Tengger people always be modest in their daily life, doing all the activities with gratitude to God and not overly grandiose in desire. They prefer to live in a simple and modest life, they said that living a life has to be nrimo (received) for all the grace of the Almighty.

In addition, Tengger community also has five principal bases which are used as their main foundation in life; those five principles are united as one and called as panca sesanti setya (five loyal life principles). They are setya budaya (obedient, diligent, and independent), setya wacana (consistency toward the words), setya

semaya (keeping promises), setya laksana (submissive and obedient) and setya mitra (loyal friend) (Santoso et al, 2012).

From those five setya, in living social life, there are three important principles that underlying the way of communication of Tengger community. They are setya wacana, setya semaya, and setya mitra. Those three doctrines symbolize the notion in socializing with other people whether from outside or inside Tengger community. Firstly is setia wacana (consistency toward the words), it means that Tengger people should have the properties of responsibility in his or her social life principle especially in consistency on words that they said. It also can be meant that they have to do according to what they say. Second is setya semaya (keeping promises), a sense in which every person will be trusted by other friends if they keep their promises. By making this base as a foundation, Tengger people are always trying to keep their promises, they believe that the promise is a debt, so it is have to be paid. The last is setya mitra (loyal friend), this principle is well applied in Tengger community and grows enhancement between one and another member. As argued by Santoso et al (2012), that togetherness in Tengger community is also still well maintained. It can be seen in all the properties and helping each other in custom events which occurs in any religious activities such as ceremonies kasodo, karo, entas-entas and others.

Further, the compliance and obedience of each member of Tengger community are also still well maintained. Both customary law and formal law make the village always in peace and harmony. So, it is a common thing when the shaman of Tengger

said that the level of crimes in Ngadisari area are occurred primarily to zero percent each year, as well as the divorce rate and theft, all has a zero percent incidence rate. But if it is compared with the outside area, it will be a remarkable thing, considering in this era, there are so frequent criminal cases happened both in rural and urban are without exception.

2.7.Tengger Dialect

Santoso et. al (2012, p 41) agreed that Tengger is a dialect which is included into Javanese language family. Further, an anthropologist, Sunoto (1984, 1990) also argued that local language that is used by Tengger community is a dialect. It is because Tengger dialect itself has its own differentiation with the Javanese language such as in grammar, vocabulary and in phonological term.

In vocabularies for example, Tengger dialect has its own characteristics which are only manifested in the feature of itself. It is the same with the other dialects in the Javanese language family such as ngapak-ngapak in Tegal, and osing in Banyuwangi, which have their own characteristics in term of dialect.

Javanese	Tengger Dialect	Using dialect	Ngapak-ngapak Dialect	English
bapa, bapak	Bapa'	byapak	Bapak	Father
aku, kula (read: kulo),dalem	Aku	Ingsun, isun, hun	Inyong, nyong	I

Ibu	Mama'	Mak	Biyung	Mother
akowe, awakmu, sampeyan, peno	Rika, sira	Siro	Koen, rika	You

Table 2.1: The vocabulary of each Javanese dialect (Tengger dialect, Using

dialect, and Ngapak-ngapak)

Further, Sunoto (1990) reported that some of the characteristics which distinguish Tengger dialects with other Javanese dialects lied in grammar aspect such as in inflection and derivation. Here are several examples that had been pictured in Sunoto's;

Javanese	Tengger dialect	English
/Garing/ - /garingno/	/garing/ - /garingke/	Dry – drying
/benik/ - /benikno/	/klambi/ - /nglambeken/	Dress – dressing
/Bethek/ - /mbetheki/	/pager/ - /mager/	fence – fencing

Table 2.2. Tengger dialect Derivation

Javanese	Tengger dialect	English
/abang/ - /lewih abang/ - /abang sanget/	/abanga/-/abangan/- /kabangan/	Red- more red- most red

/gagah/ - /lewih gagah/ - /gagah sanget/	/gagaha/-/gagahan/- /kəgagahən/	Strong – Stronger - Strongest
/ayu/ - /lewih apik/ - /apik sanget/	/ayua/ - /ayuan/ - /kayuanən/	Pretty – prettier – prettiest

Table 2.3. Tengger dialect Inflection

The last, in phonological differentiation, the vocabularies of Tengger dialect often ends with different final vowel /a/ like "opo" becomes "apa", "sego" becomes "sega" and so on. So, it is becoming a differentiator with other Javanese language which is using final vowel /o/. In addition, although has final vowel /a/ in almost vocabularies, it also does not mean that Tengger dialect is the same as Tegal dialect which is called as ngapak-ngapak.

2.8.Related Research

There were several studies concerned about language socialization. For making specific, the writer concerns with the three researches concerned in this study they are Smith-Hefner's (1988), Janes and Morris's (2005) and Layli Hamida's (2011).

Smith-Hefner's (1988) research entitled The Linguistic Socialization of Javanese Children in Two Communities introduced about the use of addressing talk that used in two communities. The first is a rural community named Tengger, and the second is an urban community named Ciliwung community. She stated that Tengger community is a community that has less hierarchical, more communitarian, social holds sway and uses a nonstandard Javanese language called local Tengger dialect as

a variant of ngoko. Most of the interaction within the villagers there uses local Tengger dialect. Local Tengger dialect is also used by Tengger caregivers to their children. As a comparison, in her discussion about Ciliwung, Smith-Hefner stated that Ciliwung is a community that has an honorific pattern of interactions and use standard Javanese language in their daily life. Furthermore, even in those urban Ciliwung households where caregivers use the national language, Javanese honorific forms were still supplied for much term of interactions such as when involving communication of older or higher status persons such as fathers, mothers, and so on.

There are some similarities and differences between Smith-Hefner's research and the writer's. The similarities are both, Smith-Hefner and the writer use language socialization as the based theory and make the Tengger community as the participant of the study. On the contrary, the dissimilarities between Smith-Hefner's study and the writer's study are in the explanation of the research results and the range of the time in which the research was conducted. First, Smith-Hefner's explanation about the language socialization in Tengger community was incomplete. It is because the proportion of Ciliwung community is more dominant than Tengger community. Second, the range of the time in which the research was conducted until now is very long, 1988 – 2013. Then, we also analyzed difference field, she analyzed the addressing term, while the writer analyzes the family value.

The second related study is a study that was conducted by Jones and Morris (2005) entitled Welsh Language Socialization Within the Family. They found that the

children's minority language socialization is a complex process involving a very young age. In Welsh, local language socialization was conducted in the practicing of interaction with other family members, friends, and neighbors. The findings of their study indicate that the mother in Welsh talk more compare to father. They play a more significant role in the Welsh language socialization of their children. It is because the mothers in Welsh are the child's primary caregiver and spend more time with their children than fathers do. As the similarity, Jones and Morris did the same field with the writer, a research in the field of language socialization within the family. Contrarily, the location of the observation is not the same. They conducted a research in Welsh, whereas the writer conducts the research in Tengger Community.

The third, is a study that conducted by Hamida (2011), entitled Family Values in the Maintenance of Local/Home Language. She studied about how the cultural changes in a society can change the perspective, values and choice of family in using local language. She shows that there are three different conditions in some families in facing this situation; a) There are some families who still realize the importance of local language preservation so that engage and socialize the language; b) there are some families who consider that the local language is important, and has to be maintained, but they do not socialize the language to their children. They prefer to use national language in every context in their house and just let their children acquire local language from their friends; c) there are some family who think that the national language is better than the local language. It is because they consider that letting their children speak with ngoko is not a good thing. So that, the family with

this condition are only socializing the national language in their family and suggesting their children to use it all the time.

Thus, although three of the previous studies were concerned about the language socialization, but by overlooking at the result, the writer still finds the gap from those researches. First, smith-Hefner seems more focused on Ciliwung community than Tengger community. The range of research time also so long. Second, Jones and Morris conducted the research in the different area of the writer's. While Hamida, she conducted the study which is focused on the family's decision in choosing the choices between socializing and maintaining local language. Further, her study also was conducted in Surabaya area, therefore our area of observation are not the same .

In contrast, this study is concerned with the parent's values in the maintenance of local dialect in Tengger community which is supported by language socialization theory introduced by Ochs and Schieffelin (1986) and the theory about the role of family values and language socialization which is introduced by Jones and Morris (2005).