

CHAPTER III

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

III.A. Presentation of the Data

In the questionnaires that the writer had distributed to the respondents, there were 10 statements. They were made based on Pateda's criteria, that people who have responsibility towards his language and its use would have some characteristics, such as (Pateda, 1987: 25-26):

- *perasaan memiliki atas bahasa tersebut, yang pada gilirannya menimbulkan kemauan untuk ikut membina dan mengembangkan bahasa tersebut.*
- *menghormati bahasa tersebut.*

To calculate the total score of individual, each statement was given score based on the table as follows:

Table 1
The Score of the Statement

No.	Statement	Score				
		SA	A	N	DS	SDS
1.	-	1	2	3	4	5
2.	+	5	4	3	2	1
3.	-	1	2	3	4	5
4.	-	1	2	3	4	5
5.	+	5	4	3	2	1
6.	-	1	2	3	4	5
7.	+	5	4	3	2	1
8.	+	5	4	3	2	1
9.	-	1	2	3	4	5
10.	+	5	4	3	2	1

Note:

- SA = Strongly Disagree
- A = Agree
- N = Neutral
- DS = Disagree
- SDS = Strongly Disagree
- + = Positive Statement (Favourable)
- = Negative Statement (Unfavourable)

Seeing the table above, the lowest possible score was: $1 \times 10 = 10$ while the highest possible score was: $5 \times 10 = 50$. So, the individual's total score must be between 10 to 50.

To get the average score of group, the writer used the following formula:

$$as = \frac{S_1 + S_2 + S_3 + S_4 + \dots + S_{30}}{n}$$

as = the average score

$S_1 + S_2 + S_3 + \dots + S_{30}$ = the score of respondents no.1 to 30

n = total respondents

In order to know whether one group has the positive (favourable) or negative (unfavourable) attitude towards Malang slang, the formula below was used:

$$x = m \left[\frac{(5.n)}{5.n} + \frac{(4.n)}{5.n} + \frac{(3.n)}{5.n} + \frac{(2.n)}{5.n} + \frac{(1.n)}{5.n} \right]$$

$$y = m \left(-\frac{5.n}{n} \right)$$

x = the mean score

y = the maximal score

m = total statements in a questionnaires

n = total respondents in one group

Thus, by using the formula above, the mean and maximal score were:

$$\begin{aligned} x &= 10 \left[\frac{(5 \cdot 30) + (4 \cdot 30) + (3 \cdot 30) + (2 \cdot 30) + (1 \cdot 30)}{5 \cdot 30} \right] \\ &= 10 \cdot 3 \\ &= 30 \\ y &= 10 \left(-\frac{5 \cdot 30}{30} \right) \\ &= 50 \end{aligned}$$

So, score 30 became the mean score for the favorable/unfavorable attitudes, while score 50 became the maximal score a group could achieve. The attitude of certain group belonged to unfavorable if its mean score was less than 30. In the contrary, if it was more than 30, it would be considered as favorable. In this case, the closer the score of one group towards the maximal score 50, the more favorable its attitude.

The data that had been calculated were presented below:

III.A.1. The Scores of the First Group**Table 2**
First Group's Scores

No.	Age	Score
1.	12	27
2.	12	34
3.	12	35
4.	12	35
5.	13	20
6.	13	24
7.	15	22
8.	15	26
9.	15	26
10.	15	30
11.	15	31
12.	17	23
13.	17	30
14.	17	35
15.	18	25
16.	18	40
17.	19	30
18.	19	30
19.	19	32
20.	20	30
21.	20	36
22.	21	30
23.	22	32
24.	24	24
25.	24	25
26.	24	26
27.	24	30
28.	24	42
29.	25	30
30.	25	30
Total	Score	889

From the table no. 2 above, we could see that the first group had the scores between 20 to 42. The respondent number 5 had the lowest score, that was 20. The highest score, 42, was gained by the respondents number 26. This first group had 889 as the total score.

III.A.2. The Scores of the Second Group

Table 3
Second Group's Scores

No.	Age	Score
1.	26	38
2.	26	40
3.	27	35
4.	27	36
5.	27	39
6.	27	41
7.	27	48
8.	28	35
9.	28	42
10.	29	36
11.	30	32
12.	30	35
13.	30	37
14.	30	41
15.	30	45
16.	30	45
17.	30	47
18.	31	42
19.	32	36
20.	32	44
21.	32	50
22.	33	33
23.	33	39
24.	34	40
25.	35	33
26.	35	38
27.	35	40
28.	36	41
29.	38	39
30.	38	50
Total	Score	1187

The table 3 showed us that the scores of this second group ranged from 32 to 50. There were 2 respondents who get the lowest score, 32. They are the respondents number 17 and 27. Meanwhile, the respondent number 21 and 29 gained the highest score, 50. The total score of this group was 1187.

III.A.3. The Scores of the Third Group

Table 4
Third Group's Scores

No.	Age	Score
1.	40	39
2.	40	41
3.	40	42
4.	40	45
5.	40	45
6.	40	50
7.	41	40
8.	41	40
9.	42	38
10.	42	40
11.	42	45
12.	43	35
13.	43	46
14.	45	38
15.	45	42
16.	45	45
17.	45	46
18.	46	36
19.	46	38
20.	46	50
21.	47	40
22.	47	42
23.	48	45
24.	49	35
25.	49	48
26.	50	36
27.	50	38
28.	52	42
29.	52	48
30.	53	40
Total	Score	1255

The table above showed us that for the third group, the score was between 35 and 50. Each of the respondents number 12 and 24 gained the lowest score, 35. The highest score, 50, was gained by the respondents number 6 and 20. For the total score, this group had 1255.

III.A.4. The Scores of the Fourth Group

Table 5
Fourth Group's Scores

No.	Age	Score
1.	55	42
2.	55	48
3.	55	49
4.	55	50
5.	55	50
6.	57	47
7.	58	39
8.	58	40
9.	58	41
10.	58	45
11.	58	45
12.	59	43
13.	59	44
14.	60	49
15.	60	50
16.	60	50
17.	62	45
18.	62	48
19.	62	50
20.	63	48
21.	64	44
22.	64	47
23.	65	46
24.	65	50
25.	65	50
26.	68	46
27.	68	50
28.	70	48
29.	70	50
30.	72	47
Total	Score	1401

From the table we could see that the score of this fourth group ranged from 39 to 50. The former was gained by the respondents number 8. The latter was gained by 9 respondents, they are the ones number 3, 5, 14, 16, 19, 23, 24, 26, and 29. The total score of this group was 1401.

III.A.5. The Comparison of the Four Group's average Scores

Table 6
The Average Scores of the Four Groups

Group	Total Score	Average Score
1st	889	29.63
2nd	1187	39.57
3rd	1255	41.83
4th	1401	46.7

From the table 6 above, we could see that the first group had the lowest average score, compared with the other three groups. The score was 29.63

The next group, the second one, had a higher average score than the previous group. Its score was 39.57.

The third group, has a little higher average score than the first and second one. The score was 41.83.

The last group, the group four, had the highest average score from all of the groups. The score was 46.7.

III.B. Interpretation of the Data

From the data that had been described before, we could see that the first group consisting the people who are between 12 and 25 years old had the lowest average score compared with the other three groups. Having score 29.63, which was less than the mean score 30, this group showed a negative attitude towards Malang slang.

The next two groups had higher scores than the first one. The second group, whose members were the people who are from 26 to 39 years old, had average

score 39.57. The third group, consisting the people whose ages are between 40 and 43 years old had 41.83. Since the scores of the two groups were above the mean score, so the attitudes of them belonged to the positive ones.

The last group had the highest score. This fourth group, whose members were the people who were more than 54 years old, had 46.7, which was closed to the maximal score, 50. It meant that the attitude of this group was very positive towards Malang slang.

Based on the description above, we could see that the younger the age-group, the lower the average score it got. On the contrary, the older the age-group, the higher the score. Since the score itself had relation with the positive or negative attitudes towards Malang slang, so we could say that the younger the age-group the more negative the attitude, and in the reverse, the older the age-group the more positive the attitude. Thus, it could be said that the condition of Malang

declines, as that was showed by the decline of the average scores.

The fact above was very interesting to be analysed further. In general, slang language considered as the language of the young people (Slang, 1995:851), so the young people were expected to have more respect and responsibility on the slang. In other words, they were expected to have more positive attitude towards it. But for Malang slang it seemed in the contrary. Instead of having more positive attitude than the older people, the young people of Malang had more negative attitude. It was a strange phenomenon, indeed.

There were some factors that could be the causes of the phenomenon above. The older age-group had the higher score than the younger -- meaning that it had more positive attitude toward Malang slang -- might be caused by the fact that they were closed to the time when the slang was invented, diversified, and disseminated. Some members of the oldest age-group even experienced

that time. The fact made they have high sense of belonging towards the slang.

Another factor was the reason of using Malang slang. After Malang slang was invented, formerly its use was only for play and for concealing the message (for secrecy). Anyway, not too long after that it became the typical code of *arek-arek* Malang. Then it was used to symbolize the Malang people identity. Most members of the older age-group also used the Malang slang for the same reason. They used it in order to show their identity as Malang people. Malang slang then became more than a mere slang language. It had a special function that other languages did not have, that was as a symbol of Malang people identity. This special function made Malang slang have a plus value than other languages. Because of this plus value, the people often treat Malang slang parallel with other standard languages such as Javanese or Indonesian. Even according to some people, it had higher position than Javanese due to its special function.

The formation of Malang slang words also Javanese phrases, compounded from some words, became one of the factors of the older age -group's positive attitude. Basically, its formation was very complicated. So formerly, to be able to speak Malang slang, someone had to know the rules and the standardized words. He could not create any word he liked. So, at that time, someone who spoke Malang slang had a big pride since it needed enough knowledge of Malang slang. This pride implied to their attitude towards Malang slang.

The younger age-group, in the contrary, had lower score than the older one. It meant that its members had the negative attitude towards Malang slang. The reasons were quite the same as the older age-group, but in the reverse situation.

These people, did not have high sense of belonging of Malang slang. In their time, the slang had already existed and disseminated. They did not any contribution in making it widely spread out and varied. Thus, it made their sense of belonging not

as high as the older people. This sense becomes lower and lower in the following generation.

According to these people, the major reason of Malang slang use was not to symbolize Malang people identity -- as the opinion of the older age-group -- but just to have fun. They treated Malang slang as just an ordinary slang language, as a social play used to relieve the seriousness of reality (Porzig, 1957:166). That was all. It had nothing special. Even, being considered as 'under-language', its position was lower than other languages including Javanese.

The formation of Malang slang words changes through time. Since most of Malang slang are derived from reversed form, now people often generalize that Malang slang is only the reversed slang. It makes a tendency among people that to make a Malang slang word, they have to reverse the word. They do not need to know the rules. As the result, the original slang words began to be forgotten. Many of the original slang words were changed in to

reversed form. For example, 'polisi' (English: police) is reversed into 'silup', while 'makan' (English: eat) becomes 'nakan'. Originally, the slang words of the two words are 'jinjak' and 'naskim'.

The easy way in using and speaking Malang slang made the pride of the user fades, since anyone can use and understand the slang. This fact made the attitude of people nowadays towards Malang slang as not as positive as the former people.