# CHAPTER III PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA 

In this chapter, the writer will present the data that have been found after collecting the datas of questionaires. Before presenting the figures of language choice, the writer will show the characteristics of the respondents and the language capability. Of all the 81 respondents from Block W Margahayu Raya Bandung who are given questionaires, only 64 filled them as told and returned them ( 80 \%). This happened because :

- some of them were not available / at home when the research took place (they're out of town for quite a long time).
- some did not fill in the questionaires correctly (most of the questions were unanswered).
- some refused to fill in the questionaire for various reasons; etc.

Therefore, the respondents studied are totaled 64 persons. The selection of respondents for the interview was conducted randomly with the following terms:

- it represents the sex differentiation (male and fenale).
- it represents the education background.
- it represents the marriage status (married or single)
- it represents the spouse ethnic group Sundanese, or others).


By applying the terms above, the data can help and support the validity of data questionaires. The writer suggests that education background, marriage status, and differentiation of spouse ethnic group of married respondents are related to the language choice of the respondents.

### 3.1. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE RESPONDENTS

From the data of 64 respondents, the writer finds and collects some informations like :

- There are 34 male and 30 female or the percentages are 53 \% male and 47 \% female.
- There are 17 respondents who are $16-23$ years old and 47 respondents who are 24-up years old or the percentages are 27 \% for the $16-23$ years and 73 \% for 24 -up years.
- There are 39 respondents who are married and 25 respondents single or the percentages are 61 \% for married couples and 39 for single. Among the 61 \% married couples, there are 16 respondents (41 \%) who are Javanese spouses, 16 respondents ( 41 \%) who are Sundanese spouse, and 7 respondents ( $18 \%$ ) other ethnic spouses.
- The composition of education distributing respondents could be seen in the following table.

Table 1. The Composition Of Education Background Of The Respondents

| Education | Frequency | Percentage |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Elementary | 0 | $0 \%$ |
| Yunior High School (SMP) | 4 | $6 \quad \%$ |
| Senior High School (SMA) | 21 | $33 \%$ |
| Diploma (SO) | 23 | $36 \%$ |
| Bachelor (S1) | 15 | $23.5 \%$ |
| Master (S2) | 0 | $0 \%$ |
| Doctoral (S3) | 1 | $1.5 \%$ |
| Total | 64 | $100.0 \%$ |

- In the table above, it is clear that $100 \%$ of the respondents have graduated from Yunior High School (SMP). Therefore, it can be considered that all respondents have good education background. With their background of education, they're considered capable in speaking Indonesian very well; as we know Indonesian language is a formal language for education.
- There're about 39 respondents who ve got a job and 25 respondents who ve not a work, or the percentages are 61\% for respondents who have an occupation and 39 \% for respondents who have not. Among the 39\% respondents, 22\% are students and $17 \%$ are house-mothers.

All of these characteristics are related and influenced with the process of language choice. For example, the education background influences the choiceof an usage a certain language by the speaker since the
language has more suitable dictions/terms.

### 3.2. LANGUAGE CENCUS

Before presenting the language choice data conform to suitable domains, the writer requires data about language cencus from respondents. After collecting and counting the data, the respondents language cencus could be seen in the table below.

Table 2. The Language Cencus Of The Respondents

| Language Cencus | Yes | Little | No |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Can understand Javanese conversation? | 43 | 20 | 1 |
| Can speak Javanese (conversation)? | 36 | 23 | 5 |
| Can read books in Javanese? | 32 | 28 | 4 |
| Can write letters in Javanese? | 26 | 23 | 15 |
| Can understand Indonesian converst.? | 53 | 11 | 0 |
| Can speak Indonesian (conversation)? | 55 | 9 | 0 |
| Can read books in Indonesian? | 55 | 9 | 0 |
| Can write letters in Indonesian? | 54 | 10 | 0 |
| Can understand Sundanese conversation? | 27 | 35 | 2 |
| Can speak Sundanese (conversation)? | 28 | 32 | 4 |
| Can read books in Sundanese? | 21 | 37 | 6 |
| Can write letters in Sundanese? | 18 | 33 | 12 |

Regarding. Table 2. above, the writer concludes that almost all respondents (85\%) feel more able of understanding, speaking, reading, and writing in Indonesian. Whereas, the capability of Javanese language
is in the second, followed by Sundanese at the third rank. This is possible considering that since 1945, Indonesian language had been established/legalized as National language in UUD 1945; and also, the establishment of Ejaan yang Disempurnakan (EYD) in 1972 which has extent the use of Indonesian language to Indonesian's aspects of life as a communication tools. The goverment also built the Pusat Pembinaan dan Pengembangan Bahasa Indonesia as an authorized institution whose one of its task is affirming actively the presence of the use of Indonesian language in society, like providing some new dictions in accordance with some needs.

Thus, it is proper to accept that fact that Indonesian language is able to remove the position of Janvanese language although Javanese is the mother tongue for the respondents. To make it clearer, the writer tries to explain in the following table.

Table 3.a. The Percentage Of Respondents Who Can
Understand A Conversation In These Languages

| Languages | Yes | Little | No | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Javanese | $67 \%$ | $31 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
| Indonesian | $83 \%$ | $17 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
| Sundanese | $42 \%$ | $55 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $100 \%$ |

$\mathrm{N}=64$ persons
It is showed here that none of the respondents are incapable in understanding Indonesian language (0\%).

Table 3.b. The Percentage Of Respondents Who Can Speak these Languages

| Languages | Yes | Little | No | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Javanese | $56 \%$ | $36 \%$ | $8 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
| Indonesian | $86 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
| Sundanese | $44 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $6 \%$ | $100 \%$ |

$N=64$ persons
None of the respondents feel incapable of speaking in Indonesian ( $0 \%$ ), while Javanese ( $8 \%$ ) and Sundanese (6\%).

Table 3.c. The Percentage Of Respondents Who Can Read Books In these Languages

| Languages | Yes | Little | No | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Javanese | $50 \%$ | $36 \%$ | $6 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
| Indonesian | $86 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
| Sundanese | $33 \%$ | $58 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $100 \%$ |

$N=64$ persons
In capability of reading books, there are more respondents who feel capable of reading books written in Indonesian than in Javanese and Sundanese.

Table 3.d. The Percentage Of Respondents Who Can Write
Letters in these Languages

| Languages | Yes | Little | No | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Javanese | $41 \%$ | $36 \%$ | $23 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
| Indonesian | $84 \%$ | $16 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
| Sundanese | $30 \%$ | $51 \%$ | $19 \%$ | $100 \%$ |

$N=64$ persons

There are more respondents who feel capable of writing in Indonesian (84\%) than in Javanese (41X) or Sundanese (30\%).

### 3.3. LANGUAGE CHOICE : THE DOMAINS CONCEPT

The writer chooses to use the domains concept from Fishman. This Fishman's key concepts intended to relate spesific language choice, from an abstraction, to general institutions and spheres of activity. According to him, domains are taken to be constellations of factors such as location; topic, and role-relationships (participants). There is a fact that two individuals who usually speak to each other primarily in $X$ language nevertheless switch to $Y$ when discussing certain topics. Certain topics are somehow handled "better" on more appropriately in one language than in another in particular multilingual contexes. By recognizing the existence of domains it becomes possible to contrast the language of topics for individuals or particular sub-populations with the predominant language of domains, if not the whole, of speech community. (Joshua Fishman, quoted by J.J. Gumpersz \& Dell H.).

Multilingualism of ten begins in the family and depens upon it for encouragement if not for protection. The family domain is handly unique with respect to its differentiability into role relations. Each domain can be differentiated into role relations that are spesifically crucial or typical of it in particular societies at
particular times (Fishman). Simirlarly, pupil-teacher, buyer-seller, employer-employee, etc, all refer to specific role relations in other domains. It would certainly seem desirable to describe and analyze language use or language choice in a particular multilingual settings in terms of the spesific role-relations within the spesific domains.

After characterized the respondents and other data gathering cencus of language, it seemed to the writer that six domains could be generalized from the innumerable situations that the writer had noticed in Block W Margahayu Raya Bandung speech community. The writer labels these as "family", "friedship", "neighbourhood", "transactions", "education", and "employment".

Although, in this research, the writer will only show a quite congruent relations between interlocutor, place or locale, and topic. Whereas a relation that is incongruent between the three factors above is not available here. This limitation is done in order to make identification for each domain clearer. For futher analysis, the writer uses some following figures.

Table 4. Language Choice By Block W, Margahayu Raya Bandung Speech Community

| Quest. <br> no | Intensity | Javanese | Languages |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 24 | Alanesian | Sundanese | Other |  |  |  |
|  | Usually | 12 | 10 | 4 | 0 |  |


|  | Often | 11 | 12 | 11 | 8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sometimes | 9 | 12 | 11 | 7 |
|  | Never | 16 | 16 | 30 | 48 |
| 25 | Always | 21 | 6 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Usually | 14 | 11 | 4 | 0 |
|  | Often | 16 | 7 | 11 | 0 |
|  | Sometimes | 5 | 8 | 6 | 8 |
|  | Never | 8 | 31 | 43 | 55 |
| 26 | Always | 4 | 4 | 3 | 0 |
|  | Usually | 15 | 24 | 15 | 5 |
|  | Often | 16 | 16 | 28 | 13 |
|  | Sometimes | 15 | 12 | 6 | 8 |
|  | Never | 14 | 8 | 11 | 38 |
| 27 | Always | 4 | 4 | 3 | 0 |
|  | Usually | 13 | 24 | 13 | 5 |
|  | Often | 17 | 16 | 30 | 13 |
|  | Sometimes | 17 | 15 | 8 | 7 |
|  | Never | 13 | 5 | 10 | 39 |
| 28 | Always | 4 | 4 | 3 | 0 |
|  | Usually | 14 | 22 | 14 | 6 |
|  | Often | 17 | 17 | 26 | 11 |
|  | Sometimes | 17 | 14 | 9 | 10 |
|  | Never | 12 | 7 | 12 | 37 |
| 28 | Always | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 |
|  | Usually | 8 | 18 | 17 | 0 |
|  | Often | 18 | 25 | 28 | 10 |
|  | Sometimes | 23 | 15 | 7 | 8 |
|  | Never | 14 | 2 | 9 | 51 |


| 30 | Always | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Usually | 6 | 19 | 18 | 0 |
|  | Often | 21 | 29 | 28 | 5 |
|  | Sometimes | 26 | 13 | 7 | 7 |
|  | Never | 11 | 0 | 11 | 52 |
| 31 | Always | 0 | 8 | 7 | 0 |
|  | Usually | 0 | 24 | 13 | 0 |
|  | Often | 5 | 18 | 24 | 5 |
|  | Sometimes | 8 | 8 | 13 | 6 |
|  | Never | 51 | 5 | 7 | 53 |
| 32 | Always | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Usually | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Often | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
|  | Sometimes | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 |
|  | Never | 14 | 0 | 9 | 8 |
| 33 | Always | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Usually | 0 | 8 | 4 | 0 |
|  | Often | 4 | 5 | 8 | 4 |
|  | Sometimes | 5 | 0 | 2 | 6 |
|  | Never | 5 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| 34 | Always | 0 | 21 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Usually | 1 | 13 | 0 | 2 |
|  | Often | 3 | 2 | 2 | 5 |
|  | Sometimes | 4 | 3 | 7 | 4 |
|  | Never | 31 | 0 | 30 | 28 |
| 35 | Always | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Usually | 2 | 18 | 5 | 2 |
|  | Often | 10 | 13 | 18 | 6 |
| SKRIPSI |  | ANGU | N |  | IDJA |

\(\left|\begin{array}{l|rrrr|} \& Sometimes <br>

Never\end{array}\right|\)| 16 | 13 | 9 | 8 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 11 | 3 | 7 | 23 |

Further processing, the writer will analyze them for each domain. In a discussion for each domain, the data counting and processing are done using one of statitiscal term, namely "mean".

### 3.3.1. Family Domain

In this domain, the three congruent components given are (1) parents, sisters, brothers, grandparents, etc (interlocutor), (2) at home (place/locale), personal matters, daily problems, etc (topics). According to this, questions number 24 and 25 are very matched. The answers of these questions are given in following figure.

Table 5.a. Mean Of Family Domain Situation By Javanese
Who Live In Block W Margahayu Raya Bandung

| Question <br> Number | Javanese | Indonesian | Sundanese | Other |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 23 | 1.88 | 1.80 | 1.14 | 0.36 |
| 25 | 2.55 | 1.25 | 0.625 | 0.14 |

Not suprisingly, the Javanese as themother tongue receives the highest score, 1.98 and 2.55. Especially, if the interlocutor is respondents parents or respondents grandparents, the mother tongue has more
points in this domain (2.55) than all the other languages put together (2.055).

But this condition doesn't happen in a situation like in question number 24 where the interlocutor is the spouse of the respondent who married (61\%). This happened because part of spouses of respondents are Sundanese people (41\%) and other ethnic (18\%), not from Javanese (41\%). So, they mostly speak in Bahasa Indonesiaas daily language at home (as the writer had explained before, Indonesian language is the national language so every Indonesian people is capable to speak in this language). The Bahasa Indonesia is like "a bridge" for these couples to make communications. We see in the figure above, the mean of the usage of Bahasa Indonesia (1.8) almost has the same point as the mean of the usage of Javanese (1.98).

### 3.3.2. Friendship Domain

In this domain, the three congruent components given are (1) friends (interlocutor), (2) at a club or a social gathering (locales), (3) personal matter, daily problems, introducing friends or colleaques to others (topics). According to this, questions number 26, 27, and 28 of the questionaire could represent this domain situation: The answers of these guestions are given in the following figure.

Table 5.b. Mean Of Friendship Domain Situation By Javanese Who Live In Block W Margahayu Raya Bandung

| Question <br> Number | Javanese | Indonesian | Sundanese | Other |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 26 | 1.68 | 2.06 | 1.89 | 0.69 |
| 27 | 1.65 | 2.11 | 1.86 | 0.75 |
| 28 | 1.70 | 2.03 | 1.80 | 0.78 |

* Significant at or above the 0.05 level

Table 5.b. shows the respondents choose the Indonesian language when they talk with their friends (the average points are 2.06, 2.11, and 2.03). This could happen because most of their friends are not Javanese people anymore since they live in Bandung. It's surprising, however, that Indonesian language should appear so strong in the friendship domains. The answer turns out to be quite simple: most of the educated multilinguals in the sample did not share mother tounge with their friends. In the second place, any discussion with friends concerning a topic from a more formal domain, such as education, science, or technology, is likely to trigger the selection of Indonesian language no matter what the setting or how close the speaker is to the people he is talking to. Interestingly, the use of Sundanese language is more often than the Javanese itself.

### 3.3.3. Neighbourhood Domain

In this domain, the three congruent components given are (1) their neighbours (interlocutor), (2) at a
neighbourhood gathering, their homes (locales), (3) sosial matters in the circle of neighbourhood (topics). According to this, questions number 29 and 30 of the questionaire could represent this domain situation. The answers of these questions are given in the following figure.

Table 5.c. Mean Of Neighbourhood Domain Situation By
Javanese Who Live In Block W Margahayu Raya
Bandung

| Question <br> Number | Javanese | Indonesian | Sundanese | Other |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 28 | 1.33 | 2.09 | 1.97 | 0.28 |
| 30 | 1.34 | 2.18 | 1.83 | 0.26 |

* Significant at or above the 0.05 level

The table above shows the respondents choose the Indonesian and Sundanese languages when they comnunicate with their neighbours (the average points are 2.09 and 2.19). Apparently, the respondents realize most of their nieghbors are the native of Sundanese language, not the Javanese, so they tend to useIndonesian language or even the Sundanese. The Sundanese language as the regional language also reported to be used particularly when the neighbours do not share the mother tounge and/or to gain intimacy with the interlocutor. And also, like in friendship domain, most of respondents are educated, so any discussion with anyone else concerning a topic from a more formal domain is likely to trigger the selection of Indonesian language no matter what the setting or how
close the speaker is. However, the reason why they use both of those languages is to gain intimacy with the interlocutor.

### 3.3.4. Transaction Domain

In this domain, the three congruent components given are (1) sellers (interlocutor), (2) at a shop or a market (locales), (3) transaction natters (topics). According to this, question number 31 of the questionaire could represent this domain situation. The answers of these questions are given in the following figure.

Table 5.d Mean Of Transaction Domain Situation By Javanese Who Live In Block W Margahayu Raya Bandung

| Question <br> Number | Javanese | Indonesian | Sundanese | Other |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 31 | 0.28 | 2.38 | 2.00 | 0.25 |
| * Significant at or above the 0.05 | level |  |  |  |

Table 5.d. shows the respondents choose the Indonesian and Sundanese languages when they talk with the sellers dealing with some transactions. The average points for Indonesian language is 2.38 (the highest) and for Sundanese is 2.00. Host respondents select those both languages to adapt themselves with the circumtances and to get something that they need easily. If they use Javanese or other languages, they're afraid the seller cannot quite understand what they want.

### 3.3.5. Education Domain

In this domain, the three congruent components given are (1) teachers, Proffesors, school friends (interlocutor), (2) at school (place/locale), homeworks, discussions in class, etc (topics). According to this, questions number 32 and 33 are very matched.

Table 5.e. Mean Of Education Domain Situation By Javanese Who Live In Block W Margahayu Raya Bandung.

| Question <br> Number | Javanese | Indonesian | Sundanese | Other |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 32 | 0.00 | 3.57 | 0.50 | 0.57 |
| 33 | 0.93 | 2.64 | 2.14 | 1.00 |

* Significant at or above the 0.05 level


#### Abstract

Table 5.d above shows that the Indonesian language gets the highest scores, 3.57 and 2.64. Even when the interlocutors are their teachers/lecturers, the Indonesian has more point in this domain (3.57) than all the other languages put together (1.07). It's not too surprising that Indonesian should score so high in the education domain. This coul be understood , because the Indonesian language is actually the formal language at school.


### 3.3.6. Employment Domain

In this domain, the three congruent components given are (1) employers, friends in their office (interlocutor), (2) at the office(place/locale), (3) their
tasks, discussions among them at the office (topics). According to this, questions number 34 and 35 are very matched.

Table 5.f. Mean Of Employment Domain Situation By Javanese Who Live In Block W Margahayu Raya Bandung

| Question <br> Number | Javanese | Indonesian | Sundanese | Other |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| .34 | 0.28 | 3.33 | 0.28 | 0.51 |
| 35 | 1.08 | 2.62 | 1.54 | 0.67 |

* Significant at or above the 0.05 level

The table above indicates the Indonesian language receives the highest scores, 3.33 and 2.62. When the interlocutor is their supervisor, almost all respondents choose the Indonesian language (the mear point is 3.33) and this scores more points than all the other languages put together (1.07). Same as the education domain, this result is not too surprising. The Indonesian language is considered more capable and suitable than the other languages due to their tasks in the office.


#### Abstract

3. 4. ANALYSIS OF DIGLOSSIA RELATED TO LANGUAGE CHOICE

According to the concept of diglossia raised by Fishman and Ferguson , it would appear that fanily, friendship, and neighbourhood might be low domains, and that education and ellployment might be high domains. The transaction domain might be rather low or rather high depending on the kind of transaction.


The family domain is the only domain where the mother tounge dominates, so the Javanese language as mother tounge might be low language. It's surprising that Indonesian and Sundanese should appear higher rating than Javanese in the friendship and neighbourhood domains. Therefore, the Indonesian and Sundanese as regional language is included the low language. Only the Indonesian language has the highest score in education and employment domains so this language might be high language.

