

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background of the Study

The possession of language, more than any other attribute, distinguishes humans from other animals. According to the philosophy expressed in the myth, and religions of many people, it is language that is the source of human life and power (Fromkin, 1984: 4). Using language as communication tool humans express their feeling, transfer knowledge and technology and, then, in turn, build their civilization. Language, no doubt, is the most important tool for human being to make their interaction and to run their life.

As communication tool bridging various ethnic groups living in this country, Indonesia as National language has been developing, even pushing regional languages function. Recently people, particularly from middle and upper class, prefer to use Indonesian rather than the regional one because of its prestige. Indonesian has been deemed high class language other than merely National language. In addition to Indonesian, there is another language that is regarded as prestigious one because of its function as International language, i. e., English.

Considering the importance of English as the International language, in Indonesia many institutions which teach English for various purposes (banking, commercial, tourism, etc.) are established and grown rapidly in big cities throughout the country. People assume that mastering English means having a good future, that is, by mastering English they will get a good job or a

good position in their career. This condition enables the two languages, Bahasa Indonesia as national language and English as foreign language, and also the two cultures, Indonesian and Western culture, to come into contact with each other. In this respect, Richard Diebold says:

“thus, in both language and culture contact, there are two aspects to be considered, a sociological learning process, viz. bilingualism and acculturation, and a result of that process : change in one or both of the systems, viz. linguistic interference and cultural borrowing (1970: 496).

From Diebold's statement one thing that should be emphasized here is the interference as the results of languages contact. Weinreich in his book, *Language in Contact* defined interference as “those instances of deviation from the norms of either language which occur in the speech of bilinguals as a result of their familiarity with more than one language, i.e. as a result of language contact” (cited in Hoffman, 1993 : 95). It can be phonological, grammatical, lexical and spelling interference (Hoffman, 1993 : 95). The prominent example of the interference as the result of English and Indonesian contact is the use of pieces (lexicons) of English within Indonesian discourses, written and spoken. In conversation we often hear someone says :

“Eh, kamu udah *married*, ya”, or

“Masih nunggu *money*-nya itu lho.”

It is said to be an interference because Indonesian has its own words or phrases of words for the English ones, so the use of English words or phrases is considered breaking the rule or norm of good and right Indonesian and it should be avoided.

This kind of interference is usually done by people from certain group or class. It deals with one reason of the use of English lexicon, that is, to show their class. Pertaining to this, Trudgill says in his book *Sociolinguistics*:

"the social environment can also be reflected in languages and can often have an effect on the structure of the vocabulary" (1974 : 27).

The diffusion of linguistic features through a society may be halted by barriers of social class, age, race, religion or other factors (Trudgill, 1974 : 35). Those groups of people stated above are middle and upper class, either in their economic status or educational background, that is, the people who actively (or passively) use English in certain occasions (going abroad, studying in colleges, etc.), those people who can be said as belonging to bilingual or multilingual society.

Talking about bilingual or multilingual society Haugen has suggested that the minimal qualification for bilingual status is the ability of the speaker to produce complete meaningful utterances in the other language (in Diebold, 1970: 496). Referring to this definition English Department students of Airlangga University are the representative example of those bilingual (even multilingual) society due to their competence and ability to produce complete meaningful utterances of both Indonesian and English (besides, Javanese for the most of them are Javanese). In this study the writer will analyze this interesting phenomenon, i.e., the lexical interference occurred within English Department students conversation. And considering the fact that conversation is influenced by some institutional factors such as what Fishman said (1971) "Who speaks what language to whom and when" (in Pride and Holmes, 1984:

15) , then, the writer will specify the study to the daily conversations among the English Department students themselves in the campus outside the class.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

The problems that will be solved in this study are

1. What kinds of English lexicon do the English Department students of Airlangga University use that are viewed as a deviation by the Indonesian purists?
2. What are the reasons of the English Department students in doing the lexical interference ?
3. In what topics of conversation do the English Department do the lexical interference?

1.3. Objective of the Study

Through this study the writer wants to find :

1. The kinds of English lexicon used by the English Department students of Airlangga University that are viewed as deviation by the Indonesian purists.
2. The reasons of the English Department students in doing the lexical interference.
3. The topics of conversation in which the English Department students doing lexical interference.

1.4. Significance of the Study

This study is expected to be able to broaden our knowledge on social aspect of linguistic phenomenon, or in another word language in society where some linguistic phenomena appear.

It is also expected to give a meaningful contribution to sociolinguistics, especially toward further investigation of this matter, lexical interference.

1.5. Scope and Limitation

Being linguistic phenomenon caused by bilingualism, in this study interference is viewed as both linguistic phenomenon and social one. Therefore, sociolinguistic problem will be analyzed with regard to the social context of the language users.

From the four interference levels proposed by Charlotte Hoffman this study will merely analyze the lexical one since, regarding with the influence of English upon Indonesian, this kind of interference does frequently happen more than the other levels. The fact shows that the lexical interference of English into Indonesian appears more frequently rather than the grammatical one.

This study is only emphasized on daily conversation among the English Department students themselves in the campus outside the class. It deals with Fishman's institutional factors, "Who speaks what language to whom and when" in which this study will analyze, in this case, the conversations of the English Department students as the speakers (who), they themselves as the interlocutors (whom) and in the daily life in the campus outside the class

(when). The phenomenon can be different if the interlocutors are from other department students. If this is so, the aim of this study could not be gained.

1.6. Theoretical Framework

This study will deal with interferences, language contact, and bilingualism. Some theories of these matters coming from some sociolinguistic will be presented here.

Diebold argues that :

“thus, in both language and culture contact, there are two aspects to be considered, a sociological learning process, viz., bilingualism and acculturation, and a result of that process : change in one or both of the system, viz. linguistic interference and cultural borrowing. “(1970 : 496).

What should be emphasized from Diebold's statement in this study is the two aspects named *bilingualism* and *interference*.

When two languages come into contact, speakers of either language may learn elements of the other. This acquisition of the nonnative language produces bilingualism. About this Bloomfield suggest the term native - like control of two languages (in Diebold, 1970 : 496) in which the speaker is able to speak in both languages, the nonnative language as well as the native one. While Weinreich adopts the term *coordinate bilingual* for any speaker learning more than one language, either during childhood acquisition of two or more native language or later “perfect” mastery of a language other than the native one. Nonnative proficiency in the second language, which presumably can be quantified, distinguishes the subordinate bilingual (in Diebold, 1970 : 496). Haugen has suggested that the minimal qualification for bilingual status is the

ability of the speaker to "produce complete meaningful utterances in the other language (in Diebold, 1970 : 496). This definition excludes some of the stages of initial learning, stages which would not permit the speaker a command sufficient to produce "complete meaningful utterances" either because the learning was restricted to a highly atomistic knowledge of the second language or because it remained entirely passive. Broader qualification for the bilingualism is given by Diebold (1970: 497) who adopts the term *incipient bilingualism* which includes the initial stages of second language learning excluded by Haugen.

As stated above, bilingualism is the result of language contact. Weinrich (in Suwito, 1985: 35) mentions that two languages are said to come into contact when the two languages are used alternately by the speaker. While Machey explains language contact as the influence of one language upon another, directly or indirectly, which results in the change of the lingual language (in Suwito, 1985 : 35). One of the result of this change is interference.

According to Hartman and Stark interference is "the errors by carrying over the speech habits of the native language or dialect into a second language or dialect (1972 : 115). However, interference is not only the influence of the native language upon the second or nonnative language, but also the influence of the second language upon the native one as Haugen says that linguistic diffusion is an effort of the speaker to use the norm of the language s/he has learned in using another language (his/her mother tongue) . In this case, the language which is influenced is the speaker's mother tongue, and not the language s/he has learned (in Tarigan, 1988: 69). The following two

definitions that are given by Mackey and Grosjean will include what Haugen says. Mackey defines interference as "the use of features belonging to one language while speaking or writing another" (cited in Hoffman, 1983 : 95) Grosjean's definition's is : "The involuntary influence that may come from two directions, the native language and the second one" (in Hoffman, 1983:96). Weinrich as the pioneer of the investigation of this field, unlike Mackey and Grosjean who prefers a neutral definition, includes in his definition of interference the term "deviation" and "norms". He, in his book *Language in Contact*, defines interference as "those instances of deviation from the norms of either language which occur in the speech of bilinguals as a results of their familiarity with more than one language, i.e., as a results of language contact" (in Hoffman, 1993: 95).

In addition to language contact, interference, according to Weinrich (in Mustakim, 1994: 8) is caused by some factors such as the insufficiency of the vocabulary of a language in facing world advance and development, the disappearance of the words rarely used, the need of synonym, and the prestige of the recipient language. The other factors are bilingualism and the lack of loyalty of the native speakers to the recipient (native) language.

Fishman proposed that there are certain institutional context called domains. Domains are taken to be constellations of factors such as location, participants, and topic (in Fasold, 1984: 183). He also suggests some variables supporting language choice in the interference process, they are family, friendship, religion, education and employment domain (cited in Mustakim,

1994 : 8). Family and friendship domains stress on familiarity, and the three other domains stress on status.

Hoffman divides interferences into four levels : phonologically, lexical, grammatical and cultural (1993 : 95). Haugen mentions that the simple form of the interference is lexical interference (cited in Mustakim, 1994 : 8).

Lexical interference can be base word, compound word, or phrase (Weinrich in Nantje, dkk, 1995:11). Hoffman also mentions another kind of word interference, i.e., an overextension of the meaning of a word into the realm of the other language.

1.7. Method of the Study

In doing this research the writer uses the qualitative descriptive method, because the writer only wants to describe English lexical interference phenomenon emerging in the English Department students' daily conversation in the campus outside the class. "A descriptive research has a purpose to describe something such as situation or action. For that definition, descriptive research is not necessary to find the relationship, to prove the hypothesis or to make a prediction about the main data (UT, 1984/1985 : 10).

According to Bodgan and Taylor, qualitative research can be defined as a research procedure which is expected to get descriptive data about people and their attitude observed (Bodgan and Taylor, 1975 : 5; Moleong, 1989 : 3; in Hasan, 1990 : 14)

Five qualitative research characteristics according to Bodgan and Biklen are (1) natural setting as a primary data (2) descriptive (3) paying attention on

the natural process than the result (4) using inductive data analysis (5) meaning is the main focus on this research (1982 : 27 - 30 in Hasan 1990 : 14).

1.7.1. Definition of key terms

- Lexicon** : the vocabulary of a language (Chrystal, 1992: 320)
- Interference** : the process where by a speaker introduces errors into one language as a result of contact with another language, typically while learning a foreign language or while living within a multilingual situation (Crystal, 1992 : 308)
- Daily conversations** : conversations occur among English Department students in their daily life in campus outside the class.
- English Department students** : English Department Students of Airlangga Uni-versity Surabaya from the first semester and up.
- Bilingualism** : a competency of a speaker to use two languages actively or passively.
- Phrase** : An element of structure typically containing more than one word, but lacking the subject-predicate structure usually found in a clause; traditionally classified into functional types

related to word class (e.g. noun phrase, Verb Phrase, adverb Phrase) (Chrystal, 1992: 324)

Idiom : A sequence of words that is semantically and often syntactically restricted, so that it functions as a single unit; the meanings of the individual words can not be summed to produce the meaning of the idiomatic expression as a whole (Chrystal, 1992:1306).

Domain : the constellations of factors such as location, participants and topic (Fasold, 1984: 183).

1.7.2. Location and Population of the study

Location of this study is Airlangga University campus. This location is chosen because this place is an educational institution which is according to Fishman can be a domain supporting the interference occurrence.

As a college Airlangga University is the place where some kinds of science disciplines are studied. The students always need material resources that frequently come from foreign resources (foreign books). No doubt, in this place the interference does happen as the result of languages contact between Indonesian as the medium and English as the main foreign language used.

Population of this study is the English Department students. The reason of this choice is because this group of people always deals with and use English, written and spoken. Therefore, it is often found out that there is lexical interference of English into Indonesian.

1.7.3. Sampling

Sample of this research is the conversation occurring among the students recorded in ten cassettes. This sample is chosen randomly, i.e., all of the individual in the population either individually or together in the group are given the same chance to be the sample (Hadi, 1987: 71 and Marzuki, 1986: 43).

1.7.4. Technique of data collecting

The collecting of the data is done by relying on the primary data. The writer will use the following steps :

- a. recording ; the writer records any conversation that happen between two or more students (but, to make the recording clear the writer will record not more than 5 students) outside the class. The recording is done without the informants' consciousness that they are being recorded, so the utterances or the words they utter are natural.
- b. distributing questionnaire ; the questionnaires are distributed to the 50 informants. The writer takes this technique to search the data which are not recorded.
- c. noting ; this technique is taken to get the data that the two techniques above do not cover. Besides that, this technique is to strengthen the recorded data and, sometimes, to get the overheard data, such as some spontaneous utterances or utterances spoken by the speakers while the writer is not recording. It is done also without the speakers' consciousness.
- d. Interviewing and observasing; to examine the validity of the answers of questionnaires given by the informants.

1.7.5. Technique of data analysis

First, the writer transcribes the recorded data in order to change then into the written ones. It is strengthened by the noted data. It will make the writer easy to analyze.

Second, the writer selects them; only utterances in which English lexicons emerge will be analyzed.

Third, the writer classifies the lexicons into three categories : words and phrases and idioms. Words category will be classified again into kinds of word such as verb, noun, adjective, etc. It will be done also toward phrases that will be classified again into some categories based on the words comprising.

Fourth, the data from questionnaire are filled and classified. This will be followed by the analysis of the data.

Cross analysis will be used to analyze the data. It means that one datum can be analyzed more than one point of view (Suhardi, 1982: 19).

1.8. Organization of the Paper

The first chapter discusses the introduction which consists of background of the study, statement of the problem, objective of the study, significance of the study, scope and limitation, theoretical framework, methods of the study, and organization of the paper. The second chapter contains the description of the study. The third chapter is the presentation and the analysis of the data. And the last chapter is the conclusion and suggestion.

CHAPTER 2

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THE OBJECT OF THE STUDY