

**DIGLOSSIA BY THE OFFICIALS OF SOCIAL INSTITUTION  
IN PANGGUNGREJO VILLAGE ON ADMINISTRATIVE  
PROCESS**

**UNDERGRADUATE THESIS**

**BY  
PRATISTI WIDYA ARINDHI  
NIM 145110101111073**



**STUDY PROGRAM OF ENGLISH DEPARTMENT OF  
LANGUAGES AND LITERATURE FACULTY OF  
CULTURAL STUDIES UNIVERSITAS BRAWIJAYA 2018**

**DIGLOSSIA BY THE OFFICIALS OF SOCIAL INSTITUTION IN  
PANGGUNGREJO VILLAGE ON ADMINISTRATIVE PROCESS**

**UNDERGRADUATE THESIS**

**Presented to  
Universitas Brawijaya  
in partial fulfilment of the requirements  
for the degree of Sarjana Sastra**

**BY  
PRATISTI WIDYA ARINDHI  
NIM 145110101111073**

**STUDY PROGRAM OF ENGLISH DEPARTMENT OF  
LANGUAGES AND LITERATURE FACULTY OF CULTURAL  
STUDIES UNIVERSITAS BRAWIJAYA 2018**

## DECLARATION OF AUTHORSHIP

Herewith I,

Name : Pratisti Widya Arindhi  
NIM : 145110101111073  
Address : Jl. Dahlia RT 21 RW 02 Cepokomulyo Kepanjen-Kabupaten  
Malang

declare that:

1. This undergraduate thesis is the sole work of mine and has not been written in collaboration with any other person. Nor does it include, without due acknowledgement, the work of any other person.
2. If at a later time it is found that this undergraduate thesis is a product of plagiarism, I am willing to accept any legal consequences that may be imposed upon me.

Malang, July 13<sup>th</sup> 2018



Pratisti Widya Arindhi  
NIM. 145110101111073

**This is to certify that the undergraduate thesis of Pratisti Widya Arindhi has been approved by the supervisor.**

**Malang, July 13<sup>th</sup> 2018**  
**Supervisor**

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Isti Purwaningtyas', with a stylized flourish at the end.

**Isti Purwaningtyas, S.S., M.Pd.**  
**NIP. 19790519 200501 2003**

This also to certify that the undergraduate thesis of **Pratisti Widya Arindhi** has been approved by the the Board of Examination as one of the requirements for the degree of *Sarjana Sastra*.



Emy Sudarwati, S.S., M.Pd., Chair  
NIK. 201009 830414 2 001



Isti Purwaningtyas, S.S., M.Pd., Member  
NIP. 19790519 200501 2 003

Acknowledged by,  
Head of Study Program of English



Juliati, M.Hum.  
NIP. 19720929 200604 2 001

Sighted by,  
Head of Department of  
Languages and Literature



Sahrudin, S.S., M.A., Ph.D.  
NIP. 19750518 200501 2 001

## **CURRICULUM VITAE**

### **DAFTAR RIWAYAT HIDUP**

Nama : Pratisti Widya Arindhi

Tempat/Tanggal Lahir : Malang, 8 Agustus 1995

Agama : Islam

Alamat : Jl. Dahlia RT/RW 21/2 Cepokomulyo Kepanjen - Kab.  
Malang

Email : pratistiwa@gmail.com

Telp. : 082234610568 / 089516718288

### **RIWAYAT PENDIDIKAN**

2014 – sekarang : Universitas Brawijaya-Fakultas Ilmu Budaya  
(Program Studi Sastra Inggris)

2011 – 2014 : SMAN 1 Kepanjen

2008 – 2011 : SMPN 4 Kepanjen

2002 – 2008 : SDN 1 Cepokomulyo

2000 – 2001 : TK Kemala Bhayangkari 13

### **PENGALAMAN ORGANISASI**

- Pemain terumpet *Marching Band* BSSB angkatan 17 SMAN 1 Kepanjen
- Staff ISO PMR *Wachesadana* SMAN 1 Kepanjen
- Anggota pembinaan OSN kebumian SMAN 1 Kepanjen
- Anggota Pramuka SMAN 1 Kepanjen
- Anggota dewan galang pramuka SMPN 4 Kepanjen
- Wakil ketua Regu pramuka inti SDN 1 Cepokomulyo

## **PRESTASI**

- Juara 3 *International Jember Open Marching Competition II* 2013 sebagai pemain terumpet
- Peserta Pesta Sains Nasional 2013 IPB
- Peserta Program Tes Pra-OSN 2013 Kabupaten Malang
- Siswa terbaik peringkat 4 paralel program IPS 2012-2013
- Wakil siswa berprestasi dari SDN 1 Cepokomulyo tingkat Kecamatan

## **PENGALAMAN KERJA**

- Magang di Dinas Pariwisata dan Kebudayaan Kabupaten Malang tahun 2017

## **SERTIFIKAT SEMINAR**

- Peserta *International Conference on Language, Literary, and Cultural Studies* 2016
- Peserta Seminar *Net goes to Campus* 2015

## **KEMAMPUAN**

- Informasi Teknologi : *Ms. Word, Ms. Powerpoint, Ms. Excel, Internet*
- Bahasa : Bahasa Jawa, Bahasa Indonesia, Bahasa Inggris

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all, I would like to express the countless thanks to Allah SWT giving me blessings and all praises to Prophet Muhammad SAW, so that I can finish the thesis entitled *Diglossia by The Officials of Social Institution in Panggungrejo Village on Administrative Process*.

I present my sincere appreciation to Isti Purwaningtyas S.S., M.Pd. for her help, support, advice, trust and guidance as my supervisor in finishing this thesis. My greatest appreciation also goes to Emy Sudarwati, S.S., M.Pd. as the examiner for the advice and crucial contribution to the improvement of the result of this undergraduate thesis.

I want to give a great gratitude for my beloved parents Kustriadi and Dwi Endah Susilorini for the endless love, support and pray. They always become my motivation to finish this thesis. In addition, I want to thank to my elder brothers, Farindhi Pramata Yudha and Barnadha Brian Garindhi who make me always want to make them proud of me, so I can finish this thesis. Last but not least, I would like to thank my friends over there for always motivating me to keep my spirit in finishing this thesis. I hope this undergraduate thesis can give the contribution to expand readers' knowledge.

Malang, July 13<sup>th</sup> 2018

The Researcher



## ABSTRACT

Arindhi, Pratisti Widya. 2018. **Diglossia by The Officials of Social Institution in Panggungrejo Village on Administrative Process.** Study Program of English Literature, Department of Languages and Literature, Faculty of Cultural Studies, Universitas Brawijaya. Supervisor: Isti Purwaningtyas.

Keywords: Diglossia, H variety, fergusson's concept of diglossia, Firth's social and context, Indonesian language.

Diglossia phenomenon that is about a certain speech community uttering high variety and low variety, also happens in Panggungrejo village. In Panggungrejo village, there are two languages are still used until now, are Indonesian language and Krama Javanese. Those two languages have high and low variety, in which Indonesian language (standard Indonesian language) and Krama Javanese as the high variety. High variety is used in formal situation, so the researcher want to analyze what is the preferable language (Krama Javanese or Indonesian language) by the officials of social institution in serving societies about administrative process and factors influencing in choosing the preferable language.

The theories used in this research are Ferguson's concept of diglossia (1959) and Firth's social and context (1935). This study employs qualitative. The sources data employed in this study is the utterances of the officials of social institution in Panggungrejo village, that are got through the observation and interview.

The result of this research shows that the preferable language used by the officials of social institution on administrative process is Indonesian language because those activities are related to the government activity. There are factors influencing the officials of social institution in choosing the preferable language divided into two kinds, are: (1) the internal factors consisting of dialog as the verbal action, ethnic/heredity and citizen's status, (2) the external factor that is about the types of speech found consisting giving order and giving detailed direction. Meanwhile, the main factor found is the age of the societies as a part of characteristic of the societies. It happens because there is a different skill in mastering Javanese. The older ones are still consistence in using Krama Javanese. On the contrary, most of the younger societies cannot speak Javanese although they actually understand it.

The further researcher is suggested to conduct research about the same theme, topic and theory with this current research but the object is different. The different object meant is officials of social institution from another village. Furthermore, the readers can compare the research result between current and the next future research to get valuable knowledge about diglossia since diglossia phenomenon also happens in many areas of Indonesia.

## ABSTRAK

Arindhi, Pratisti Widya. 2018. **Diglossia by The Officials of Social Institution in Panggungrejo Village: Krama Javanese and Indonesian Language**. Program Studi Sastra Inggris, Jurusan Bahasa dan Sastra, Fakultas Ilmu Budaya, Universitas Brawijaya. Pembimbing: Isti Purwaningtyas.

Kata Kunci: Diglossia, ragam tinggi, konsep diglossia milik Fergusson, Sosial dan konteks milik Firth, bahasa Indonesia.

Fenomena diglosia yang menunjukkan bahwa komunitas penutur tertentu berbicara menggunakan ragam tinggi dan ragam rendah, terjadi di desa Panggungrejo. Akan tetapi, terdapat dua ragam tinggi yang digunakan oleh masyarakat disana karena terdapat dua bahasa yang masih digunakan sampai saat ini, yaitu bahasa Indonesia dan bahasa Jawa. Oleh karena itu, bahasa Indonesia dan Krama Jawa menjadi ragam tinggi. Hal tersebut kemudian digunakan untuk dianalisis mengenai bahasa apa yang lebih disukai (antara dua ragam tinggi tersebut) oleh perangkat masyarakat dalam melayani masyarakat dan factor yang mempengaruhi pemilihan bahasa. Perangkat masyarakat dipilih karena mereka memiliki intensitas yang tinggi dalam berkomunikasi dengan banyak orang.

Teori yang digunakan dalam penelitian ini adalah konsep diglossia milik Ferguson (1959) dan konteks dan social milik Firth (1935). Penelitian ini menggunakan pendekatan kualitatif Sumber data yang digunakan dalam penelitian ini adalah penuturan perangkat masyarakat desa Panggungrejo yang didapat dari hasil observasi dan interview.

Hasil dari penelitian ini menunjukkan bahwa bahasa yang lebih disukai oleh perangkat masyarakat dalam proses administrasi adalah bahasa Indonesia. terdapat faktor yang mempengaruhi perangkat masyarakat dalam melayani masyarakat yang dibagi menjadi dua bagian, yaitu: (1) faktor internal yang terdiri dari dialog sebagai aksi verbal, suku atau keturunan, status kependudukan, (2) faktor eksternal yaitu tentang tipe percakapan yang terdiri dari pemberian permintaan dan pemberian petunjuk secara detail. Sementara itu factor utama adalah usia dari masyarakat. Hal tersebut terjadi karena terdapat perbedaan keahlian dalam menguasai bahasa Jawa. Orang tua masih konsisten dalam menggunakan bahasa Jawa Krama. Sebaliknya, banyak anak muda yang tidak dapat berbicara bahasa Jawa Krama meskipun mereka sebenarnya mengerti bahasa tersebut.

Peneliti selanjutnya disarankan untuk melakukan penelitian dengan tema, topic dan teori yang sama dengan penelitian ini tetapi berdeja objek. Objek yang dimaksud adalah perangkat masyarakat dari desa yang berbeda. Selanjutnya, pembaca dapat membandingkan hasil penelitian antara penelitian ini dan penelitian selanjutnya untuk mendapatkan pengetahuan berharga tentang diglossia karena fenomena ini banyak terjadi di Indonesia.

<b>TITLE PAGE .....</b>	<b>i</b>
<b>DECLARATION OF AUTHORSHIP .....</b>	<b>ii</b>
<b>SUPERVISOR'S APPROVAL .....</b>	<b>iii</b>
<b>BOARD OF EXAMINERS' CERTIFICATE OF APPROVAL .....</b>	<b>iv</b>
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENT.....</b>	<b>v</b>
<b>ABSTRACT.....</b>	<b>vi</b>
<b>ABSTRAK.....</b>	<b>vii</b>
<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS .....</b>	<b>viii</b>
<b>LIST OF APPENDICES .....</b>	<b>x</b>

## **CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION**

1.1 Background of The Study .....	1
1.2 Problem of The Study .....	5
1.3 Objectives of The Study .....	6
1.4 Definition of Key Terms .....	6

## **CHAPTER II REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE**

2.1 Theoretical Framework .....	9
2.1.1 Sociolinguistic .....	9
2.1.2 Fergusson's Concept of Diglossia .....	10
2.1.3 Language and Social Context .....	11
2.2 Previous Studies .....	12

## **CHAPTER II RESEARCH METHOD**

3.1 Research Design .....	14
3.2 Data Sources .....	15
3.3 Data Collection .....	16
3.3 Data Analysis .....	16

## **CHAPTER III FINDING AND DISCUSSION**

4.1 The Preferable Language Used in Serving Societies .....	18
4.2 The Internal Factors Influencing in Choosing the Preferable Language .....	20
4.2.1 The Various Ages .....	20
4.2.2 The Various Economic .....	25
4.2.3 The Religion .....	26
4.2.4 The Ethnic / Heredity .....	29
4.2.5 The Sex of The Societies .....	32
4.2.6 The Citizen Status .....	33
4.3 The Eksternal Factor Influencing in Choosing the Preferable Language .....	34
4.4 Discussion .....	36

## **CHAPTER IV CONCLUSION**

5.1 Conclusion .....	46
5.2 Suggestion .....	47

<b>REFERENCES .....</b>	<b>48</b>
<b>APPENDICES.....</b>	<b>49</b>

## LIST OF APPENDICES

1. Appendix 1 List of Question for Interview .....	50
2. Appendix 2 Interview Session.....	53
3. Appendix 3 Result of Interview.....	64
4. Appendix 4 Observation Session.....	70
5. Appendix 5 Result of Observation .....	71
6. Appendix 6 <i>Berita Acara Bimbingan Skripsi</i> .....	73



## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, the researcher discusses some important points related to the area of the research. They are background of the study, problems of the study, objectives of the study, and definition of the key terms.

#### 1.1 Background of the Study

The one of issues on linguistic is Sociolinguistics in which blending of society and linguistic. It is concerned with the relationship between language and the context in which it is used. Hudson (1996, as cited by Wardhaugh, 2006, p. 13) states “sociolinguistics is the study of society in relation to language”. It means that society cannot be separated from language.

Yule (1985, p.20) states “language is social aspect of human life because it is the important means of social communication among the member of society”. It means that language is used by society in a certain speech community to share something in which it will be understood by all people. The examples of languages are English, Indonesian, Malay, Hindi, and Japanese.

Indonesian language itself is a national language of Indonesia. It is recognized in the constitution of the republic of Indonesia (Amandemen Undang-Undang Dasar RI) 1945, it states “the national language is Indonesian”. In addition, Indonesian is unitary language which is explicit in *Sumpah Pemuda*

October 1928. By recognizing Indonesian language as the national language, it causes all formal activities use Indonesian language. Furthermore Indonesia society must be able to communicate using Indonesian language.

Indonesia as the diversity country has many local languages. Based on a latest research conducted by Department of National Education (*Depdiknas*) in 2009 shows that Indonesia consists of 746 local languages spread over Indonesia that depend on geographical areas, cultures, and ethnics. Local language is a language uttered in a certain area such as urban, town, province or island. Local language usually is mother tongue uttered by person for first time, so it is also called as first language.

The national and local languages mentioned above cause Indonesia society master at least two languages which are Indonesian as the national language and one local language. This situation called as Bilingualism and the society called a bilingual. Spolsky (1998, p.45), states “bilingual is a person who has some functional ability in a second language”. In this research, it means every person has functional ability in national language and local language. however, those two languages are used for different function and purpose. It is cleared by Soemarsono’s statement (2010, p.8) “the function of the local language is different with the national language and every local language has different context”. It also happens in Java Island in which society speak Indonesian and Javanese for different function and purpose.

The use of two languages in certain speech community for different function and purpose creates diglossia phenomenon. Wardhaugh (1986, p.89), states “diglossia situation exists in society when it has two distinct codes which show clear functional separation”. It means, when Java society master Indonesian language and Javanese, they further use those two languages for different conditions, it will cause diglossia phenomenon in which one of those languages becomes high (H) variety and the other one is low (L) variety.

The H variety and L variety is differentiated from how the speaker gets the variety. Wardhaugh adds (1986, p. 90) in the following

The H variety is also likely to be learned in some kind of formal setting, e.g., in classroom or as part of a religious or cultural indoctrination. To that extent, the H variety is taught, whereas the L variety is learned

So, looking at the previous paragraph, we can assume that Indonesian language is an H variety because it is taught in school started from elementary until high school even in college. In the contrast, Javanese is L variety. Yet it is only valid for Ngoko Javanese because one variety of Javanese is also taught in school that is Krama Javanese. It means that Javanese itself has H and L variety, in which the former is Krama Javanse and the latter is Ngoko Javanese.

In addition, Spolsky (1998, p.63), states “diglossia is a situation when two distinct varieties of the same language are used, side by side, for two different sets of functions”. It means that diglossia can only occur for the same language which has some varieties like Javanese. As we know that Javanese has two varieties



which are Krama and Ngoko Javanese. Meanwhile, for being good society of Indonesia, society has to master Indonesian language because most of all formal activities use Indonesian language. It means Indonesian language has important role in Indonesia society. Based on that issue, the researcher wants to analyze whether preferable language in certain village of Java in serving society is Krama Javanese or Indonesian language and to analyze what factors influencing the use of preferable language.

The title of this research is “Diglossia by the officials of social institution in Panggungrejo Village on administrative process”. In analyzing the research, Fergusson’s concept of diglossia is used to identify the variety position of Krama Javanese and Indonesian language. Firth’s language and social context is used to analyze factors influencing the officials of social institution in choosing preferable language.

The researcher only focuses on the diglossia of the officials of social institution who are indigenes and can speak both Krama and Ngoko Javanese, also master Indonesian language. They consist of one village head, three hamlet heads, and 29 neighborhood heads. They have been chosen because they have high intensity in communicating with society. The scope limitation in this research is only focused on administrative process. It includes letter handling and stamp request. It has been chosen because in those activities, the officials of social institution use whether Indonesian or Krama Javanese depend on the society requesting administrative service. Panggungrejo Village has been chosen because the societies there still use Javanese in daily life beside Indonesian language as

unitary language that must be mastered. Based on village's database of Panggungrejo in 2015 shows that 60% of society is indigenes or coming from Javanese speaking areas who master Javanese including Krama and Ngoko. On the other hand, 20% is immigrants who come from other Javanese speaking areas, while the residue is immigrants who cannot speak Javanese. It shows that this village is unique to conduct the research.

In this research, the researcher expects this research can give valuable contribution. First, for the researcher and readers, this research is expected to increase knowledge in the study of sociolinguistics, particularly about diglossia. Second, for the future researchers, this research is expected to be useful to give reference to the future researcher to analyze diglossia by the officials of social institution from another village in serving societies on administrative process.

## **1.2 Problems of the Study**

Based on background of the study above, the formulations of the problems are:

1. What is the preferable language (Krama Javanese or Indonesian) used by the officials of social institution in serving societies on administrative process?
2. What are the factors influencing the officials of social institution to use preferable language in serving societies on administrative process?

### 1.3 Objectives of the Study

Concerning the problems mentioned above, the objectives of the study can be described as:

1. To find out the preferable language (Krama Javanese or Indonesian) used by the officials of social institution in serving societies on administrative process
2. To find out the factors influencing the officials of social institution to use preferable language in serving societies on administrative process

### 1.4 Definition of Key Terms

Some of key terms in this study are defined to avoid misunderstanding

**Diglossia** : A relatively stable language situation in which, in addition to the primary dialects of the language, there is a very divergent, highly codified superposed variety (Spolsky, p.54)

**High (H) Variety** : The prestige variety - generally a standard variety - and is typically reserved for official functions in more formal speech situations in the public sphere (Wardhaugh, p.90)

**Low (L) Variety** : Exclusively used in and restricted to informal speech situations in the private sphere (Wardhaugh, p.90)

**Bilingual** : Bilingual is a person who has some functional ability in a second language. In this case, every person has functional ability in national language and local language (Spolsky, p.45)

**Panggungrejo Village** : It is one of village in Kepanjen sub-district, Malang Regency. It is heterogeneous village (60% is indigines and 40% is immigrant in which 25% is army mostly from outside of Java (not Javanese speaking areas) but 15% is civil society (Haerul: 2017)

**Officials of social institution** : It is institution established by society in order to fulfill the village assignment and as partner of village to empower the society. It includes village head, parts of village head, hamlet head, and neighborhood head. Meanwhile, the objects in this research are one village head, three hamlet heads, and 29 neighborhood heads. (PERMENDAGRI Number 7:1983 )

**Administrative Process** : It is a process relating to administrative and document activities including letter handling and stamp request (Kustriadi: 2017)



## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

In this chapter, the researcher discusses the theoretical frameworks used to analyze the data and previous studies which are closely similar to the type of analysis in this research.

#### 2.1 Theoretical Framework

In the theoretical framework, the researcher shows some theories are sociolinguistics, language and social context, multilingualism and diglossia.

##### 2.1.1 Sociolinguistics

Sociolinguistics is a study about language and society. language is used to interact and communicate with other people in society. In the same way, Holmes (1992, as cited by Mohammed, 2010, p.1) states that “sociolinguistics is a term that refers to the study of the relationship between language and society and how language is used in multilingual speech communities”. That statement is also supported by Yule (2010) who states “ Sociolinguistics is the study of relationship between language and society, it has strong connection with antropology of language and culture, sociology of the role language plays in social group and social psychology of how attitudes and perceptions are expressed”. Those two statements mean that language cannot be separated with society.



### 2.1.2 Ferguson's Concept of Diglossia (1959)

According to Ferguson (1959, p. 336), linguist who first introduces the term of Diglossia from French into English, states as follows:

diglossia is a relatively stable language situation in which, in addition to the primary dialects of the language (which may include a standard or regional standards), there is a very divergent, highly codified (often grammatically more complex) superposed variety, the vehicle of a large and respected body of written literature, either of an earlier period or in another speech community, which is learned largely by formal education and is used for most written and formal spoken purposes but is not used by any sector of the community for ordinary conversation.

He adds that diglossia has been applied when "one particular kind of standardization where two varieties of a language exist side by side throughout the community, with each having a definite role to play". Two varieties meant by Ferguson refer to standard language and regional dialect in which, he (Ferguson :1959, p. 325) states "the standard language and regional dialect as used, where many speakers speak their local dialect at home or among family or friends of the same dialect area but use the standard language in communicating with speakers of other dialects". Ferguson (1959, p.327) further explains that the two varieties of language mentioned consist of H ('high') variety or simply H for standard language, and the regional L ('low') varieties or, collectively, simply L for regional language.

The H variety and L variety is differentiated from how the speaker gets the variety. Wardhaugh adds (1986, p. 90) in the following:

The H variety is also likely to be learned in some kind of formal setting, e.g., in classroom or as part of a religious or cultural indoctrination. To that extent, the H variety is taught, whereas the L variety is learned

It means that H variety is taught in formal activities such as school whereas the L variety is acquired in society such as in family, neighborhood and peer group. Those explanations will be used by the researcher to identify the variety position between Indonesian language and Krama Javanese by society in Panggungrejo Village.

### **2.1.3 Language and Social Context**

Holmes (2001, p. 1) states “sociolinguistics is concerned with the relationship between language and the context in which it is used.” It means that sociolinguistic also studies about the use of language based on the context. Trudgill (1983, as cited by Rukmana, 2012, p. 11) is one of linguist showing the relationship between language and social context of society. He states that social context is context of the person spoken to, and in the role relationships and relatives statuses of the participants in a particular discourse. In this case, Firth (1935, p.182) divides set of categories grouped in the context of situation employed to analyze factors influencing the officials of social institution in using preferable language, as mentioned in the following :



- A. The relevant features of participants: persons, personalities
  - i. The verbal action of the participants
  - ii. The non-verbal action of the participants
- B. The relevant objects
- C. The effect of the verbal action

Firth (1935, p.178) further explains the description of mentioned above as follows:

(a) the economic, religious, and other social structures of the societies of which the participants are members; (b) types of linguistic discourse such as monologue, choric language, narrative, recitation, explanation, exposition, etc.; (c) personal interchanges, e.g. mentioning especially the number, age, and sex of the participants and noting speaker-listener, reader-writer and reader or writer context, including series of such interchanges; (d) types of speech function such as drills and orders, detailed direction and control of techniques of all kinds, social flattery, blessing, cursing, praise and blame, concealment and deception, social pressure and constraint, verbal contracts of all kinds and phatic communion.

Those explanations above will be used by the researcher to analyze the factors influencing the officials of social institution in choosing the preferable language (Indonesian language or Krama Javanese).

## 2.2 Previous Studies

There are two previous studies related to this research. The first one is a research project by Joey Low Xiao Xuan (2011) from faculty of arts and social sciences, Universiti Tunku Abdul Rahman (Utar). The title of his study is “A Study Of Diglossia: A Survey Of Different English Varieties Used By Utar

English Language Course Students”. This study uses quantitative and qualitative description approach. The data that is researched in this study is, Universiti Tunku Abdul Rahman English Language Course Students. Questionnaire technique is used to elicit data. Ferguson’s concept of diglossia and Bloome’ factor are used as the theories.

The second previous study is research by Riski Ade Chandra (2014) from faculty of cultural studies Universitas Brawijaya (UB). The title of his study is “A Study of The Use of Diglossia in the Main Character Dialogue of the Pursuit of Happiness Movie”. This study uses qualitative approach. The data that is researched in this study is the main characters dialogue of the pursuit of Happiness Movie. Ferguson’s Concept of Diglossia and Firth’s social and context are used as the theory of the study.

The similarities between the first previous study and this current study is located in the first problem of the study about the preferable language used. In addition, the first previous study and this current study also employ the Ferguson’s concept of diglossia to analyze the variety. On the contrary, the similarity between the second previous study and this current study is located in the theories that are employed, Fergusson’s concept of diglossia and Firth’s social and context are used to answer the problem of the study.

## CHAPTER III

### RESEARCH METHOD

In this chapter the researcher describes the method that is used in conducting this research. This research method is arranged based on the problems analysis and the main purposes of the research. In this chapter the researcher discusses the research design, data sources, data collection, and data analysis.

#### 3.1 Research Design

In this study, the researcher employs qualitative approach. Creswell (2005, p.39) explains that qualitative research is:

A type of educational research in which the researcher relies on the view of participants, ask broad, general questions, collects data consisting of words (or text) from participants, describes and analyzes these words for themes, and conducts the inquiry in a subjective manner.

Qualitative approach is dominantly employed to answer the second problem of the study, that is about the factors influencing the officials of social institution in choosing the preferable language.

#### 3.2 Data Sources

The researcher only employs one kind data sources that is primary data. The primary data in this research is the utterances of the officials of social institution in serving society about administration process in Panggungrejo Village that are got through the observation and interview conducted by the

researcher. The observation is employed to get real information in the reality. Meanwhile, the interview is employed to get the deeper data because according to Ary et al (2010, p.438) states that interview can provide information that cannot be got through the observation. By conducting the interview, the researcher can get deeper information about the social phenomena.

The participants of this research are officials of social institution consisting of one village head and 2 neighborhood heads of Panggungrejo Village. The village head and neighborhood head number two are as the participant of interview session, on the other hand, neighborhood head number two and three as the participant of the observation session. They have been chosen based on a request by the village head of Panggungrejo stating that society who they lead is more heterogeneous and they can represent the others officials of social institutions in Panggungrejo village.

### 3.3 Data Collection

In collecting the data, the researcher employs some steps. The steps are mentioned as follows:

1. Interviewing several officials of social institution and recording the conversation of interview at the same time. The questions in the interview are adapted from Firth's social and context consisting of three features

2. Observing the serving society conducted by the officials of social institution
3. Transcribing the dialogs got through the observation
4. Transcribing the conversation of interview

### 3.4 Data Analysis

After gaining and collecting the data taken from questionnaire, recording, and interview, the researcher analyses the data based on some steps as follows:

1. Making pecentage of language that is used (Indonesian language orKrama Javanese) got through observation and interview

$$\text{Percentage} = \frac{\text{Condition using the preferable language}}{\text{All conditions}} \times 100\%$$

2. Analyzing the data got through interview and observation based on Firth's social and context about feature of participant
3. Analyzing the data got through interview and observation based on Firth's social and context about the relevant object
4. Analyzing the data got through interview and observation based on Firth's social and context about the effect of verbal action
5. Drawing a conclusion from the result of the data analysis

## **CHAPTER IV**

### **FINDING AND DISCUSSION**

Based on the problems of the study mentioned in the first chapter, in this chapter the researcher will present the preferable language used by the officials of social institution in serving societies and the factors in choosing the preferable language based on the theories used that are mentioned in the second chapter.

#### **4.1 The Preferable Language Used in Serving Societies**

To get the findings, the researcher conducted observation and interview sessions. Those two sessions were conducted in three weeks, started from January 14 until March 14, 2018. In observation session, the researcher observed the activities conducted by the neighborhood head number two and three (RT 02 and RT 03) with random societies about administrative process, such as about making identity card, letter handling and stamp request. In observation, the researcher recorded the dialog and then transcribed it. To get more findings, the researcher conducted interview session. The researcher as interviewer interviewed the village head, Mr. Haerul and neighborhood head number two, Mr. Maja about language used and the reasons in choosing preferable language in serving societies about administrative process.

According to the data got through interview shows that there are two preferable languages used by the officials of social institution in serving societies,

are Indonesian language and Krama Javanese. Those two languages are used for different function and conditions. In the case about serving societies on administrative process, the officials of social institution of Panggungrejo village prefer to choose Indonesian language rather than Krama Javanese that is appropriate with the statement uttered in the interview session as in the following:

- |                    |  |
|--------------------|--|
| <i>Peneliti</i>    | : <i>“Dalam melayani masyarakat berusia kurang dari 25 tahun, bahasa apa yang anda gunakan ketika menjelaskan sesuatu kepada mereka”</i> |
| (The Researcher    | : “in serving societies about less than 25 years old, what is the preferable language you use?”)   |
| <i>Kepala Desa</i> | : <i>“secara umum, tetep urusan pemerintahan bahasa Indonesia.”</i>  |
| (The Village Head  | : “generally, because it is related to government case, so the language used is Indonesian language”)                                    |

The dialog above is an example showing that the preferable language used by the officials of social institution is Indonesian language no matter the other conditions emerging such as the religion, sex, ethnic or heredity. It happens because the scope limitation in this research is only located on administrative process in which the activity is related to government. The all stuff related to government obviously uses Indonesian language because it is a national language or unitary language which must be mastered by all Indonesians.

On the other hand, there is an exception when the societies are more than 45 years old, then the officials of social institution prefer to choose Krama Javanese proven in the following:

*Kepala Desa : “nah ini harus tahu samean. Kalau umurnya ya tua, tadi lebih 40 atau 50 tahunan. Itu saya ada yang pakai bahasa Krama. Alasanya simpel mbak. Sebenarnya, kalau menurut saya, Krama itu lebih sopan dan akrab, kalau saya loh mbak, dan kalau kita ngomong sama orang yang lebih tua kok saya ngerasa enak pakai bahasa Jawa, lebih cocok rasanya mbak. Kalau urusan bisa, jelas mereka bisa past bahasa Jawa. Jadi ya saya, gimana mbak ya, lebih cenderung aja”*

(The Village Head : “you have to know. If the societies are more about 40s or 50s, I prefer to choose Krama Javanese. the simple reason is because I think Krama is more polite and intimate. I feel better to choose Krama to older one. Meanwhile, they, of course, master Krama Javanese.”)

The statement above shows that although the officials claim that in serving societies on administrative process, Indonesian language used, but there is exception for certain condition.

## **4.2 The Internal Factors Influencing in Choosing the Preferable Language**

In interview session, the researcher made questions adapted from Firth’s social and context. The questions and answer of the interview session then create factors influencing the officials of social institution in choosing the preferable language. The first factor found is internal factors coming from the societies themselves, are:

### **4.2.1 The Various Ages**

The first is the various ages. Various ages means the age belonged to the societies of Panggungrejo village, not the age of the officials of social institution since the object of this research is the response conducted by the officials of social



institution. So, in this part, the researcher looks for the preferable language used by the societies having various ages.

The various ages are divided into three categorizations, such as the societies who are less than 25 years old, the societies who are 26-45 years old, and the societies who are more than 46 years old. In this part, the officials of social institution are questioned about the language used in serving societies who are in different categorizations of age mentioned before.

In fact, the officials of social institution prefer to use two different high varieties in serving societies who are in different categorizations. In serving societies who are less than 25 years old, the officials of social institution prefer to choose Indonesian language. Haerul (2018) as the village head of the officials of social institution declare the preferable language as the dialog got through the interview below:

*Peneliti* : “baik pak. Selanjutnya, Dalam melayani masyarakat berusia kurang dari 25 tahun, bahasa apa yang bapak gunakan dalam melayani masyarakat yang beragama sama dan berbeda agama? Apa ada perbedaan pak?”

(The researcher : “the next question, in serving societies who are less than 25 years old, what is the preferable language used in serving societies who have same and different religion? is there any differences?”)

*Kepala desa* : “nah ini.. tidak ada mbak. Apalagi umurnya juga masih muda. Masalahnya gini ya mbak, kalau umurnya masih muda itu, hampir semuanya pakai bahasa Indonesia. Alasanya ya karena mereka banyak yang tidak bisa bahasa Jawa Krama mbak. Mungkin ngerti, tapi kebanyakan nggak bisa jawab. Banyak itu mbak”

(The village head : “there is no difference because they are still young. The problem is if they are still young, so Indonesian language is the dominant language to use. The reason we choose Indonesian language because most of them cannot speak Krama Javanese. They might understand but most of them cannot speak to answer by using Krama Javanese well.”)

The dialog above shows that, no matter the condition of the societies, the officials of social institution prefer to choose Indonesian language in serving societies who are less than 25 years old. In addition, to show the use of Indonesian language as the preferable language used in serving societies who are less than 25 yeras old, below:

#### **Dialog 1 Various Ages**

Ketua RT	: “Monggo mas. Silakan. Ada yang bisa dibantu mas?”
Saputro	: Gini pak, saya mau ngurus surat keterangan tidak punya rumah itu gimana ya pak? Katanya harus ke RT dulu, gitu pak. Gimana pak?”
Ketua RT	: Gini.. gini mas. Jadi mas-nya bener datang ke saya dulu sebagai RT to mas? Nah nanti saya kasih itu.. berkas...surat dari RT. Saya stempel (surat) di sini. Setelah itu samean langsung ke ketua RW. Samean tau kan mas, ketua RW? Pak Ali petek

The dialog above is the data got through observation. It consists of two persons who are the neighborhood head number two (Maja) as the official of social institution and one society with the description in the following:

Description	
Name	: Dio Arya Eka Saputro
Sex	: Man
Old	: 23
Job	: Employee
Religion	: Islam
Heredity/ethnic	: Java

Status : Indigene  
 Language : Indonesian language and Javanese

The dialog above shows that the society named Saputro is 23 years old, he is in the first category, that is the society who are less than 25 years old. According to the statement spoken by the Haerul mentioned before, shows that in serving societies, the officials of social institution tend to choose Indonesian language. That is proved with the observation data when the officials of social institution served Saputro who are less than 25 years old, the officials of social institution used Indonesian language.

The second category is societies who are 26-45 years old. In serving societies in this category, the researcher tends to choose Indonesian language although they sometimes use Krama Javanese. The choosing Indonesian language as the preferable language has same reason. That is because not all the societies who are in this category can understand and speak Krama Javanese well. So, to avoid misunderstanding and miscommunication, the officials of social institution prefer to choose Indonesian language as unitary language that can be mastered by all Indonesians. Maja (2018) as the officials of social institution working as neighborhood head number three, states on the interview session as in the following:

*Peneliti* : baik pak, pertanyaan selanjutnya, Dalam melayani masyarakat berusia sekitar 25-45 tahun, bahasa apa yang anda gunakan dalam melayani masyarakat yang bejenis kelamin wanita dan laiki-laki?  
 (The researcher : okay, the next question, in serving societies who are 25-45 years old, what is the language used in serving societies who are men or women?)

*Ketua RT : 25-45, Indonesia aja, banyak yang gak bisa jawab pas ditanya pake Krama Inggil nduk*  
 (Neighborhood head : 25-45, I used Indonesian language, most of them cannot answer after they are asked by using Krama.)

The last category is societies who are more than 45 years old. In serving societies who are in this category, the officials of social institution prefer to choose Krama Javanese. The reason in choosing Krama Javanese as the preferable language is because the officials of social institution argue that it would be polite to use Krama Javanese to societies who are more than 46 years old. The statement of the social institution is also proved by the dialog got through interview below:

*Peneliti : “nah, kategori ketiga ini pak. Jadi warganya lebih dari 46 tahun. Dalam melayani masyarakat berusia lebih dari 46 tahun, bahasa apa yang anda gunakan ketika masyarakat tersebut termasuk dalam golongan masyarakat yang memiliki ekonomi rendah?”*

(The researcher : in the third category is the societies who are more than 46 years old. In serving societies who are more than 46 years old, what is the preferable language used to societies who have low economy?)

*Kepala Desa : “nah ini harus tahu samean. Kalau umurnya ya tua, tadi lebih 40 50 tahunan. Itu saya ada yang pakai bahsa Krama. Alasanya simpel mbak. Sebenarnya, Krama itu lebih sopan, dan kalau kita ngomong sama orang yang lebih tua, ngerasa enak pakai bahasa Jawa, lebih cocok rasanya mbak. Kalau urusan bisa, jelas mereka bisa pakai bahasa Jawa. Jadi ya saya lebih cenderung aja pakai Krama.”*

(The village head : you have to know. If the societies are older, are about 40s or 50s, I prefer to use Krama Javanese. The simple reason is because Krama is more polite to be used to talk to older person. In addition, the societies in this category must speak and understand Krama well”)

The dialog shows that the officials of social institution prefer to choose Krama Javanese in serving societies who are more than 46 years old because they argue that Krama is more polite to be used to talk to older society.

#### 4.2.2 The Various Economic

The meaning of economic here is related to the job belonged to the societies. In this part, the economic is divided into three categories, such as high, middle and low economic background. So, this part is used to discover the preferable language used by the officials of social institution in serving societies who have different economic background.

The officials of social institution claim that there is no influence between economic and language used in choosing the preferable language. Here the transcription showing that economic background does not influence in choosing the preferable language by Haerul as the village head got through interview session:

*Peneliti : nah, masuk di inti pertanyaan ya pak? bahasa apa yang bapak gunakan, bahasa Indonesia atau bahasa Jawa Krama, ketika masyarakat tersebut termasuk dalam golongan masyarakat yang memiliki ekonomi rendah? Maksud dari ekonomi rendah disini, semisal masyarakat tersebut(atau orang tuanya) memiliki pekerjaan sebagai tukang ojek, supir angkot ataupun buruh?*

(The researcher : go to the main question. What is the language used, Indonesian language or Krama Javanese, when the societies have low economic background?)

*Kepala desa : gini mbak, kalau saya enggak melihat ekonomi atau kerjanya. Ya, saya kalau melayani memang suka pakai bahasa Indonesia, itu kan bahasa formal mbak, jadi karena berurusan dengan pemerintahan.. ya bahasa Indonesia*

(The village head : I do not see the economic background of the societies. I like using Indonesian language because it is formal language. In addition, because it is related to the government activities... I like using Indonesian language)

*Peneliti* : termasuk kalau ekonomi dari masyarakat itu tinggi juga pak?

(The researcher : is it including in serving societies who have high economy?)

*Kepala desa* : iya mbak. Tidak ada perbedaan, mau jadi polisi, tentara samapai tukang becak,karena kan juga ada lo mbak yang juga kerjanya tukang becak

(The village head : yes it is. There is no difference, no matter the job of the societies)

From the dialog above, shows that the economic background of the societies does not influence the officials of social institution in serving societies.

#### **4.2.3 The Religion**

Religion meant is not about kinds of religion like Islam, Christen, Hindu, Budha or Catholic. Yet it is related to the similarity and the differences of religion belonged to the societies and the officials of social institution. There are some societies who have same and different religion with the officials of social institution. There are two languages used by the officials of social institution in serving two kinds of societies related to the religion.

In serving societies who have same religion, the officials of social institution prefer to choose Krama Javanese. The officials of social institution claim that if the societies have same religion with the officials of social institution, they will often meet together in the holy place like mosque or church, so they have intensity to communicate each other. Furthermore the officials of social

institution feel comfortable to choose Krama Javanese because Krama Javanese is used in formal situation but the officials of social institution claim that the using of Krama Javanese is more intimate. So that is appropriate to the relationship had by them, that is intimate, because they often n meet at holy place and do pray together.

On the other hand, if the societies have different religion, the officials of social institution prefer to use Indonesian language as the proven in the following:

<i>Peneliti</i>	: “ <i>tidak ada perbedaan ini pak? Yang agamanya sama, sama yang beda?</i> ”
The researcher	: “is there any difference between the societies who have same and different religion?”
<i>Kepala Desa</i>	: “ <i>sek mbak, gini, kalau Krama soalnya biasanya kan kalau bapak-bapak itu ketemu di mushola, pas tahlilan, kayak lebih akrab. Jadi gak hanya lebih sopan si kalau menurut saya mbak, bahasa Jawa itu juga kayak lebih akrab. Nah beda si mbak sebenarnya, malah kadang kalau di dari agama yang beda, disi kalau nggka salah ada apa ya, konghuchu, atau buddha saya lupa, itu jadi kayak kadang reflek menggunakan bahasa Indonesia. Saya juga nggak tahu mbak, seharusnya tidak ada perbedaan. Tapi itu e mbak yang terjadi</i> ”
The village head	: “prefer to choose Krama Javanese because we meet them at the mosque, at <i>tahlilan</i> , so it would be intimate. So, I think, not only more polite, Krama Javanese is more intimate. Then there is difference. If we serve societies from different religion, such as Konghucu or Buddha, we reflectly prefer to choose Indonesian language with no reason.”

The dialog above is conducted by the researcher and the village head as the representative of the officials of social institution in Panggungrejo village.

That dialog shows that there is different language used by the officials of social

institution in serving societies who have same and different language. They tend to choose Krama Javanese to the societies who have same religion, on the other hand, they prefer to choose Indonesian language to the societies who have same religion. Yet, it happens only when the officials of social institution know well the religion of the societies, because Haerul (2018) adds that if they do not know the religion of the societies, they prefer to choose language after looking another reason rather than must discover the religion of the societies. That is proved as the following:

### Dialog 2 Religion

Neighborhood Head	: Monggo pak, ada apa ini pak?
Utomo	: Ini, ngancani yuga, ngurus status nikah KTP mas, disini mas nggeh?
Neighborhood Head	: Inggih pak bisa disini
Utomo	: Persyaratne nopo mawon mas?
Neighborhood Head	: Lah niki.. ngeten pak. Seng pertama ngurus ten RT, inggih ten mriki pak. Lah jadi itu surat keterangan pindah yang sudah saya, RT tanda tangani pak. Setelah itu ke RW, minta tanda tangan juga. Yang terakhir bapak kalihan yuga-nipun pergi ke kantor desa. Lah itu nanti diantar ke kecamatan.. gitu pak. Nah yang perlu disiapkan itu..
Neighborhood Head	: Fotokopi KK lama, surat nikah, foto kopi KTP sama yang asli dibawa juga pak, ditambah foto pas .. pas foto. Lah nanti KTP nya akan diambil sama pihak kecamatan pak

The previous dialog consists of two persons who are the neighborhood head number two as the officials of social instituion and one society with the description below:

#### Description

Name	: Ahmad Danu Utomo
Sex	: Man
Old	: 49
Job	: Army
Religion	: Islam



Heredity/ethnic	: Java
Status	: Immigrant from Central Java (has been living in Panggungrejo for 20 years)
Language	: Indonesian language and Javanese

In the dialog above, the society named Utomo and the neighborhood head have same religion, is Islam. That is not appropriate with the statement of the officials of social institution that they use Krama Javanese to the societies who have same religion with them because in the dialog above shows that the officials of social institution use Indonesian language not Krama Javanese although the society has same religion with the head. So, it can be conclude that religion is not consideration thing in choosing the preferable language.

#### **4.2.4 The Ethnic/ Heredity**

According to the statement of Haerul (2018) as the village head of Panggungrejo, state that Panggungrejo is heterogeneous village. Furthermore, there are many kinds of ethnic or heredity live in this village although the dominant ethnic is still Javanese. Ethnic or heredity meant is about the ethnic or heredity belonged to the societies. For example, the societies come from other heredity or ethnic like Chinese, Papua, or Western.

In this part, the officials of social institution use two different languages. In serving societies who come from Java (Java ethnic or Java heredity), the officials of social institution prefer to choose Krama Javanese. The simple reason is because the societies must speak or at least, understand Krama Javanese. On the other hand, in serving societies who come from heredity or ethnic outside of Java, the officials of social institution prefer to choose Indonesian language although

the society actually can speak and understand Krama Javanese. It has been conducted to avoid misunderstanding and miscommunication if the societies cannot speak Javanese. The proven is in the dialog got through observation as in the following:

### Dialog 3 Papuanese Ethnic

Neighborhood Head	: Pak Ekky? Monggo pak. Duduk di sini. Monggo. Ada apa ini pak?
Joddy	: Denish mau daftar kuliah ini, pak. Butuh surat keterangan tidak ada telepon katanya. Tidak ada telepon rumah itu...surat. Ini saya bias minta disini ini apa harus ke desa ini pak Rokhim?
Neighborhood Head	: Iya pak Ekky..bisa. langsung di saya bisa. Bisa langsung di RT kalau gak mau jauh-jauh
Joddy	: tidak perlu?
Neighborhood Head	: Ndak pak. Disini sudah ada stempel. Kalau mau ke desa.. ya... monggo, tapi disini sudah bisa
Joddy	: Terus gimana ini pak ini?
Neighborhood Head	: Gini, bapak bikin surat sendiri, soalnya-kan keterangan untuk keperluan sekolah jadi.. kan bukan kependudukan...

The dialog above consists of two persons who are the neighborhood head number two (Maja) as the representative of officials of social institution and one society with the description in the following:

#### Description

Name	: Ekky Stephanus Joddy
Sex	: Man
Old	: 55
Job	: Army
Religion	: Christian
Heredity/ethnic	: East Indonesia
Status	: Immigrant from Ambon (has been living in Panggungrejo for 30 years)
Language	: Indonesian language, Ambonese, Javanese

On the dialog above shows that after looking at the appearance of the society, Joddy, who is Papuanese, the official of social institution prefers to choose Indonesian language. It happened because there is possibility that Joddy cannot speak Javanese. In addition, there is a prove about ethnic influencing in choosing the preferable language in the following:

#### **Dialog 4.4 Chinese Ethnic**

Neighborhood Head	: Monggo ..monggo. Silakan. Ada yang bisa dibantu mbak, sore sore ini
Wodjo	: ini pak, anak saya.. kan mau ngurus KK
Neighborhood Head	: Samean kalau mau ngurus ya ke RT dulu, dapat surat.. dapet stempel disini, baru ke desa.

The dialog above consists of two persons who are the neighborhood head number two (Maja) as the representative of officials of social institution and one society with the description below:

#### **Description**

Name	: Nina Wodjo
Sex	: Woman
Old	: 38
Job	: Housewife
Religion	: Islam
Heredity/ethnic	: Chinese
Status	: Indigene
Language	: Indonesian language and Javanese

In the dialog above, it tells about the society named Wodjo meeting the head to ask about how to get the renewal of family card, the head then gave order about what to do. Wodjo is from certain heredity, Chinese. It can be seen easily by looking at the appearance of hers for the first time. Based on the heredity belonged to Wodjo, the head prefers to choose Indonesian language although in

the description of Wodjo, is written that Wodjo can speak and understand Indonesian language well. It has been conducted by the head to avoid misunderstanding between them.

In the conclusion that ethnic or heredity belonged to the societies is used as the consideration thing in choosing preferable language. In addition, Maja (2018) as the neighborhood head number three states that the ethnic or heredity belonged to the society can be seen from the appearance of the societies.

#### 4.2.5 The Sex

Sex is divided into two kinds, are man and woman. Sex meant in this part is about sex of societies served by the officials of social institution. So, the using of this part is to discover the language used by the officials of social institution in serving societies who are men or women.

There is no difference in choosing language conducted by the officials of social institution. Here is the dialog related to the sex of societies:

<i>Peneliti</i>	: <i>“Dalam melayani masyarakat berusia lebih dari 46 tahun, bahasa apa yang anda gunakan dalam melayani masyarakat yang bejenis kelamin wanita dan laki-laki?”</i>
The researcher	: “in serving societies who are more than 46 years old, what is the language chosen in serving societies who are man and woman?”
<i>Kepala Desa</i>	: <i>“gak ada aturan, laki-laki sama perempuan dilayani sama”</i>
The village head	: “there is no rule, men and women have same treatment and service”

In the dialog above shows that the officials of social institution treat the same thing to women and men.

#### 4.2.6 The Citizen' Status

The citizen status of societies meant here is the citizen status belonged to the societies. The citizen status of societies is divided into two kinds, indigenes and immigrant. In this research, indigene means the societies who come from Java. On the other hand, immigrant means the societies who come from other areas.

In serving societies who are indigenes, the officials of social institution prefer to choose Krama Javanese since the societies must speak and understand Krama Javanese well. On the other hand, the preferable language used in serving societies who are immigrant is divided into two, immigrant who can speak Javanese and immigrant who cannot speak Javanese.

- |                    |   |
|--------------------|---|
| <i>Peneliti</i>    | <i>: itu pak, maksudnya gini, pendatanya itu seumpama dari Jawa Tengah, atau dari Blitar, pokoknya bisa bahasa Jawa pak, termasuk Krama</i>                                   |
| (The researcher    | : I meant, in serving societies who are immigrant, for example come from Central of Java or Blitar but they can speak and understand Javanese well, including Krama Javanese) |
| <i>Kepala Desa</i> | <i>: kalau pendatang, kayak tamu, baru ketemu, lya lebih enak bahasa Indonesia meskipun mungkin bisa bahasa Jawa</i>  |
| (The village head  | : they are immigrant, they are like guests, we already meet, so it would be better to use Indonesian language though they might speak and understand Javanese)                |

The dialog above shows that the preferable languages used in serving immigrant who can and cannot speak Javanese is Indonesian language.

### 4.3 The External Factor Influencing in Choosing the Preferable Language

The second factor is factor coming from outside of the societies. In this research, the external factor is the types of speech function found in the conversation when the officials of social institution are serving societies on administrative process.

There are only two types of speech function found in this research, are giving order and giving detailed direction. Those two types of speech functions are conducted by the officials of social institution in serving societies on administrative process. Giving order found is about an order asked by the officials of social institution to the societies, meanwhile the giving detailed direction is giving explanation about information stated by the officials of social institution to the societies.

Since this research is about serving societies about administrative process, the language used is Indonesian language because the activities conducted (administrative process) are related to the government term. The one of administrative processes that is giving detailed direction is conducted by the officials of social institution by using Indonesian language. The transcription found from interview related to this part as in the following:

<i>Peneliti</i>	: <i>“bahasa apa yang anda gunakan ketika menjelaskan sesuatu kepada mereka, semisal aturan tertentu kayak menjelaskan bagaimana cara untuk mendapat KTP yang baru karena KTP nya ilang. Gimana pak?”</i>
The researcher	: “what language is used to giving detailed direction, such as how to get new identity card?”

*Kepala Desa* : “*sama mbak. Pokoknya tetep urusan pemerintahan bahasa Indonesia.*”  
 The village head : “same answer. When the activity is related to government, the language used is Indonesian language.”

In the dialog above shows that in giving detailed direction, Indonesian language becomes the preferable language. On the other hand, there is an exception of language used to serve societies about giving detailed direction who are more than 45 years old

*Peneliti* : *kalau Dalam melayani masyarakat berusia lebih dari 46 tahun, bahasa apa yang anda gunakan ketika menjelaskan sesuatu kepada mereka, semisal aturan tertentu, tata cara?*  
 (The researcher : in serving societies who are more than 45 years old, what is the language used in giving detailed direction to them?)

*Ketua RT* : *Krama.*  
 (The neighborhood head : Krama)

*Peneliti* : *tapi kan urusan pemerintahan pak*  
 (The researcher : but that is related to government activities)

*Ketua RT* : *iya, tapi usia itu tetep faktor utama, kayak yang saya bilang, harus sopan, saya kan bilang sopanan pakai Krama. Tapi selama emang bisa Krama loh ya*  
 (The neighborhood head : yes it is but the age is main factor, as I have said before, we have to be polite, I have said that it would be polite to use Krama. Yet I only happens when the societies do speak Krama Javanese)

The dialog above shows that in serving societies who are more than 45 years old, the officials might choose Krama Javanese but it only happens when the societies do master Krama. In addition, according to the finding got through

observation shows, the officials prefer to use Indonesian language in giving detailed direction although the societies are more than 45 years old.

Different from giving detailed direction, in giving order, the officials of social institution prefer to choose both Indonesian language and Krama Javanese. The use of Krama Javanese is when the societies can speak Krama Javanese as an example got through observation in the following:

- |                        |  |
|------------------------|--|
| <i>Peneliti</i>        | : <i>bahasa apa yang anda gunakan ketika memberikan permintaan untuk dilakukan oleh masyarakat tersebut?</i> |
| (The researcher        | : what is the language used in giving order to the societies?)   |
| <i>Ketua RT</i>        | : <i>ini kayak yang tadi ya? Mungkin krama</i>   |
| (The neighborhood head | : is it like before? It might be Krama)  |
| <i>Peneliti</i>        | : <i>kenapa pak?</i>   |
| (The researcher        | : why?)  |
| <i>Ketua RT</i>        | : <i>apa ya, kan Cuma permintaan jadi cenderung kesitu kalau ini. Kecuali kalau penjelasan panjang lebar</i> |
| (The neighborhood head | : it is just giving order so I tend to use Krama, it would be different if it is giving detailed direction)  |

#### 4.4 Discussion

Diglossia is a sociolinguistic phenomenon, when a certain speech community speaks two high varieties for different situation. Wardaugh (1986, p. 90) defines high variety in the following:



The H variety is also likely to be learned in some kind of formal setting, e.g., in classroom or as part of a religious or cultural indoctrination. To that extent, the H variety is taught, whereas the L variety is learned

From the statement above, it can be seen that both Krama Javanese and Indonesian language are high varieties because those two languages are learned in school. In addition, Fergusson (1959, p. 336) states that high variety is used in formal situation, that is further appropriate to both Indonesian language and Krama Javanese because those two languages are used in formal situation.

Although those two languages become high varieties, the preferable language between two languages (becoming high varieties) in serving societies on administrative process conducted by the officials of social institution in Panggungrejo village is Indonesian language. Based on data got through interview and observation session shows that 91.1% with the explanation is 41 from 45 conditions based on Firth's social and context is the using of Indonesia language. It means, Indonesian language is used in serving societies on administrative process conducted by the officials of social institution in Panggungrejo village, meanwhile 26.7% with the explanation is 12 from 45 conditions based on Firth's social and context is the percentage of the officials of social institution in serving societies on administrative process by using Krama Javanese.

The reason why the preferable language is Indonesian language not Krama Javanese because the officials of social institution claim that administrative process is one kind of government activities that is related to formal condition and situation. In Addition, all rules and law related to government use Indonesian

language. Furthermore, it would be better to use Indonesian language as unitary language that must be mastered by all Indonesians.

The second problem of this research is the factors influencing the officials of social institution to use preferable language in serving societies about administrative process. To answer the second problem, the researcher analyzed the findings got through observation and interview based on Firth's social context theory.

Firth (1935, p.182) divides set of categories grouped in the context of situation, as mentioned in the following:

- A. The relevant features of participants: persons, personalities
  - i. The verbal action of the participants
  - ii. The non-verbal action of the participants
- B. The relevant objects
- C. The effect of the verbal action

Those features are used to answer the second problem, which is about factors influencing the officials of social institution in choosing the preferable language, started from point A until C. The researcher analyzed the factors influencing in choosing the preferable language based on categories grouped in the Firth's context of situation above (three features) in which the observation data is also used to add the information.

In point A of Firth's theory talks about the relevant features of the participant. In more explanation (Firth:1935, p.178), the point A talks about two

features, are verbal action of the participants (types of linguistic) and non-verbal action of the participants (social structures of the societies of which the participants are members).

The first feature of participant is verbal action. Verbal action talks about types of linguistic discourse such as monologue, choric language, narrative, recitation, exposition. In serving society about administrative process, there is only one type of linguistic found in this research, is dialog. It is cleared with conversation got through the observation.

Dialog is conversation happened between two persons, in this case are the official of social institution and a society. Based on the dialogs got through the observation session shows that dialog becomes one of the factors in influencing to choose the preferable language because when the official of social institution serves the society, they see the context of the society first to choose whether Indonesian language or Krama Javanese will use. Look at those five dialogs show that for the first time, the officials of social institution use Krama Javanese only for small talk by saying "*monggo*", they then continue the conversation by using certain language after looking at the society's context. It might be different from the other type of linguistic, for example is meeting. The possible linguistic type happened in the meeting is explanation, then the language used might be same for the first time until the end of the meeting because meeting is activity has been planned, it is not like the dialog which is not planned before. Furthermore, the conclusion is that dialog influences the officials of social institution in choosing the preferable language.

According to the data got through the observation and interview show that economic background does not influence the officials of social institution in choosing the preferable language. The officials of social institution prefer to use Indonesian language to all society, whether the society has low, middle or high economy, since the conversation talks about administrative process, they argued that it is one of government service so it must be conducted by using Indonesian as unitary language. On the other condition, the officials of social institution state that they might use Krama Javanese in serving societies, it does not because of the economic background, but the other factors inside.

On the interview to the village head and neighborhood head, consisting of five categories differed from the age, in which every category also talks about religion, shows that religion is one of factors influencing in choosing the preferable language. According to Haerul (2018) states that in serving societies who are muslim as same as the religion of officials of social institution, Krama Javanese then will use. That happened because when the officials of societies have same religion, they have high frequency in communicating each other. If the societies and the officials of social institution have same religion (Islam), they meet each other in mosque or other religion activities. Furthermore Krama Javanese is assumed as the intimate language that can be used between them. That is cleared by Haerul (2018) who states that Krama Javanese is more intimate.

On the interview to the village head and neighborhood head as the representative of official of social institution, consisting of five categories differed from the age, in which every category also talks about ethnic/heredity, they state

that ethnic/heredity belonged to the societies is one of factors influencing the heads in choosing certain language. Ethnic or heredity here means when society is from one of certain ethnic/ heredity, such as Sunda, Java, Papua. The officials of social institution argued that when society has ethnic outside of Java, for example, when the society comes from Chinese, the society might cannot speak Javanese including Krama Javanese. In fact, there are many chineses who can speak and understand Javanese but for avoiding miss communication, so the heads chooses to use Indonesian as unitary language that can be mastered by all Indonesians.

The second point (point B) of Firth's social and context theory is the relevant object. Firth then explains (1935, p.178) the relevant object is about personal interchanges, including mentioning especially the number, age, and sex of the participants including series of such interchanges. The relevant objects emerging in the data is about age of the participant and sex of the participant.

Age is the main factor in choosing preferable language by the officials of social institution in serving societies. On the interview session, when the village head was questioned about the language used to serve the societies who are less than 25 years old about sex, Haerul (2018 as the village head states "nah kalau itu sama. Umur 20 sampai segitu saya masih suka pakai bahasa Indonesia (that is same, on the age around 20s, I like speaking Indonesian)". In addition, in the same question the researcher asked to the neighborhood head, Maja (2018) states "pokoknya kurang 25 tahun kalau saya mau apapun itu pasti bahasa Indonesia (when the societies are less than 25 years old, no matter the other conditions, I

must choose Indonesian language)”. Those two transcriptions mean that age is significant factor in choosing certain language.

Since the age does influence in choosing certain language, Indonesian language is used in serving societies who are less than 25 years old and immigrant who can or cannot speak and understand Krama Javanese. On the other hand, Krama Javanese is used in serving societies who are more than 46 years old. Although age is significant factor in choosing the preferable language, there are other conditions becoming factor can influence the choosing language such as economy or religion.

Similar with the religion feature, the sex does not influence the heads in choosing certain language. No matter the sex of the societies, whether man or woman, the choosing of the preferable language is not influenced by the sex of the societies. On the interview session, both Maja as the neighborhood head and Haerul (2018) as the village head agree to state that sex is not the factor in choosing certain language.

The verbal action happened in the observation session is dialog. In the Firth’s explanation (1935, p. 178) that the effect of verbal action is about types of speech function such as drills and orders, detailed direction and control of techniques of all kinds, social flattery, blessing, cursing, praise and blame, concealment and deception, social pressure and constraint, verbal contracts of all kinds and phatic communion. In the findings got through interview and observation, the researcher found two types of linguistic function, are orders and detailed direction.

The first type of speech function happened in this research is giving order. Giving order is part of government activity in which based on the village head that in government activity usually uses Indonesian language. Yet the officials of social institution argue that not all activity related to giving order uses Indonesian language. Giving order is like asking someone to do something, so the officials of social institution argue that the language used should not always Indonesian language. In giving order they can use whether Indonesian or Krama Javanese depend on other factors such as age, economic or religion. For an example is when the society is more than 45 years old, so the language used by the officials of social institution in giving order is Krama Javanese.

The second kind of administrative process happened in this research is giving detailed direction. In the interview session, the officials of social institution prefer to choose Indonesian language rather than Krama Javanese. Maja (2018) states that activities related to government usually use Indonesian language. It happens because giving detailed information about administrative process is related to the government and law, so it would be better to talk to use Indonesian as unitary language.

The similarities between this current research and first previous study entitled “A Study of Diglossia: A Survey of Different English Varieties Used By Utar English Language Course Students” belonged to Joey Low Xiao Xuan, is in the first problem of study that is analyzed, that is about the preferable language used in the certain speech community. This current study analyzed the preferable language between two high varieties, Indonesian language and Krama Javanese.

On the other hand, the previous study analyzed the preferable language between British English as high variety and Malaysian English as low varieties, that is used in the university.

In the previous study, the preferable language used in the university is British English rather than Malaysian English. It happens because British language is more recognized. In addition, because the object in the study is English Department Students, so the students more have knowledge about British English and practice British English more rather than Malaysian English. Meanwhile, in this current study, the preferable high variety used is Indonesian language. The reason is because the situation happened is formal situation.

The factors influencing the choosing of the preferable language, between this current research and the previous studies have difference. To get the factors, the previous study does not use theory. The factors got by self-analyzing to the data got through survey, the factors found in the previous study are the addressee, situation, medium, subject and purpose.

Different from the first previous study, the current study use the same theory by Firth with the second previous study, entitled “A Study of The Use of Diglossia in The Main Character Dialogue of The Pursuit of Happiness” belonged to Ade Chandra. In the previous study, the factors found are gender, age, Social classes, Ethnic background, and Speech community. On the other hand, the factors found in the current study are dialog as verbal action, the ethnic/heredity belonged to the societies, the age of the societies, the type of linguistic function



happened in the conversation. The factors found are different because the object of the study is also different, including the situation and condition happened.

## CHAPTER V

### CONCLUSION

This chapter concludes all the explanations and analysis presented in findings and discussions. In addition, this chapter also provides some suggestion to the future researcher who will analyze about diglossia.

#### 5.1 Conclusion

This research entitled “Diglossia by The Officials of Social Institution in Panggungrejo Village on Administrative Process”, conducted to analyze the preferable language used by the officials of social institution in serving societies on administrative process and the factors influencing in choosing the preferable language. To analyze the problems, Fergusson’s concept of diglossia and Firth’s social and contexts are employed in this research. Observation and interview is employed to collect the data. In addition, the research design employed in this research is qualitative approach.

The result conducted in previous chapter shows that the preferable language used by the officials of social institution in serving societies on administrative process is Indonesian language because administrative process is related to the government activity, so Indonesian as unitary language that can be mastered by all Indonesians is used. The factors influencing the officials of social institution in serving societies on administrative process divided into two kinds

are: (1) the internal factors consisting of dialog as the verbal action, ethnic/heredity and citizen's status, (2) the external factor that is about the types of speech found consisting giving order and giving detailed direction. Meanwhile, among those factors mentioned before, the main factor found is the age of the society.

#### 4.2 Suggestion

This research is about diglossia phenomenon that is part of sociolinguistics. This research analyzed the preferable language used by the societies in Panggungrejo village having two high varieties, also the factors influencing in choosing preferable language. Therefore, the further researcher is suggested to conduct research about the same theme, topic and theory with this current study but the object is different, the further researcher can choose the officials of social institution from another village which has two high varieties still used, Indonesian language and local language. This will become an interesting research since the emerging of two high varieties, especially between local and national language almost happened in all areas of Indonesia for some reasons.

## REFERENCES

- Ary, D. Jacobs, L.C. Sorensen, C. Razavieh, A. (2010). *Introduction to research in education*. California: Wadsworth Group, Eight Edition.
- Creswell, J.W. (2012). *Educational research: planning conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative reaserach*. Boston: Pearson Education Inc, Second Edition.
- Ferguson, C.A. (1959). *Sociolinguistics Perspectives: Paper of Language In Society, 1959-1994*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Fishman, J.A. (1967). *Language Problems in Developing Nations*. New York: Wiley.
- Halliday, M.A.K. & Ruqaiya Hasan (1985). *Bahasa konteks dan teks: aspek – aspek bahasa dalam pandangan semiotiksosial*. Translated by Tou Asrudin Barori (1992). Gajah Mada University Press.
- Holmes, J. (2001). *An introduction to sociolinguistics*. London: Longman.
- Myers-Scotton, Carol. (2006). *Multiple Voices: an introduction to bilingualism*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Rukmana. Linda Herna. (2012). *A study of register used by the prostitutes community in the book Surabaya double cover sex in the city*. Unpublished Thesis. Malang Universitas Brawijaya.
- Spolsky, Bernard. (1998). *Sociolinguistics*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Wardagh, R. (2006). *An introduction to sociolinguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd, Fifth Edition
- Yule, George. (2010). *The study of language* . New York: Cambridge University Press.