

LANGUAGE CHOICE AND ATTITUDE AMONG NATIVE LUBUKLINGGAU COMMUNITY

Sastika Seli¹, Ladie Resyta Arma², Dewi Syafitri³
Sekolah Tinggi Keguruan dan Ilmu Pendidikan-PGRI Lubuklinggau^{1,2,3}
selisastika@gmail.com¹

ABSTRACT

This study aims to explain the choice of language and domains in the Lubuklinggau indigenous people, language attitudes towards the selected language, and the factors determining language choice in the Lubuklinggau indigenous people. The research method used is the descriptive qualitative method. The subjects of this study were the indigenous people of Lubuklinggau. The data collection techniques used in this study were questionnaires and interviews. This study shows three common languages commonly used by the Lubuklinggau indigenous people and seven domains. The three languages are PMLD, BI, and Cul. In conclusion, the Lubuklinggau indigenous people usually use three common languages in seven territories. The choice of language is influenced by several factors such as dominant language, solidarity, prestige and politeness.

Keywords: Attitude, Language Choice, Language Domain, Maintenance Multilingualism

INTRODUCTION

Language choice is a condition when the language speakers decide to use different option of languages in different situation. Language choice is informed by the kind of participants in a communication situation, the topic, social distance, and location as well (Ansah, 2014). These speakers master more than language that make them bilingual even a multilingual. This language use makes a speaker must decide what language one must use in different domain (Holmes, 1992). Domain is considered as an institutional context, which affected by topics, locations and participants, when a language is considered to be more appropriate to use than other Adams et al., (2012). This phenomenon possibly happens in a place with multi-culture people.

Lubuklinggau is a developing city located in a strategic area passed by public transport or private transport from the west highway to the east road or just the opposite. Society is also multicultural. Dealing with this situation, the fact shows that the use of native language in this city is decreased because of the effect of new cultures such as the internet and television (hariansilampari.co.id). It caused the people in Lubuklinggau to use different languages when they communicate with others. In exceptional cases of multilingualism appears commonly in inter-ethnic or inter-linguistic families, such as families where husbands and wives speak different languages.

Choosing the language in different domain has been discussed by many sociolinguists who present different result based on different society that they researched. One of the examples is the research by Dweik & Qawar (2015) about the maintenance of Arabic use among Arabic-Canadian in Quebec. They choose some domains to speak Arabic at home with their children, the mosque for worship, and in

Arab media such as the radio. At the same time, Arabic speakers also used English and French in other domains such as in official spheres and educational institutions. The researchers also concluded that Arabic speakers of Quebec mixed Arabic with French and English in other areas such as in the neighborhood, with friends, and in their media use. In contrast, language spoken in Maale, Ethiopia, found maintained by the people in the country because it was supported by regional nationalism which corresponds to ethnic nationalism (Barnes & van Aswegen, 2008).

On the other hand, some speakers can possibly have negative attitude toward their vernacular or native language such as in Nigeria present the fact that Nigerian languages are endangered because of the influence of modernity that lead the children speak English and forget their native language. It also happens in some urban areas in this country where a lot of young people cannot speak their native languages because of negative attitude of the parents who see this as a good thing for their children. The parents think if the children do not know their native language they will master English easily.

The previous research above presented the language maintenance could be affected by various factors such as nationalism (pride), social interaction, social distance, social scale and status of the language. Furthermore, Myers-Scotton as cited in (Francis, 2007) also mentions about some factors such as demographic factor of speakers and educational factors such as medium of teaching and institutional force.

The development of Lubuklinggau city maybe now change the perspective, attitudes as well as language maintenance in using the native language (Cul language). However, it is interesting that the lingua franca in Lubuklinggau is the regional dialect instead of the native language or national language (Bahasa Indonesia). Indeed, it becomes urgent to investigate further how the speakers treat those two regional dialects.

Some information was preliminarily obtained by indirect observation toward some college students. They asserted that they were not native Lubuklinggau who speak the Cul language because this language was embarrassing. Some native speakers felt doubt about admitting that they could use it. This negative attitude triggered questions about whether they still try to maintain the language. Moreover, the native speakers also live side-by-side with the migrants from different areas of Indonesia. Therefore, further investigation is required to explore and describe the language choice and the attitude toward some language varieties they possibly use. Knowing the attitude toward specific languages may give different results on language maintenance. As explained in two cases by Holmes (1992), language maintenance through a positive attitude of the speakers would help, a) the maintenance of the French language in Canada due to the international status and prestige of French; b) the maintenance of Greek language by most of the Greek immigrants in other countries, due to the pride in using this language which helps them resist language shift to another language.

RESEARCH METHOD

This research was descriptive qualitative research. The subject of the research in this study refers to the native speaker of Lubuklinggau. Native speakers of Lubuklinggau were people who lived and were born in Lubuklinggau. In collecting the data, the researchers used questionnaires and interviews. The researcher adopted the questionnaire from Dweik & Qawar in the journal *Language Choice and Language Attitudes in a Multilingual Arab Canadian Community: Quebec-Canada: A Sociolinguistic Study*. There will be two sections of taking a questionnaire. The

questionnaire in this research translated into Bahasa Indonesia in the order made native speaker of Lubuklinggau easier to understand what will be answered and to avoid misunderstanding because not all people in Lubuklinggau understand or able to speak English, so the writer concluded that it was the best way translated the questionnaire into Bahasa Indonesia. The researcher also guided some older informants in filling the questionnaires because most of them could not speak BI.

This research used semi-structured interviews. In this research, some indicators will be asked of the respondents. They were as follows: mother tongue, language choice, language prestige, the function of those language choices, and status of the language. Interview in this research translated into PMLD to make informants understand the question and avoid misunderstanding.

In analyzing the data, there were some steps or procedures that used by researcher, as follows: identification, classification, data reduction, description, and conclusion. Trustworthiness of the research was measured by credibility, transferability, dependability and confirmability through triangulation technique.

FINDING

The Language Choice and Domain in Native Lubuklinggau Community

The data was taken by giving the questionnaires to the respondents. The questionnaires were about what language that respondents usually used to communicate with other people. The domain included family, neighborhood, in every condition, religion, education, workplace, and public.

Table. 1
Language Choice and Domain in Native Lubuklinggau Community

Domain	Language Choice				
	Indonesia Language	Malay - Palembang Dialect Lubuklinggau	Cul Language	English	Others
Family	Mother	3	24	75	1
	Father	2	33	75	1
	Siblings	4	24	73	
	Children	8	26	33	1
Neighborhood	Neighbors	4	50	65	1
In every condition	Close friends	7	48	68	
	Friends	6	55	57	
Religion	Ustad	52	34	37	
	Priest	14	5	7	
Education	Teachers/ Lecturer	63	47	12	
	Principle	68	38	9	
	Staffs	48	34	18	
	Friends	33	46	29	
Work place	Employer	21	24	14	1
	Workmates	18	25	18	1
	Employee	16	16	16	1
Public	Audience	31	23	1	
	School	64	31	1	
	Thanks Giving	64	21	2	

Garvin and Mathiot as cited in (Ginting, 2018) formulate the following three characteristics of positive language attitude, namely: (1) language loyalty, (2) language pride, (3) awareness of the norms, and negative language attitude, namely: (1) Language disloyalty, (2) Language lack of pride, (3) Unawareness of the norms. A positive attitude may assist in maintaining a certain language because the speakers still feel pride in using the language. In contrast, if speakers' attitudes are negative, it might be dangerous for language maintenance.

The attitude on specific language among native Lubuklinggau is classified according to language because each language presented a different attitude. First, the attitude on Cul language in Informal and intimate domains such as neighborhood and friendship domain is positive because they mostly use it in those two domains. Some speakers also used this language in education and the workplace but only with high solidarity and intimate relationship. However, in the public domain and formal situation, they speak BI and PMLD and avoid using the Cul language.

Second, PMLD received a positive attitude from native Lubuklinggau because the status of this language is as *lingua Franca* in Lubuklinggau. Therefore, this language is flexible to use both in the more private domain and public domain. This language is also sometimes used in a formal situation. Third, BI received a positive attitude from native Lubuklinggau because the status of this language is H. BI is the national language in Indonesia. Therefore, it has high prestige in Lubuklinggau, too.

The Factors that Determine the Language Choices among the Native Lubuklinggau in Lubuklinggau

The data were obtained from questionnaires and interviews. The result of the questionnaires is presented in the table below.

Table. 2
The Factors of Language Choice in Native Lubuklinggau

No	Statements	Agree	Disagree
1	I use a variety of language based on how far I know my interlocutors	94	6
2	I use a variety of language based on who my interlocutor is	91	9
3	I use my native language because I want to show my identity	73	27
4	I use a variety of languages because my school or campus forces it.	53	47
5	I use native Lubuklinggau because all people around me use the Lubuklinggau language	91	9
6	I use a variety of language because I respect my interlocutors	88	12
7	I use a variety of language because I am proud when I use my native language (Lubuklinggau) to people who are not native Lubuklinggau	16	84
8	I use a variety of language because I want my interlocutor comfortable to communicate with me	84	16
9	I use a variety of language because my mother and my father teach me more than one language	75	25
10	I use a variety of language because it makes me easier to get something I want	75	25
11	I use a variety of languages because of my religion. Learn	70	30

about that language			
12	I use a variety of language because I want to show that I can speak more than one language use	46	54

Some factors that influenced native Lubuklinggau in choosing the language varieties are, a) what dominant languages used in certain domains; b) solidarity among people with same language knowledge and those with intimate relationship; c) language prestige in specific domains and also used to identify the ethnicity; d) politeness when using the language.

DISCUSSION

There were three common languages that mostly native Lubuklinggau use to communicate in their community. There are Cul language, Palembang-Malay Lubuklinggau (PMLD) dialect, and *Bahasa Indonesia* (BI). Cul language is the native language of Lubuklinggau city (Irawan, personal communication, May 26, 2019), and almost all native Lubuklinggau community used *cul* language to communicate with the others. Native Lubuklinggau used Cul language in family, neighborhood, and friendship domains. The researcher concluded that Cul language was the first language (L1) in native Lubuklinggau.

This result deal with the other research by Granhemat and Abdullah (2017) in title *Gender, Ethnicity, Ethnic Identity, and Language Choice of Malaysian Youths: the Case of the Family Domain* and Ansah (2014) in title *Language Choice in Multilingual Communities: The Case of Larteh, Ghana* who pointed out that L1 primarily used in the home (family) it was also preferred in this research when the native Lubuklinggau in the family domain, there were 75 people from 100 people native Lubuklinggau talks Cul language to their mother and father, 73 people from 100 people talked *Cul language* to their siblings, and 33 people spoke *Cul language* to their children. Neighborhood domain, there were 65 people from 100 people native Lubuklinggau who chose *Cul language*. Friendship domain, there were 57 people from 100 people native Lubuklinggau who chose Cul language to communicate with their friends.

The second language that mostly native Lubuklinggau used was PMLD in neighbors and friendship domain in education. The researcher can conclude that PMLD was a second language (L2) as a *Lingua Franca* among the native Lubuklinggau community. Neighborhood and friendship in education domain which was used PMLD usually not originally from Lubuklinggau. In the area, there were 50 people out of 100 people native Lubuklinggau who chose PMLD to communicate with their neighbors. There were 46 people out of 100 people native Lubuklinggau who chose PMLD. The result in this domain higher than two other languages 33 people out of 100 people native Lubuklinggau chose the Indonesian language, and 29 people out of 100 people chose the Cul language to communicate with their friends.

Badan Pusat Statistik Lubuklinggau (2017) stated that there were about 86 ethnicities in Lubuklinggau. Four common ethnicities in Lubuklinggau are Lembak, Saling, Rawas, and Palembang. Meanwhile, the *lingua Franca* of those 86 ethnics is PMLD. The researcher concluded that the Indonesian language was a second language (L2) as a national language usually used in the proper place (education and workplace domains). This result agrees with Ansah (2014) who pointed out that the third language usually used in education but in Ansah's research religion domain used L2 as *lingua franca* but in this research religion domain used L2 as a national language (Indonesia language).

On the other hand, the third language that usually used in native Lubuklinggau was the Indonesian language. As a result of the domain in education itself, 68 people from 100 people native Lubuklinggau chose the Indonesian language. Then, 63 people from 100 people native Lubuklinggau chose the Indonesian language. There were 48 people from 100 people native Lubuklinggau who choose the Indonesian language, and then there were 33 people from 100 people native Lubuklinggau who chose the Indonesian language. Therefore, from the explanation above, the researcher can conclude that mostly native Lubuklinggau used the Indonesian language when those people in the domain of education.

Most people in the workplace domain used the Indonesian language. There were 21 people of native Lubuklinggau who chose the Indonesian language to communicate with their employer, there were 18 people from 100 people native Lubuklinggau chose the Indonesian language to share with their workmates, and then there were 16 people from 100 people native Lubuklinggau chose the Indonesian language to communicate with their employee.

Language Attitude among Native Lubuklinggau toward the Language Varieties They Use

Garvin and Mathiot as cited in Ginting (2018) formulate the following three characteristics of positive language attitude, namely: (1) language loyalty; (2) language pride; (3) awareness of the norms, and negative language attitude, namely: a) language disloyalty; b) language lack of pride; c) unawareness of the norms. The analysis of language attitude of native Lubuklinggau toward languages they use was based on this theory.

As presented previously in table 1, most speakers used the Indonesian language to speak in a distant relationship and more public domain such as Education, workplace and other places such as government office and mall. Those domains are the place where the speakers used BI. In the Education domain, the positive attitude of BI was triggered by the high (H) status of this language. People think it is more polite to speak *Bahasa Indonesia* in this domain toward more superior people such as teachers, lecturers, principals, or other academics. It was interesting to know when some speakers also chose to speak BI to their Quran teachers. In fact, learning is usually happening at home, not at formal school. BI was used because Quran teachers also considered being superior for them.

Furthermore, there was a greater difference in the workplace. In this domain, speakers preferred to use PMLD instead of BI. PMLD is the language used mainly by native Lubuklinggau, whose mother tongue is *Cul* language. The data show that their language attitude toward PMLD is positive because they are loyal, proud, and aware of it.

Dealing with *Cul* language, the interview data show that some speakers said about the feelings of their native language. They said not ashamed of using *Cul*, another language, as the vernacular to speak in public the c domain. However, the analysis shows different results. Some answers contradict what they say dealing with pride when using vernacular in the public domain. There was a hesitation in their answer, such as using particle '*sih*' that indicates the uncertainty of the feeling. Another answer, for example, presented that they only felt insecure and considered their interlocutors' sense. It can be summarized that some speakers have a lack of pride and language disloyalty when speaking out of family and close friendship domain. As also presented

by questionnaire data, *I use a variety of language because I want my interlocutor comfortable to communicate with me*, and the result of this statement there were 84 people native Lubuklinggau from 100 people as the sample of this study chose to *agree* of this statement because those people want someone comfortable when those people talk to the native Lubuklinggau and 16 people native Lubuklinggau from 100 people decided to *disagree* of this statement because some of those people did not care about whatever the interlocutors feeling.

Coultas (2003) states that some attitudes presented by speakers show that using regional talk people: 1) may feel the intimacy; 2) seem to be less educated, more honest, inappropriate in some formal context; 3) beneficial for comedy performance. Native Lubuklinggau also feel the intimacy toward the family members and close friends who share the same knowledge of *Cul* language. Therefore, the attitude toward *Cul* language is positive in intimate relationship yet negative in public domain.

The Factors Determining the Language Choice among Native Lubuklinggau in Lubuklinggau

Some sources influenced language choice in the native Lubuklinggau community, such as bilingualism, multilingualism, and the domain of language choice. The third sources above were familiar sources that mostly happened when native Lubuklinggau want to their language if those native Lubuklinggau communicates the others.

Multilingualism is someone that can speak more than two languages use in their daily activities. Multilingual is also sometimes used to refer to the people who can use more than two languages (Jendra, 2010). Therefore, mostly native Lubuklinggau understood more than two languages use in their daily activities. Based on the results of the interview with Khotija in personal communication, May 26, 2019, stated that the speakers used different language with different people, if those people do not understand what she meant; she changed the language when she wants to communicate to those people. On the other hand, Ermi, in personal communication, May 26, 2019, stated that when she met her family and neighbors, she used *Cul* language and when she met my friend at her school or the other place. Usually, she used PMLD. Still, when she is in education, she used the Indonesian language. Those two people rep representative people active Lubuklinggau because mostly, native Lubuklinggau has a similar statement which those people have more than two languages use in their daily activities.

Domain of language choice is an area that made someone at those areas change the language used when those people in the different area. Domain is certain factors-who you are talking to, the social context of the talk, the function, and the topic, of the discussion out to be important in accounting for language choice in many different kinds of community (Holmes, 1992). Meanwhile, Gopar, in personal communication, May 26, 2019 stated that when he want to comwantscate with other people, he read the condition such as when he met his customer that wants buy sowantsing in the small shop he usually used BI or PMLD. On the other hand, when he met his Chinese friend, he used BI, and when he met his neighbors, he used the *Cul* language.

According to Dweik & Qawar, (2015) most researchers agree upon the same factors that influence the language choice i.e. dominant languages, prestigious languages and language preference determine language choice in multilingual communities. Other factors such as social status, gender, education, age, ethnicity, topic, place, etc are also triggered the language choice.

In the family and friendship domain, the speakers use the *Cul* language because of

the dominant language used in the neighborhood area. In the area where native Lubuklinggau lives, the speakers use the *Cul* language as the symbol of intimacy that reflects high solidarity. They speak this language to the family members who are native Lubuklinggau as well as the neighborhood. They also talk about this language to close friends with similar language knowledge.

When the solidarity was high, they chose PMLD to speak with family members and friends. There were 94 people native Lubuklinggau from out of 100 people as the sample of this study chose *agree* of this statement because those people usually uses the language based on who the interlocutors are and distance of the speakers. The rest chose *Cul* language to speak anywhere they are. A group that feels closer solidarity may be willing to overcome some linguistic difference in creating a norm (Wardhaugh, 2006).

In more formal and public domains such as religion, education, workplace, and governmental office, they dominantly use BI to some extent. BI is used for some considerations include politeness, standardization, and prestige. For example, to God, Religious leaders, teachers, lecturers, principals, academics, employers, government office staff. On the other hand, speaking with working partners, they mostly use PMLD, and in a small case, they talk to the *Cul* language.

In formal situation and public domains they avoid to use *Cul* language because they are afraid that people may see them as uneducated people and make fun of their accent. It can be concluded that native language has low prestige used in these domains showing a low social status. Similar case also happened to Haitian, people use Haitian Creole and the local variety of French. The Creole is considered to show ignorance, poverty, inferiority yet at the same time showing Haitian solidarity (Wardhaugh, 2006). It also similar to native Lubuklinggau who still feel proud of *Cul* language in showing their identity to others.

CONCLUSION

This research showed three common languages were usually used by native Lubuklinggau and seven domains. They are *Cul* language that used mainly in the family (mother, father, siblings, and children), neighborhood (neighbors), and friendship (close friends and friends. PMLD is used chiefly in the neighborhood (neighbors) and friends in education domains'. The last is BI that primarily used in formal and public domains such as education (teachers/lecturers, principle, and staffs) and workplace (employer, workmates, employee, and audience). Meanwhile, language choice is influenced by some factors such as dominant language, solidarity, prestige, and politeness. Surprisingly, native Lubuklinggau shows a positive attitude toward those three language varieties because the perspective will be based on the domains in using the language.

SUGGESTION

Maintain the language, it is necessary to instill a proud attitude in using the language.

REFERENCES

- Adams Y., Matu P. M., & Ongarora, D. O. (2012). Language Use and Choice : A Case Study of Kinubi in Kibera, Kenya. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 2(4),99–104. <https://www.ijhssnet.com/journal/index/834:vol-1-no-21-si-december-2011abstract13&catid=16:journal-abstract>
- Ansah, M. A. (2014). Language Choice in Multilingual Communities-The Case of

- Larteh, Ghana. *Legon Journal of the Humanities*, 25, 37-57.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.4314/ljh.v25i1.3>
- Badan Pusat Statistik Lubuklinggau. (2017). *Kota Lubuklinggau dalam Rangka Lubuk Linggau Municipality in Figures 2017*.
<https://lubuklinggaukota.go.id/public/view-pdf/15>
- Barnes L., & Van, A. K. (2008). An Investigation into the Maintenance of the Maale language in Ethiopia. *African Identities*, 6(4), 431-444.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14725840802417984>
- Coultas, A. (2003). *Language and Social Context*. England: Taylor & Francis e-library
- Dweik B. S., & Qawar, H. A. (2015). Language Choice and Language Attitudes in a Multilingual Arab Canadian Community: Quebec-Canada: A Sociolinguistic Study. *British Journal of English Linguistics*, 3(1), 1-12.
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/278785088_LANGUAGE_CHOICE_AND_LANGUAGE_ATTITUDES_IN_A_MULTILINGUAL_ARAB_CANADIAN_COMMUNITY_QUEBEC-CANADA_A_SOCIOLINGUISTIC_STUDY
- Francis, N. (2007). Carol Myers-Scotton: Multiple Voices: An Introduction to Bilingualism. *Applied Linguistics*, 28(1), 155-158.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/aml055>
- Ginting, S. A. (2018). Language Attitude of Sellers in Traditional Market Toward Karonese Language. *English Language Teaching*, 11(7), 125-130.
<https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v11n7p125>
- Granhemat, M., & Abdullah, A. N. (2017). Gender, Ethnicity, Ethnic Identity, and Language Choices of Malaysian Youths: The Case of the Family Domain. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 8(2), 26-36.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.7575/aiac.all.v.8n.2p.26>
- Holmes, J. (1992). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. London: Longman Group
- Jendra, I. I. (2010). *Sociolinguistics: The Study of Societies Languages*. Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu
- Wardhaugh, R. (2006). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics (Fifth Edition)*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing