Proceedings

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE
ICEL 2013

The First International Conference on Education and Language (ICEL)

28,29,30 January 2013
Bandar Lampung University（UBL）
Indonesia

UBL
SOLUTION FOR PRESENT AND FUTURE

In Cooperations With

UNIVERSITY OF WOLLONGONG

words illumine everything
EFL University
INDIA

الجامعة الإسلامية العالمية ماليزيا
INTERNATIONAL ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY MALAYSIA

Indonesia   **Australia**   **India**   **Malaysia**

Faculty of Teacher Training and Education (FKIP)
English Education Study Program, Bandar Lampung University (UBL), Indonesia

PROCEEDINGS

The First International Conference on Education and Language

ICEL 2013

28 -30 January 2013

PREFACE

The activities of the International Conference is in line and very appropriate with the vision and mission of Bandar Lampung University (UBL) to promote training and education as well as research in these areas.

On behalf of the First International Conference of Education and Language (ICEL 2013) organizing committee, we are very pleased with the very good responses especially from the keynote speakers and from the participants. It is noteworthy to point out that about 80 technical papers were received for this conference

The participants of the conference come from many well known universities, among others:
University of Wollongong, NSW Australia, International Islamic University Malaysia, Kyoto University (Temple University (Osaka), Japan - Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi, India - West Visayas State University College of Agriculture and Forestry, Lambunao, Iloilo, Philipine - Bahcesehir University, Istanbul, Turkey - The Higher Institute of Modern Languages, Tunisia - University of Baku, Azerbaijan - Sarhad University, KPK, Pakistan - Medical Sciences English Language Teacher Foundation Program, Ministry of Health, Oman - Faculty School of Arts and Sciences, Banga, Aklan Philippines - Sultan Ageng Tirtayasa, Banten, - Pelita Harapan University, Jakarta - STIBA Saraswati Denpasar, Bali - University of Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta - Ahmad Dahlan University Yogyakarta - Sriwijaya University, Palembang - Islamic University of Malang - IAIN Raden Fatah Palembang - Universitas Diponegoro, Semarang, Indonesia - Universitas Haluoleo Kendari - State Islamic University of Sunan Gunung Djati, Bandung - Tadulako University, Central Sulawesi - Sanata Dharma University - Lampung University and Open University,

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to the International Advisory Board members, sponsors and also to all keynote speakers and all participants. I am also grateful to all organizing committee and all of the reviewers who contribute to the high standard of the conference. Also I would like to express my deepest gratitude to the Rector of Bandar Lampung University (UBL) who gives us endless support to these activities, so that the conference can be administrated on time.

Bandar Lampung, 30 January 2013

Mustofa Usman, Ph.D
lCEL 2013 Chairman

PROCEEDINGS

The First International Conference on Education and Language
(ICEL 2013)
BANDAR LAMPUNG UNIVERSITY
Bandar Lampung, Indonesia
January 28, 29, 30, 2013

Steering Committee

Executive Advisors
M. Yusuf S. Barusman
Andala Rama Putra Barusman

Chairman
Mustofa Usman

Co-Chairman
Harpain
Baginda Simaibang

Secretary
Yanuar Dwi Prasetyo

Treasurer
Tissa Zadya

Technical Committee Team
Tissa Zadya
Nadia Dalimunthe
Yanuar Dwi Prasetyo
Bery Salatar
Zainal Abidin

International Advisory Board

Mustofa Usman, Indonesia	M. Yusuf S. Barusman, Indonesia	Jayashree Mohanraj, India
Garry Hoban, NSW Australia	Jan Wright, NSW Australia	Ujang Suparman, Indonesia
S. Mohanraj, India	Harpain, Indonesia	Ahmad HP, Indonesia
Ken Cruickshank, NSW Australia	Hon Wie Leong, Singapore	Baginda Simaibang, Indonesia
Baverly Derewianka, NSW Australia	Raihan B. Othman, Malaysia	Nuraihan Mat Daud, Malaysia
Ahmad F. Ismail, Malaysia	Andala R. P. Barusman, Indonesia	Udin Syarifuddin W, Indonesia
Hery Yufrizal, Indonesia	Khomsahrial Romli, Indonesia	Undang Rosyidin, Indonesia
	Mohamad Sahari Nordin, Malaysia	

Organizing Committee

Chair Person
Tissa Zadya

Vice Chair Person
Baginda Simaibang

Secretary
Yanuar Dwi Prasetyo

Treasure
Samsul Bahri
Dian Agustina

Special Events
Bery Salatar
Nadia Dalimunthe
Siti Rahma Wati
Dina Ika Wahyuningsih
Kefas Ajie
Fajar Ryantika

Transportation and Accommodation
Irawati

Publication and Documentation
Indriarti Gultom, MM.
Dina Ika Wahyuningsih
Noning Verawati
Masitoh
Rifandy Ritonga

Consumption
Yulfriwini
Ni Sayu Kade Lena Widyawati
Miryanti Feralia
Novita
Cornellius Vilardi
M. Agusman Ajijaya
I Gede Ryan Ekki .P.
Qory Fahrunisa ,F.

Facility and Decoration
Zainal Abidin
Sudarto
Tri Suhartono
Sukamto
Suprapto

Table Of Content

THE PATTERNS OF SASAK CODE CHOICEE

Dr. Lalu Abd. Khalik

Bumi Gora Academy of Foreign Languages, Nusa Tenggara Barat, Indonesia

Corresponding email : laluabdulkhalik@yahoo.com; Cell-phone: 6281355808045

Abstract

This paper mainly aims to show the patterns of code choice within the Sasak multilingual community. A simple assumption is within the Sasaks' repertoire, there must exist regularity in the way of choosing a certain code that might be different from other speech community. The differences can be assumed as the cultural uniqueness that operates within its specific value system hold by the community and ultimately those differences form the identity of the community.

It has been generally accepted that there are three general rules of code choice in multilingual society, i.e. situational, repertoire, and metaphorical rules. This metaphorical rule dominates the code choice rules in Sasak context which is realized in the form of patterns; symmetrical, asymmetrical, stratified, and pseudo-symmetrical patterns.   These patterns are quite different from those previously revealed by some researchers around the world. The differences are mainly because of the differences of values operating within the culture of each community.

Keywords: Sasak, Patterns, and Code-choice

1. INTRODUCTION

Society and language are so closely intertwined that society cannot be said to be " out there" independent of a language whose task it is to reflect it as Roger Fowler (1985:62) puts it, " language is a reality-creating social practice". This statement is in line with Bernstein's hypothesis (Gumperz and Hymes, 1972:409) which says that social relationships act as intervening variables between linguistic structures and their realization in speech. Language that people produce is not a random entity, but it must be rule-governed. So far linguists have found out that there are so many sociolinguistic variables involved in realizing a stretch of expression in the form of language. Those variables or linguistic features vary in form and have social significance (McKay and Hornberger, 1997).

In any bilingual or multilingual society, what interesting is the factors that govern the choice of a particular code on a particular occasion. Why do people choose one code rather than another, what brings about shifts from one code to another, and why they occasionally prefer to use a code formed from two other codes by mixing the two? In what so-called diglossic situation the choice is governed by clear functional differences between the codes, (Wardhaugh, 1987:108). A serious explanation is also needed to the other types of bilingual situation such as code choice, code switching/mixing as phenomena. Furthermore, an assumption underlying much of the research in bilingualism is that language varieties are meaningful: they are indexical of a speaker's origin or of aspects of their social identity (for instance, their social class or ethnic group), but they also carry certain social values related to the speakers who use them and the contexts in which they habitually used (Mesthrie et. al. 2000:148).

Sasak is one of local languages used by Sasak tribe in Indonesia that has its own specialties and uniqueness. One will find it difficult to understand Sasaks without having sufficient knowledge of all social and cultural aspects. Duranti, (1997:2) emphasized that language is also a cultural practice, or in Chomsky' term as quoted in Radford (1981:1) "mirror of the mind", that come together to form the pattern of speech behavior and rules of speaking. Without a deep understanding and analysis of those complexities, it will be very difficult to come up with the general view of the present situation of communication in Sasak.

Sasak is a speech community that seems to fulfil the typology proposed by Fishman as "Both Diglossia and Bilingualism" (Fasold, 1987:41 and Williams, 1992:98). Fishman (1972:96), as quoted in Williams (1992:99), claims that diglossia and bilingualism in association exist in a "fairly large and a complex speech community, that its members have available to them both a range of compartmentalized roles as well as ready access to these roles". In Sasak diglossic situation, it is nearly impossible to say anything without indicating the social relationship between the speaker and the listener in term of status and familiarity. Status is determined by many things; wealth, descent, education, occupation, age, kinship, and nationality (Fishman, 1972) see also Foley

(1999), but the important point is that the choice of linguistic forms as well as speech style is mostly determined by caste and relative status of the conversers. The difference is not minor, a mere du and Sie in German (Fishman,1972:252) or T and V difference , (aT form, named after Latin *tu*, for informal, relaxed usage and a V form, from Latin *vos* for formal, polite context) see also Foley (1999:314). To greet a person lower than oneself one says *Ape arak* but one greet a superior with *Napi pengandike*, both meaning *What's up?* Harold F. Schiffman in Coulmas (2000:213) emphasizes the use of L where H is expected (or vice versa) constitutes a violation of communicative competence rules.

2. CODE-CHOICE

I am also in the opinion that Sociolinguistics only exists as a field of study because there are choices in using language. The very term "societal multilingualism" refers to the fact that there can be several languages in the society (Fasold,1987:180). In this article, we will investigate what makes people in a society choose to use one language rather than another in a given instance.

Code choice, the term code is more neutral (Wardaugh, 1987:86) which is also known as language choice in certain literatures such as used by Sridhar in McKay and Hornberger (1997:51) see also Fasold (1987:180), is a linguistic phenomenon commonly found in any multilingual society. Sasak speech community is no exception since people of Sasak speak more than one language and language variety as previously stated.

Ellias-Olivares (1979) in McKay and Hornberger (1997:51), assumes that in heterogeneous speech community, with varying degrees of linguistic diversity and linguistic complexity, speakers interact using different speech varieties drawn from a repertoire of choices which for the most part are not random. On the contrary, the distribution of usage of these choices is determined by several factors in the social communicative system of the community.

For a multilingual individual, there are some different languages or codes in his/her repertoire but the question is how and when are the codes used? To find the appropriate answer, the notion of domains is very important. Fishman (1964, 1965, 1968e) as quoted in McKay and Hornberger (1997:183) proposed that there were certain institutional contexts, called **domains,** in which one language variety is more likely to be appropriate than another. *Domains are taken to be constellations of factors such as location, topic, and participants.* According to Fishman (1972b:437), domains explore "who speaks what language to whom and when" in those speech community that are characterized by widespread and relatively stable multilingualism.

Barber (1952) has formulated domains at the sociopsychological level. He groups of the domains as intimate (family), formal (religious ceremonial) informal (neighborhood), and intergroup (economic and recreational activities as well as interactions with governmental-legal authority). In the research by Fishman and associates (Rubin, 1968; see also Fishman, 1978), language is discussed in terms of the following domains: the family, the play ground and street, the school, the church, literature, the press, the military, the courts, and governmental administration (Fishman 1972b:441). A similar pattern was found by Parasher (1980) as quoted in Fasold (1987:184) in his study of code choice in two cities in India. Parasher used self-reported questionnaire data and attempted to determine people's language use in domains, in Fishman's sense. He asked about language use in seven domains; (1) family; (2) friendship; (3) neighborhood; (4) transactions; (5) education; (6) government; and (7) employment. Gal's work (1978b, 1979) as also quoted in Fasold (1987) on code choice in Oberwart, Austria used implicational scale focusing on various interlocutors such as; 1. God; 2. grandparents and their generation; 3. black market clients; 4. parents and their generation; 5. age-mate pals, neighbor; 6. brothers and sisters; 7. salespeople; 8. spouse; 9. children and that generation; 10. government. This last model mentioned will be adopted in this article with some modification and adaptation. In investigating mutilingual societies, subsequent researchers have either added to or reduced the numbers of domains.

An analysis of how languages of a multilingual community are used reveals a highly sophisticated and efficient pattern. All the languages are not used in all the domains. It is believed that certain languages are particularly suited to certain domains. There is an enormous body of research investigating language use in different domains; for example, language use in intimate (e.g., family, friends, neighborhood) versus utilitarian (e.g., place of work, government offices, banks) domains have been investigated by many researchers. Rubin (1968) presents the case of Guarani and Spanish in , where Spanish is used in the government, in the business transactions, and with the foreigners, whereas Guarani is prefered with friends, family and servants. In Indonesia, the Javanese language has two speech levels, the formal style, known as kromo (used with older and higher-status people), and the intimate style, known as ngoko (used with peers and with people of lower status). Speakers choose the level depending on their relationship with others in the group (Alip, 1993) see also the similar findings on Javanese by Geertz (1972) and Zane Goebel (2001). K.K. Sridhar (1982) demonstrates that speakers in urban centers in South India employ a triple-layered distribution in which English, the regional language Kanada, and Hindi (the official language of the country) play different roles, depending on intimacy,

status, and power. A similar study conducted by Parasher (1980) as quoted in Fasold (1987:184) found out that family, friendship, and neighborhood might be Low domains, and that education, government, and employment might be High domains. The transaction domain might be Low or rather High depending on the kind of the transaction. In the three Low domains mother tongue is dominantly used whereas English, Hindi or regional languages are dominantly used in the High domains. Gal's work on the code choice in Oberwart, Austria found out that there are many bilinguals in Hungarian and German. Hungarian, the traditional ingroup language of one segment of the society, is the Low variety. German, the national language, is the High language. Hungarian is associated with traditional rural peasant values. German symbolizes the more Austrian and urban values.

3. KENDS OF CHOICE

Moyer in Auer (1999:222) found out that bilingual conversation in Gilbraltar typically involve language choice at three distinct levels of conversational structuring. At the highest level a main language can be selected for the entire conversation. At the intermediate level within the same conversation participants may momentarily select or negotiate the use of different language for limited number of turns. At the lowest level, a speaker may choose to switch different types of structures within a turn or turn constructional unit.

However, it is generally accepted that there are three kinds of code choice:

- Code-switching.
- Code-mixing, where pieces of one language are used while a speaker is basically using another language. The language "pieces" taken from another language are words, but they can also be phrases or larger units.
- Finally, there is variation within the same language.

These three kinds of choice cannot be clearly separated from each other. The three kinds of choice are best viewed as points on a continuum from relatively large-scale to relatively small-scale choices. The middle category, code-mixing, is very difficult to distinguish from the other two. Hill and Hill as quoted in Fasold, (1987:181) in their study of language choice between Spanish and Nahuatl in a Mexican Indian group, found it hopeless to try to distinguish between code-mixing and code switching.

On the other hand, code-mixing or switching is often hard to distinguish from intra-language variation. One criterion that is sometimes offered to distinguish switching from mixing is that grammar of the clause determines the language. By this criterion, if a person uses a word or a phrase from another language, he has mixed. But if one clause has the grammatical structure of one language and the next is constructed according to the grammar of another, a switch has occurred. (Fasold,1987:182). In this article, the term code switching will be used and encompass code mixing and intra language variation.

Up to the present, there are so many researches that have been conducted to answer the question "why is it that speakers engage in code-switching (CS) ? and largely received the answer that CS is a *strategy to influence interpersonal relations*, Scotton in Coulmas (2000:218). Lately, the answer has been refined. For example, first Gumperz (1982) and then Auer (1984) began to speak of CS as a "contextualization cue" which is used in signaling and interpreting speaker intentions. Most researchers studied the social functions of CS on a micro-level, but argued that interpersonal usage patterns in CS reflect group values and norms. In various publications, Myers-Scotton developed the theme of CS as a tool for the speaker and an index for the addressee of the negotiation of the interpersonal relationships. Earlier Scotton (1976) introduced the notion of CS as a *strategy of neutrality in interpersonal relation*.

To sum up, there are some major motivations of code-switching also distinguish it from other language contact as stated by Scotton in Coulmas (2008:218) as follows;
to add a dimension to the socio-pragmatic force of one's discourse persona.

a) To function as a discourse marker.
b) To lexicalize semantic/pragmatic feature bundle's from the EL (embedded language) which better convey the speaker's intentions than related lexemes from the ML (matrix language).
c) To lexicalize semantic/ pragmatic feature bundles found only in EL.
d) The last motivation which is also mentioned and has significance to this research is language **attrition.**

4. SASAK CODE CHOICE PATTERNS

An adequate description of language used in Lombok must specify the conditions patterning language choice. Johnson (1973) in [19] has outlined three types of rules accounting for language choice by participants in speech events in Larteh, Ghana: **repertoire rules, situational rules, and metaphorical rules**. A repertoire rule predicts language use by reference to the language proficiency of speakers. A situational rule predicts language use by reference to the speech event situation, namely setting, topic, etc. The situational rules for Larteh refer to special language choices in the schools and in Christian churches.

A Metaphorical rule refers to the social meaning conveyed by language choice. Patterns of solidarity, intimacy, and status, for instance, are often established, conveyed, and altered by language choices outside those predicted by repertoire and situational rules. In Larteh, switching to Twi or English from the Larteh language can "stress education or affiliation with wider reference groups."

Situational rules are those which have received greatest attention from linguists. Diglossia may be viewed as language situation in which **situational rules dominate**, constituting the major operating factor patterning. In the context of code choice by Sasaks in Lombok, there are different rules seem to apply [12]. A situational rule that both Fergusson and Fishman found out that the use of L or H depends very much on the situation where the code (language) is used. For example L is used in the church or government offices whereas L is used in family or neighbor. It is also different to what Johnson (1973) in [19] has found out in his research that is repertoire rule dominates the choice of a code. Related researches in Indonesia do not specifically focus on the patterns of code choice but rather on the other aspects even though they employ the implicational scale as used in this research.

Sasaks speak some language varieties such as; Sasak Alus (SA), Sasak Jamak (SJ), Sasak Kasar/Base Terminal(BT), bahasa Jejawen /Kawi Madya (K) and also Indonesia Alus (IA) [12]. From the perspective of language domain , it has been found out that in Sasak interaction context there is a tendency of each domain has its own characteristics as follows:

a) Base Terminal (BT) is the most commonly used in intimate domain but mainly by young people where there is no social constrain that debars the interaction.
b) In a purely casual domain, there is a tendency of SJ to be intensively used in the sense of its matrix language (ML).
c) In consultative domain, there is a shift toward higher level of code such as SA but in its low level of SA.
d) BI itself seems to be dominanty used in the formal domain whereas the other codes are also used but only to cetain degree.
e) In frozen domain, the codes like IA and SA play dominant roles but in a very limited context like the ritual in a wedding ceremony, Kawi (K) is the only language for the purpose.

It must be acknowledged though, to certain extent, the situational and repertoire rules operate but on the very limited contexts as follows:

Repertoire rules,
a. Most of the older generation of Sasaks use Sasak because the only language they speak.
b. Some children tend to speak bahasa Indonesia (BI) in most domains because they are more convenient with their Indonesian.
c. Older generation speak Sasak to the non-Sasak government officials/staff because they are not confident with their bahasa Indonesia, for example a witness speaks Sasak in a court because he feels his Sasak is better than Bahasa Indonesia.

Situational rule,
a. In informal situation like the interactions that happen in intimate, casual and consultative situations, BT and SJ are more intensively used than other codes.
b. Bahasa Indonesia is used in more formal situation like education specifically in the classroom context or in the government offices such as Court, Police Office, etc.
c. Kawi language is the only used for ritual language such as in the "sorong serah aji kerame" that is in the traditional wedding party procession.

From the data gathered through observation, questionnaire, and interview, it has been found out that the **metaphorical rules** dominates the code choice, mainly in more traditional context, that is one chooses a certain code because s/he wants to convey social meaning such as **solidarity, distance, intimacy and status**. This general rule is realized by the following specific rules:

I. In Dialog context, that is the pattern of code choice as used in a dialog, the code-choice patterns consist of:
  A. Symmetrical Pattern, this pattern is used when two interactants feel or want to make themselves equal. This pattern has two form as follows:
    1. Low symmetric, the symmetrical interaction using L code(s) such as:
      a. Base Terminal (BT) is used symmetrically by a Sasak to his intimate friend to show intimacy.
      b. Sasak Jamak is used symmetrically to show solidarity in general friendship relation or in any casual interaction.
    2. High symmetric, the symmetrical interaction using H code(s) such as:
      a. Sasak Alus is used symmetrically by a noble man to a noble man, like an interaction between a village chief, who besides rich is also noble, and a government official at the Lombok Tengah regency office.
      b. Sasak Alus is used symmetrically by a Tuan Guru/Ulama to a common man.

c. Sasak Alus is used symmetrically by a rich man to a rich man.

d. Indonesia Alus or Sasak Alus is used symmetrically by a government official to a government official

e. An outsider speaks Sasak Alus symmetrically to a Sasak to show his affiliation with the reference group.

B. Assymetrical Pattern, this pattern is realized when the interactants agree on their differences such as social status, age and education.

a. Sasak Alus is used asymmetrically by a subordinate to his boss or by a poor man to a rich man

b. Sasak Alus is commonly used asymmetrically by a common people or a poor man to a very rich man

c. Sasak Alus is widely used asymmetrically by a slave/worker to a noble man/master (usually landlord)

d. Sasak Alus is definitely used asymmetrically by students to his teacher in non-classroom context.

e. Sasak Alus is used asymmetrically by a wife to her husband.

f. Sasak Alus is used asymmetrically by a child to his parents.

g. Sasak Alus is generally used asymmetrically by a younger man to an older one.

C. Pseudo-symmetrical Pattern, this patters is used when a speaker wants to emphasize a certain intention to his interlocutor like sarcasm, anger, etc., or he just wants to educate his interlocutor.

i. Sasak Alus is used symmetrically by parents or older family members to their little children to educate them.

b. Bahasa Indonesia is used symmetrically by parents or older family members to little children to teach them the variety.

D. Stratified Pattern, this pattern is used in Low Symmetrical interaction but involving a third high-status person that force them to switch to H code.

a. Sasak Alus is also used when interactants involve a third person who deserved to be addressed in the variety whereas the interactants addressed each other in Sasak Jamak.

II. In Monolog Context, the code choice pattern as used in a monolog like preaching, campaign, or a speech in general.

b. In a monolog context such as in a political activity , Sasak Alus and Indonesia alus are more favorable than any other language within the Sasaks' repertoire.

c. Sasaak Alus or Indonesia Alus is used for commercial purpose.

d. Sasak Alus or Indonesia Alus is used by traditional Islamic preachers

e. Bahasa Indonesia is used by more modern Islamic preacher.

The question is why the metaphorical rule applies within the Sasak communication context? The answer might be because Sasak has different *values, beliefs, and norms* underlying its organization of interaction. **To communicate in the Sasak context does not merely depend on the repertoire of what languages or codes you speak well but also what code to use, what to say to whom, and how to say it appropriately in any given situation.** That is the notion of communicative competence, introduced by Hymes (1966) in McKay and Hornberger (1997) , which may be broadly defined as what a speaker needs to know to communicate appropriately within a particular speech community.

Up to this point, the Sasak code choice situation has proved the Hymes' argument to be true. In order to communicate appropriately one does not only need to know the grammar of a given language (repertoire), or just the situation where the language is used, but one needs to go beyond, that is to the culture, the belief, values, and norms of the community.

5. THE VALUE BEHIND THE NORMS.

For Sasaks, adat (custom) constitutes a system of norm that must be highly upheld. It is also considered as a contrasting device between a man and an animal. Breaking the adat consequently means the level of human dignity has seriously decreased which is in Sasak term "susut". Anyone who experienced this "susut" deserved to be ousted and ostracized and never come back to the community.

All norms manifested in the "adat" are motivated and guided by a value system that is "tulah manuh, maliq, merang". Accordingly, doing whatever against the value system will automatically incur a disaster to the doer which is believed to be more serious and dangerous than a sin in Islamic concept. A big or small disaster as the consequence depends very much on the wrongdoing he makes. The "adat" organizes all aspects of human life in their socialization including how to appropriately communicate to one another. The value system of "tulah manuh" that controls and guides how human beings interact one another. I still remember when I was watching the traditional puppet of Lombok, "wayang kulit", any time a common man or a slave comes to meet the king he

would say, *Ye jaladri, kawule nunas nurgehe moge-moge hambe tan kene baye sang tular manuh dawek suntarimanan dawek,* meaning "Oh Lord, I beg your pardon and wishes never get any "tulah manuh" (curse), I beg your pardon my Lord."

The concept of "tulah manuh" is considered to have a direct link with and motivate the code choice patterns. In order that one can be avoided from the negative impact of tulah manuh, one has to implements some basic principles in his social life, i.e., **wiraga, wirama, wibusana, wirasa.**

- **Wiraga** deals with non-verbal language (kinesic) or human behavior in the society.
- **Wirama** regulates how one interacts using language in his society or how to convey his idea appropriately.
- **Wirasa** deals with the way of understanding one's feeling.
- **Wibusana** regulates the acceptable way of dressing.

Those four principles are aimed to humanize a human. If they behave not the way they should behave, the logical consequence is their degree of honorable human being will go down to the animal's level. When a noble man behaves improperly, he is no longer a noble.

Above all, the basic principles are implicitly elaborated in the seven commandments of Kotaragama book like how a common man should behave before his king (Kotaragama, 1996:41). In one dictum, it is stated that one must be "kwanten", meaning he has to speak respectfully to his master and not allowed to speak improperly or using a bad language let alone to swear the king. The Sasaks are still very loyal to their custom, see Lukman in [12]. Besides, the traditional Sasak community is fully aware that speaking inappropriately will bring a very serious consequence in the form of social ostracism or being labeled as a man who do not know adat (ndek taok adat/ botek) but also because there is a belief that it will bring a "tulah manuh" disaster that is similar to the sin in Islamic concept but far more serious than a merely sin. The punishment from the unseen force in "tulah manuh" is more direct. They also believe that a certain people can cause "tulah manuh" . So, if one makes any wrongdoing against this kind of man through inappropriate words or action, a disaster will be unavoidable.

As a researcher and also as a Sasak, after leaving the Lombok Island for thirty years, what I observe today is sometimes different from what I understood in the past. Today, there are three big forces that come to struggle one another: tradition, Islam and modern world. Those the three forces are the sources of the values and norms of the present Sasak. Those three forces intermingle to form a new system of belief, values and norms. But it must be admitted that the quality and degree of the new system differs significantly from a city to villages and the areas where the existence of Tuan Guru dominates any other influence.

One interesting example of the intermingling process of the three forces is the wedding ceremony. In this kind of ceremony, people today make three kinds of activities in a one ceremony representing the three forces. The first group of guest, usually those representing the Islamic force, comes normally in the evening. They come to pray and recite "berzanji". The second group is the guest from the traditional community who comes usually from morning until afternoon in the second day of the ceremony. The last group to come is those who represent the more modern guests. However, the majority of the Sasaks fall between the two poles, the traditional and orthodox Islam.

Sasaks consider a language is a very sensitive issue. Making a blunder in choosing a language or code often brings a serious consequence on the speaker. If someone does not know the norms of speaking or choosing the appropriate code in a given situation he will be considered as the one that does not know the Sasak custom (adat) consequently his status will considered as no more than a "botek" (a monkey). They argue that only an animal that cannot use language appropriately (endek tao base). Choosing an appropriate code or language depends very much on the constellation of many aspects. There is a time when Sasak Alus (H) is more appropriate. Though the level of Sasak Alus itself must be in accordance with an interlocutor and other aspects. There is a time when an older people use Sasak Alus, which is in normal interaction it is considered inappropriate, to a younger or a child. This does not mean because he respects the child but to teach the variety to the child . When Sasak Alus is used not in the appropriate situation and to the wrong interlocutor, it will turn to be an insult or the interlocutor will feel inconvenient where in such situation he only expects to be addressed in Sasak Jamak. There is also a variety of Sasak that most people recognized as "bahasa terminal", (Station language). This variety is actually used when one gets angry. But in the station context, drivers of public transportation use it for intimacy among themselves. An outsider would think it is very rude to speak that variety, but for them it is normal. On the other hand, the use of bahasa Indonesia in an intimate relation will be considered "arrogant",. That is why one will rarely hear people talk in bahasa Indonesia or in Lombok popularly called "base orang" (they language) in a very intimate relation. .

For a Sasak, intimate friends is everything. He always opens himself for them in whatever form they come in. The use of Base Terminal indexes that their relationship is very close or *kalah besemeton* (more than sibling like relationship). In this kind of relationship, the meaning of words cannot be interpreted through what one says but who says it to whom. The intimate friends in Sasak term are like *aik dait empak den tao tebelat* (fish and water

that they cannot be separated).

One day in 2007, I met a relative of mine, who lived in Mamuju, went to Lombok to bring his 15 year-old daughter to study and to "learn" language (brajah base). The use of "brajah base" or learning language did not really mean to learn the language per se but the norms of a wide interaction in the context of Sasak custom and culture which cannot be learned in, let say, Mamuju where there is a Sasak community but the cultural atmosphere is different. Every parents really care with knowledge skill of their children because they do not want their children to be said "endek naon base" (do not know language). The expression "endek naon base" virtually means one does not know "adat" because Sasaks do not distinguish between adat and language. For them language and adat are intricately intertwined.

The other important point to note in connction with the cultural value behind the code choice is the assymetrical interaction between a husband and his wife. It is almost certain that the husband speaks SJ to his wife conversely his wife speaks SA in return. This situation is not because of the difference in sex but merely because the cultural reason that is a wife is always culturally considered younger than her husband no matter in fact he is older. The vocative *arik* which is used to refer to a wife which literally means "youger sister" clearly explain the matter.

Sasak language with all its varieties; Sasak Alus, Sasak Jamak, Sasak Kasar (Base Terminal), bahasa Jejawen (Kawi Madya) and also Indonesia Alus constitutes the identity of Sasak community that distinguishes them from other tribes. Though some argue that culturally and linguistically,Sasak is similar to Balinese and Javanese, but it remains different or in other words similar but different. Any similarity with the two tribes was because historically both tribes had come to Lombok and conquered it for a period of time. Majapahit under the commodore Nala and Karang Asem King came to Lombok and they both left some traces but the important thing is the Sasak is the living artifact that can tell us about the past history or how Sasak had been influenced by other tribes. The existence of religion, culture and language syncreticisms are the answer of any doubt. This kind of sycreticism also happened at other communities in other parts of the world, (see Linguistic Syncretism and linguistic ideologies: Transforming Sociolinguistic Hierarchy on Rapa Nui (Easter Island)-Miki Makihara: American Anthropologist, September 2004;106,3; Academic Research Library, pg. 529.).

By observing the Sasak code choice patters above, it is very clear that there is a real opposition or struggle (congah in Sasak) in progress in Sasak society that is the existence of local language opposition against BI. The culmination of the opposition is the formation of a new variety or code which is called IA. Besides, there is a tendency of cultural resources exploitation for political and commercial interests. In the political world, politicians consistently use local or mixed languages to show their affiliation with local people, whereas in the world of commerce the slogan in local code is also often used.

One important reason of the opposition is because there is a strong propelling force of nobility revitalization where the acknowledgement of status is not only the monopoly of the ascribed *menaq* but the gained high social status also deserves the same acknowledgement. Such acknowledgement seems very clear through the use of linguistic symbol that can only be optimally expressed through the local language with its SJ, SA, and IA varieties.

A quite large number of Sasaks is still illiterate mainly from the older generation, but their illiterateness is in term Latin. Virtually, literacy tradition of Sasaks had developed for long time since Majapahit occupied the land of Lombok. This all can be seen from the literary works that were written in Jejawen alphabet and in Kawi language or in Sasak. There are still many people from the older generation that are still able to write well in the alphabet. Young generation also has high motivation and interest to learn the language because when they master the language, there is a social advantage. They are also respected by the Sasak community. They even often get invitation to read the old manuscripts and consequently they get paid for that. Besides, there seems to be a new collective awareness among the Sasaks and also the local government to develop and maintain the Sasak tradition, custom and culture not to mention the Sasak language. Above all, in its effort to make Lombok to be a main tourism destination, the local government works all out to improve any cultural related resource. The central government also supports any effort to develop the local culture including preventing a language death. Up to present, National Museum of NTB has translated and transliterated many ancient manuscripts found in Lombok, such as Joarsah [12].

Eventhough the Kawi language is considered a dead language, but it is still used, not for social interaction, in some occasion as the ritual language only, such as in the wedding procession "sorong serah aji kerame". In this ritual, both the spokesperson of the bride and groom families talked. But this interaction is only a social and cultural symbol rather than communication transaction. Kawi is also still widely used in the puppet show mixed with other languages like Sasak and bahasa Indonesia.

The Sasak community who is still loyal to the adat can be seen from his belief which is amalgamation or syncreticism of various beliefs such as the ancestor's belief, the influence of Hindu, Budha (Boda in Sasak) and Islam. Those beliefs are crystallized in the concept of "tulah manuh, maliq, merang and duse". Tulah manuh is a

kind of the belief that if you do any wrong doing to a man, mainly to an old people, parents, religious leaders and so on, then you will get the punishment from the unseen power in what ever form it might be because those people bring "tulah manuh" power. Maliq is a concept that similar to the tulah manuh except on the punishment comes because one misbehaves toward nature. Merang itself deals with human dignity (one's inner life) which must always be protected with the strong wall both by oneself and other people. A man who has lost his "merang" is no more than an animal and a man who like this will be ostracized by his community. The last mentioned teaching is similar to the Islam concept because to be a Sasak is to be Moslem at various degree of faith. To this point, the theological concept of Sasak community has been proved to be dynamism, animism, pantheism, and anthropomorphism as stated by Asnawi in [12].

The above belief is still clearly seen mainly at the traditional community. In their interaction, they tend to be more careful and for any first encounter they will dig in as much as possible about personal information of their interlocutor. A complete information of the interlocutor status, social status like education, religion, and primarily his nobility is very important for them to enable to tune their code choice appropriately. Communication at any first encounter is always more difficult than any communication particularly on the determination of a normal metric language or variety. For example, at first one speaks Sasak Alus with his interlocutor of the new encounter. But having examined about social background and any personal information, he will soon switch into another code for his interlocutor does not expect to be addressed with the code or the addresser feels his interlocutor does not have any right to be addressed with the code.

In connection with the above situation, there is a story I quoted from my informant as follows:

"One day there was a big wedding party at a sub-village. Many guests were coming and welcomed warmly by the host. They were all sitting under a "tetaring", a large tent with thatched roof or coconut leaf roof. Some government officials were invited including the head of the district, "Pak Camat". Finally Pak Camat came with his driver. He wore a national dress that was a "safari" but his driver wore a traditionally formal dress. What happened then, because Pak Camat was new at the district and nobody at the party recognized him, the people hurriedly welcomed and shook hand with the driver and no body was care with the real Camat "

That is what happened when one does not understand the culture of a community. In Sasak context at least, if one wishes to be respected, he must know and apply the four principles in socializing; **wiraga, wirama, wibusana, and wirasa.**

6. CONCLUSION

There are many aspects that can be traced through the study of code choice patterns. Some researchers were more concerned with the shift and maintenance of a given language and some on the phenomenon of a diglossia per se. Some other focused on the belief, value, and norm behind the code choice phenomena. But in this paper, the vocal point is on the norms of code choice in the Sasak multilingual context of interaction.

From the perspective of the code choice patterns, it is found out that of the three general rules of code choice in multilingual society, i.e. situational, repertoire, and metaphorical, this metaphorical dominates the code choice rules or patterns in the Sasak multilingual context. This finding is different from the common assumption and the previous research finding claiming that in any diglossic community the choice of certain code tightly regulated by the situation where it is used. Take the diglossic situation in Paraguay for example, Guarani is normally used in informal situation.

In the context of code choice by Sasaks in Lombok, there are different rules apply. A situational rules that both Fergusson or Fishman found out that the use L or H depends very much on the situation where the code (language) is used. For example L is used in the church or government offices whereas L is used in family or neighbor. It is also different to what Johnson (1973) and [12] have found out in their researches that is repertoire rule dominates the choice of a code. Related researches in Indonesia do not specifically focus on the patterns of code choice but rather on the other aspects even though they employ the implicational scale. See for example Sumarsono in Sumarsono (2004) conducted his research on the maintenance of "Bahasa Melayu Loloan" by its speakers in Bali by observing Melayu Loloan Community in choosing codes within their repertoire. It must be acknowledged though, to certain extend, the situational and repertoire rules operate but on the very limited contexts. Virtually, the difference lies on the fact that western community is more egalitarian than let say Sasak for example.

In [12] his research has found out that the metaphorical rules dominates the code choice that is one choose a certain code because s/he wants to convey social meaning such as solidarity, distance, intimacy and status. This general rule is realized by the following specific rules that can be seen from two main angles as follows:

I. Dialog context, that is the pattern of code choice as used in a dialog consisting of:

  A. Symmetrical Pattern, this pattern is used when two interactants feel or want to make themselves equal. This pattern has two form as follows:

    1. Low symmetric, the symmetrical interaction using L code(s).

2. High symmetric, the symmetrical interaction using H code(s) .

B. Assymetrical Pattern, this pattern is realized when the interactants agree on their differences such as social status, age and education.

C. Pseudo-symmetrical Pattern, this patters is used when a speaker wants to emphasize a certain intention to his interlocutor like sarcasm, anger, etc., or he just wants to educate his interlocutor.

D. Stratified Pattern, this pattern is used in Low Symmetrical interaction but involving a third high-status person that force them to switch to H code.

II. Monolog Context, the code choice pattern as used in a monolog like preaching, campaign, or a speech in general.

    a. In a monolog context such as in a political activity , Sasak Alus and Indonesia alus are more favorable than any other language within the Sasaks' repertoire.

    b. Sasaak Alus or Indonesia Alus is used for commercial purpose.

    c. Sasak Alus or Indonesia Alus is used by traditional Islamic preachers

    d. Bahasa Indonesia is used by more modern Islamic preacher.

From the way Sasaks communicate each other it can be concluded that one is considered a noble man is the one who:

- Is rich
- Has important position in the government
- Has high education
- Has excellent knowledge and practice of Islam

The underlying concept behind those above norms of Sasak communicatin is a value system. All norms manifested in the "adat" are motivated and guided by the value system that is "tulah manuh". Doing whatever against the value system will automatically incur a disaster to the doer which is believed to be more serious and dangerous than a sin in Islamic concept. A big or small disaster as the consequence depends very much on the wrongdoing he makes. The "adat" organizes all aspects of human life in their socialization including how to appropriately communicate to one another.

One of the most important features of diglossia (Fergusson, 1996: 27) within the nine parameters of Ferguson's original concept is the function of H and L, i.e. where, when, and with whom they are spoken. H is used for all formal occasions, on the job, and in most literature, while L is used in informal settings, such as conversations with friends, or within the family circle. Whereas Sasak diglossia itself is weak at this point though there is a tendency L is used in informal occasion and H is often used in formal one but still often there is no clear cut boundary of their domains. The tendency can be presented as follows;

Intimate ------------- BT and SJ

Casual --------------- SJ

Consultatve------------- SA, BI

Formal ------------------- BI, SA, and IA

Frozen -------------------- BI, SA, IA and K

The weakening of diglossia can be interpreted as the existence of local language opposition against BI. The opposition often causes diglossic leakages which ultimately can strengthen the language maintenance of local language against BI. The culmination of the opposition is the formation of a new variety or code which is called IA. Besides, there is a tendency of cultural resources exploitation for political and commercial interests. In the political world, politicians consistently use local or mixed languages to show their affiliation with local people, whereas in the world of commerce the slogan in local code is also often used.

One important reason of the opposition is because there is a strong propelling force of nobility revitalization where the acknowledgement of status is not only the monopoly of the ascribed *menaq* but the gained high social status also deserves the same acknowledgement. Such acknowledgement seems very clear through the use of linguistic symbol that can only be optimally expressed through the local language with its SJ, SA, and IA varieties.

REFERENCES

[1] Alip, F.B.1993. *Language Planning in Indonesia. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation.* Stony Brooks, NY: State University of New York

[2] Auer, Peter, Ed 1998. *Code-Switching in Conversation*. London: Routledge.

[3] Barber.C.1952. *Triangualism in Pasqua: Social Functions of Language in an Arizona Yaqui Village*.Tucson:university of Arizona

[4] Coulmas Florian.2000.*The Handbook of Sociolinguistics*. Massachusetts. Balackwell PublishersInc.

[5] Duranti, Alessandro.1997. *Linguistic Anthropology*. Cabridge: Cambridge University Press

[6] Fasold, Ralph.1987. *The Sociolinguistics of Society.* Basil Blackwell, London

[7] Fishman, Joshua A.Ed. 1972. *Readings in the Sociology of Language*. Mouton,Paris.

[8] Folley,William.1999.*Antropological Linguistics An Introduction*. Blackwell Publishers Inc., Oxford

[9] Geertz, Cifford.1972. Linguistic Etiquette in Fishman, Joshua A.Ed. 1972. *Readings in the Sociology of Language*. Mouton,Paris

[10] Goebel,Zane. (2001) "Communicative Competence in Indonesian: Language choice in inter-ethnic interactions in Semarang" Northern Territory University, Education, http://linguistlist.org/pubs/diss/bbrowse-diss-action.cfm?DissID=1429

[11] Gumperz John J and Dell Hymes.1972. *Directions in Sociolinguistics*. Newyork: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

[12] Khalik, Abd. Lalu.2009."Sasak Choice Patterns: A Sociolinguistic study", Unpublished Dissertation, Hasanuddin Universirty

[13] Mahyuni.2007. "*Social Change and the Sasak Traditional Speech Convention"*.MLI Thn ke 25 No.2, Jakarta

[14] McKay, Sandra Lee and Nancy H. Hornberger.1997 *Sociolinguitics and Language Teaching.* Cambridge University Press, London.

[15] Mesthrie, Rajend et.all .2000.*Introducing Sociolinguistics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

[16] Radford, Andrew.1981. *Transformational Syntax.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

[17] Rubin, Joan.1968b. *Bilingual Usage in Paraguay*. In Fishman 1968c:512-30.

[18] Sridhar, Kamal K.1987.Societal Multilingualism in McKay, Sandra Lee and Nancy H. Hornberger.1997 *Sociolinguitics and Language Teaching.* Cambridge University Press, London.

[19] Tollerson, James William.1978. Diglossia in Slovenia (Unpublished Dissertation). Stanford University, USA.

[20] Wardaugh, Ronald.1987.*An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. Basil Blackwell, London

[21] Williams, Glyn. 1992. *Sociolinguistics.* New York :Routledge

[22] Yassi, Abdul Hakim.2003.*Code-Switching as a Communication Strategy in Indonesian-English Bilingual Discourse: A Congruence-Functional Approach to Indonesian to Indonesian-English Code-Switching.* Makassar:PPS Unhas.

universitas
bandar lampung