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ABSTRACT


The fame of Yogyakarta as a cultural city with its affordable tourism facilities has always acted as a magnet for foreign tourists seeking unforgettable vacation and experiences. Therefore, abundance of foreign tourists chooses Yogyakarta as one of the tourist attractions. One of the famous tourism centers is Prawirotaman. The credibility of Prawirotaman is already known by foreign tourists all over the world. Besides its numerous facilities such as hotels, guest houses, money changers, cafés and travel agents, the existence of pedicab as a means of transportation presents an interesting Sociolinguistics phenomenon to observe, particularly the English simplified structure.

There were two research questions presented in this study: (1) How do pedicab drivers use English to talk to foreign tourists? and (2) How does Indonesian language affect the use of English in the conversation between pedicab drivers and foreign tourists?

As an endeavor to answer the first research question, the researcher carried out an interview. The interview aimed to obtain information, such as the pedicab drivers’ social background, perspectives about English and experiences in learning English. Furthermore, in obtaining the data for the second research question, the researcher recorded conversations between three foreigners and twelve pedicab drivers at Prawirotaman area. Afterwards, the recorded conversations were converted into written form. The sentences and phrases found were then classified into five categories based on five characteristics of pidgin.

From the obtained data, the researcher found three interesting facts about the pedicab drivers’ way of using English, namely spontaneous way, the use of simole vocabulary, and the use of base form. The pedicab drivers were unconsciously apply Indonesian grammatical rules while talking to the foreign tourists. The pedicab drivers admitted that grammar does not have significant role in developing a conversation with the foreign tourists. In total, there were fifty four sentences classified into five pidgin’s characteristics, namely extreme reduction of inflectional morphology, minimal number of preposition, one wh-word for all questions, invariant word order for question and restricted number of vocabularies. Moreover, as the implication on education, the findings may assist teachers or future teachers to design and to develop appropriate teaching techniques for the pedicab drivers. Furthermore, the researcher offered suggestions addressed to other researchers, lecturers, and students who are concerned and interested in similar topic.

**Keywords:** pedicab driver, English simplified structure, pidgin
ABSTRAK


Kepopuleran Yogyakarta sebagai kota budaya dengan berbagai fasilitas pariwisata yang terjangkau menjadi daya tarik bagi para turis asing yang ingin menikmati liburan dan pengalaman yang tak terlupakan. Oleh sebab itu, banyak turis asing yang memilih Yogyakarta sebagai salah satu tujuan wisata. Dari sekian banyak pusat pariwisata yang ada di Yogyakarta, Prawirotaman adalah salah satunya. Selain banyaknya fasilitas yang tersedia seperti hotel, wisma, tempat penukaran uang, kafe, dan agen perjalanan, keberadaan becak sebagai salah satu alat transportasi menjadi fenomena sosiolinguistik yang menarik untuk dikaji, khususnya Bahasa Inggris dengan struktur yang sederhana.

Ada dua pertanyaan dalam penelitian ini, yaitu (1) Bagaimana tukang becak menggunakan Bahasa Inggris ketika berbicara dengan turis asing? dan (2) Bagaimana Bahasa Indonesia mempengaruhi penggunaan Bahasa Inggris dalam percakapan antara tukang becak dan turis asing?


Dari data yang diperoleh, peneliti menemukan tiga fakta menarik mengenai cara penggunaan Bahasa Inggris oleh tukang becak, yaitu secara spontan, perbendaharaan kata yang sederhana, dan penggunaan bentuk dasar kata. Para tukang becak secara tidak sadar menggunakan tata Bahasa Indonesia ketika berbicara dengan turis asing. Menurut mereka, tata bahasa tidak mempunyai peran penting dalam berkomunikasi dengan turis asing. Secara total, terdapat lima puluh empat kalimat yang diklasifikasikan berdasar lima karakteristik Bahasa Inggris Pasaran, yaitu pengurangan infleksi morfologi, jumlah preposisi yang minimal, satu macam kata untuk segala bentuk pertanyaan, urutan kata yang berlainan dalam pertanyaan dan terbatasnya perbendaharaan kata. Sebagai implikasi terhadap pendidikan, penelitian ini dapat membantu guru atau calon guru untuk mendesain dan mengembangkan teknik mengajar yang tepat bagi para tukang becak. Peneliti juga memberikan saran yang ditujukan kepada peneliti, dosen, dan mahasiswa yang tertarik dengan topik yang sama.

*Kata kunci: tukang becak, Bahasa Inggris dengan struktur sederhana, Bahasa Inggris Pasaran*
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

This chapter offers a general introduction of this research. Hence, it contains the background of the research, the problem formulation, the problem limitation, the research objectives, the research benefits and the definition of some important terms.

A. Research Background

Indonesia is well-known for its beauty of diversity around the world. This country consists of numerous tribes, cultures and tremendous tourist attractions. The opulence which is owned by Indonesia supports rapid growth of recent tourism in this country. Based on the *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English* (2001: 1931), tourism can be defined as “the business of providing things for people to do, places for them to stay while they are on holiday.” It is unquestionable that tourism is a main factor that supports national development of Indonesia. According to Kusumonagara (2000: 3) there are several advantages that can be gained from tourism. For the country and its society, tourism may create bigger opportunities of job and business, rise society’s income, create an innovative market for local products, increase infrastructure of a particular place, emerge new skills and technology, add knowledge in preserving cultural society and increase land arrangement. Concisely, tourism offers numerous benefits for the country and its society by empowering the local potentials.
Habitually, abundance of foreigners chose Indonesia as the destination to spend their leisure time during vacation or to learn the Indonesian culture which is obviously different from that of their countries. Besides the beautiful culture, tourism facilities in Indonesia are affordable compared to other countries. Therefore, there are several famous tourists attractions such as Bali, Lombok, Sulawesi, Toraja, Solo, Bandung or Yogyakarta.

Yogyakarta is one of the cities in Indonesia with a lot of tourist attractions. Besides, Yogyakarta is also known as the cultural center of Java. There are Kraton and nearby the breathtaking temples of Borobudur and Prambanan. Compared to other cities, Yogyakarta is not only famous for the tourist attractions but also the center for education in Indonesia. Many good universities are located in Yogyakarta, as a result, many people come to study and bring their cultures to Yogyakarta. Henceforth, Yogyakarta can be defined as the miniature of Indonesia (Kusumonagara, 2000: 5). As a cultural city, Yogyakarta offers not only a beautiful view or affordable cuisine and beverages but also the harmony of diversity. It can be seen from the preserved Javanese cultural ceremonies that are usually held in Yogyakarta and also the ceaseless rapid development of shopping areas and other sophisticated facilities. Both can take place harmoniously.

Recently, Yogyakarta can be considered as one of the tourist destinations among foreigners who want to spend their vacation. The preserved Javanese cultural ceremony and position of a traditional leader (King) that still has strong influence in the society cannot be erased by modernization easily. Kraton and its rituals, traditional markets and traditional vehicles in the middle of Yogyakarta
are reality that can be found in Yogyakarta. One of traditional vehicles which is popular among foreign tourists is pedicab. Therefore, it is very easy to find foreign tourists walking along the street or taking pictures while sitting in the pedicab. The existence of pedicab as a traditional vehicle of transportation becomes a feature of Yogyakarta. Besides its unique shape, the driver of pedicab is also an interesting subject to observe.

Usually, pedicab drivers in Yogyakarta are attempting to persuade foreign tourists by greeting and having conversation. They attempt to attract foreign tourists’ attention. Moreover, foreign tourists also respond to pedicab drivers’ utterances. Generally, pedicab drivers tend to use local language in daily conversation rather than the Indonesian. However, Indonesian is acknowledged as the national language of this country. Considering the identity of the Indonesian as the national language, this research will focus on the Indonesian as a factor that might affect the English uttered by pedicab drivers.

Although pedicab drivers and foreign tourists have dissimilar languages, frequently the conversation happens in English. How the communication develops among pedicab drivers and foreign tourists is an interesting phenomenon to observe. Moreover, the communication that occurs between pedicab drivers and foreign tourists is in English which is dissimilar to English in general. What makes it different from general English are the structure and the diction. Furthermore, this special English is called simplified structure of English.

The consideration of why the researcher decided to choose Prawirotaman as the place to conduct the observation is the credibility of the place itself.
Prawirotaman is the center of foreign tourists who spend their vacation in Yogyakarta. Therefore, there are numerous hotels, guest houses, cafés, money changers and pedicabs which facilitate foreign tourists during their holiday in Yogyakarta. It is believed that Prawirotaman is the suitable place for the researcher to conduct the research since it is the place where pedicab drivers and foreign tourists get together.

A. Problem Formulation

This research, as it has been stated, endeavours to find out how the mother tongue of the pedicab drivers affects the use of English in the conversation with foreign tourists. It attempts to answer the following questions:

1. How do pedicab drivers use English to talk to foreign tourists?
2. How does Indonesian language affect the use of English in the conversation between pedicab drivers and foreign tourists?

B. Problem Limitation

This research attempts to identify the way of pedicab drivers in Prawirotaman in using English orally while talking to foreign tourists. Although the local language has significant role in communication of pedicab drivers, this research focuses on the analysis of the influence of Indonesian language on the English spoken utterances of pedicab drivers. The underlying reason of this limitation is due to the identity of the Indonesian language as the national language of Indonesia. Furthermore, this research involves pedicab drivers in Prawirotaman area, Yogyakarta and several foreign tourists who visit the Prawirotaman area.
C. Research Objectives

The research findings hopefully will achieve some objectives which are useful for readers and future researchers. This study would like to observe the phenomenon of simplified structure of English which is used in the conversation between pedicab drivers and foreign tourists. By conducting this research, it is expected that a general view of the Indonesian language’s influence on the target language, namely simplified structure of English, can be obtained.

D. Research Benefits

This research aims to elaborate the influence of the Indonesian language on the English spoken utterances of the pedicab drivers at Prawirotaman area. Therefore, this research will optimistically give significant advantages for researchers who are concerned with sociolinguistics knowledge, lecturers, and students.

For researchers who are concerned with sociolinguistics knowledge, this research can give a description of the latest development of the use of English and the influence of the Indonesian language on simplified structure of English in Yogyakarta. Later on, this research is expected to be one of the references or sources that may be useful for other researchers who are interested in the similar topic.

For lecturers of the sociolinguistics course of the English Language Education Study Program in Sanata Dharma University, this research will be very useful because it provides examples and explanations of the influence of the
Indonesian language on simplified structure of English. Therefore, this research can assist the lecturers to determine what kind of influences from the Indonesian to simplified structure of English that may broaden knowledge in sociolinguistics scope.

For students of the English Language Education Study Program in Sanata Dharma University, this research can be one of the references for those who are eager to find out and comprehend the influence of the Indonesian on simplified structure of English.

E. Definition of Terms

In order to give a guideline to the readers about this content, the researcher attempts to explain several terms which are commonly used in this research. They are:

1. Simplified Structure of English

Martin (2008) defined simplified structure of English as “the simplified version of English, characterized by restricted core of vocabulary and a limited range of simple sentence structure, developed to communicate with an international audience.” In this research, it means English which has simpler word organization and uttered by the pedicab drivers while talking to foreign tourists. Besides, the simpler word organization and other features that make it differ from English in general might occur due to influence of the Indonesian language on the simplified structure of English.
2. Prawirotaman

Prawirotaman is situated at southeast of the Kraton palace and becomes a famous place for travel backpackers. Elliot & Witton (2003: 222) stated that “this area used to be the center for the mid-range hotels in Yogya, but many have slashed prices - and sometimes standards - in recent years.” In Prawirotaman, there are numerous hotels, lodgings, guest houses, cafés, money changers, internet, art shops, travel agents and pedicabs which facilitate foreign tourists during their holiday in Yogyakarta. Therefore, pedicab drivers and foreign tourists usually meet in Prawirotaman. Based on the credibility of Prawirotaman as the tourist destination to stay while spending leisure time during vacation, researcher is convinced that Prawirotaman is an appropriate place to conduct the research.

3. Pedicab Drivers

Pedicab is a traditional vehicle that can be found in Yogyakarta. “Pedicab driver is a person who sits at the back of a pedicab and moves it by pedaling” (Perwitosari, 2001: 5). As a traditional vehicle of transportation which is frequently used by foreign tourists to go around Yogyakarta, the driver of pedicab is demanded to be able in having communication in English with the foreign tourists. Related to this research, the main source for the researcher to obtain meaningful data is the conversations which occur between the pedicab drivers and the foreign tourists.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This research is going to examine the influence of the Indonesian language on simplified structure of English. Therefore, a review of theories related to a comparison of Indonesian language and English, pidgin, second language acquisition, age, personality, motivation and L1 transfer will be discussed in theoretical description. Furthermore, the theories which are related to the research questions will be elaborated in theoretical framework.

A. Theoretical Description

This part elaborates several theories on main differences between Indonesian and English, pidgin, second language acquisition, age, personality, motivation, and L1 transfer.

1. Main Differences between Indonesian and English

English proficiency has become an obligatory for everyone recently, including Indonesians. It can be seen from numerous places which offer English learning, English in traffic signs, commercial advertisements, English as one of requirements in job vacancies, and so on. These are evidences of the fame of English in Indonesia. Therefore, learning English as a second language is easily found in Indonesia. Due to the high demand of English oral and written proficiency, adults, adolescence, teenagers, and even children are willing to learn English as early as possible in order to equip themselves to be ready in facing global era. Concisely, everyone is willing to learn English, including pedicab
drivers. Pedicab drivers realize that English can be one of assets to welcome foreign tourists and earn money for living. Although the pedicab drivers never go to school and learn English in such a classroom or join an English course, but it does not become a barrier to be able to speak English. It is undeniable that the local language is used in colloquial by the pedicab drivers frequently rather than Indonesian language. Besides, the pedicab drivers come from villages in which the inhabitants preferably use the local language. Nevertheless, Indonesian language is acknowledged as the national language. Therefore, the researcher decided to choose Indonesian language as the main topic discussed in this research. Since it is impossible to completely account for the two languages, Indonesian language and English, this part will only treat the main differences between them. The traditional grammarians divided words into 10 classifications, namely noun, verb, adjective, adverb, pronoun, numeral, determiner, preposition, conjunction and interjection. Both Indonesian language and English own those classifications. The differences can be found in inflection. In English, inflections of noun, verb, adjective, adverb and genitive are acknowledged (Quirk, 1973: 58), while Indonesian language does not have inflection, for example:

**English**: 
[1] I _go_ is 1st person singular  
[2] You _go_ is 2nd person singular  
[3] He _goes_ is 3rd person singular with "goes" as a different spelling of "go".

**Indonesian**: 
[4] Saya _pergi_  

PLAGIAT MERUPAKAN TINDAKAN TIDAK TERPUJI
Dia pergi (the verbs remain the same)

Furthermore, Indonesian language employs adverb of time to express grammatical time relations. English, on the contrary, employs tenses for verb to express grammatical time relations.


English : [9] She worked in New York

To indicate plural form, Indonesian language and English have different concepts. Indonesian language does not have plural suffix which is comparable to English (s). Indonesian plural concept is understood by context or by reduplication, for example:

English : [11] houses, students
Indonesian : [12] rumah-rumah, murid-murid

Concerning noun phrase and verb phrase, Indonesian language and English have dissimilar concept. A complete sentence in English as well as in Indonesian must have at least a subject and a predicate. Meanwhile, in Indonesian language, the predicate can be a verb phrase, an adjective phrase or a noun phrase. On the contrary, predicate of a sentence in English should be in a form of verb phrase (Keraf, 1979: 148).
2. Pidgin

Formerly, pidgin was developed on sea-coast areas where people were gathering and trading. The primeval traders were attempting to speak to other traders albeit they have dissimilar languages. The traders were native speakers of colonial language such as Portuguese, Spanish or English, whereas their interlocutors were Indian, Chinese, Africans or American Indians. Therefore, pidgin emerged due to the language dissimilarity. By creating a pidgin, the primeval traders were successfully delivering their ideas to the interlocutors. The word pidgin may reflect its use as a means of communication between primeval traders and it may derive from Hebrew pidjom which means “trade or exchange” or combination of two Chinese characters meaning “paying money” (Holmes, 2001: 82).

A pidgin, according to Hartford (1997: 5) can be defined as “those lects which arise in a context where interaction is among speakers who have different L1s.” Considering the fact that pedicab drivers are coming from village in which the inhabitants preferably use the local language colloquially, the researcher decided Indonesian language as main focus of this research due to its identity as national language. Holmes (2001: 43) stated that “pidgins are used almost exclusively for referential rather than affective functions.” Pidgins are used for particular functions such as commerce or animal hides rather than to show respect toward others, to signal social distinctions and to maintain social relationship in a society. Therefore, since the conversation that happens among pedicab drivers and
foreign tourists cannot be included into affective function, it is an evidence to signify that simplified structure of English can be classified into pidgin.

Pidgin serves highly limited functions in society. It emerged because of an urgency to create a means of communication among speakers who have dissimilar L1. Therefore, there are numerous characteristics possessed by pidgin. These are several features that differentiate pidgin from language in general. Mühlhäuser (1986: 155-156) stated some characteristics of pidgin, namely an extreme reduction of inflectional morphology, SVO word order, invariant word order for questions, lack of number distinctions in nouns, minimal contrast in pronouns (person and number), minimal number of prepositions and one wh-question word for all questions. It is supported by Holmes (2001: 83) who coined four major characteristics of pidgin. Compared to fully developed languages, pidgins typically posses simplified structure, a restricted number of vocabularies, non-inflectional words and disuse of affixes to mark gender.

3. Second Language Acquisition

Compared to first language acquisition which is “a complicated but relatively rapid process through which children become competent and proficient users of their communities’ language(s)” (Mackey, 2006: 433), second language acquisition is more difficult and challenging. Adult learners consume more time to master a language compared to younger learners. Gass & Selinker (1994: 245) claimed four reasons why adults learn L2 slowly compared to children, namely the reluctance to adopt a novel language, several cognitive factors that are responsible for the incapability of adults to learn well, neurological changes that
barrier adults to learn successfully (loss of brain’s flexibility) and a fact that children are exposed to better input to language learning. The word “second” in terms of second language acquisition refers to any language that is learned subsequent to the mother tongue. According to Ellis (2001: 3), second language acquisition is a “study of the way in which people learn a language other than their mother tongue.” The second language is generally signified with L2. “An L2 can be referred to any language learned after learning the L1, regardless of whether it is a second, third, fourth or fifth language” (Gass & Selinker, 1994: 4).

Several theories of second language acquisition are offered by scholars. First theory is widely known as behaviorist learning theory. Behaviorist learning theory started to be an influential approach of second language acquisition in 1950s and 1960s. This theory coined that second language learners required “the appropriate language behavior through repetition and reinforcement without paying much attention to meaning” (Mackey, 2006: 434). Besides, behaviorist learning theory emphasized on ceaseless drills and claims that the cause of errors made by learners is the L1 knowledge. In this theory, Ellis (2008: 22) also supported that “where the first and second language share a meaning but express it in different ways, an error is likely to arise in the L2 because the learner will transfer the realization device from his first language into the second.” Another opinion related to behaviorist learning theory is coined by Ellis (2008: 21). He stated that learning of habit can take place in two ways, imitation and reinforcement.
Second theory consists of two opinions, namely comprehensible input and natural order hypothesis. This theory claims language learning is “a more complex interaction of internal and external factors” (Mackey, 2006: 435). Ellis (2001: 4-5) stated that social milieu and input are two things that can be classified into external factors, while cognitive mechanism, general knowledge and communication strategies are internal factors. This theory emphasized on the importance of comprehensible input and natural order of acquisition which all learners will experience regardless of his or her L1.

Interaction hypothesis as the third theory argues that “second language development can be facilitated when learners attempt to communicate with other speakers in the L2, experiencing difficulties, and engage in further interaction with their interlocutors to resolve their problems” (Mackey, 2006: 438). In learning second language, interaction is noteworthy. By interacting and practicing second language with peers, it is expected that learners will obtain significant progress in mastering second language.

Socioculturalism is defined as a theory of second language acquisition that focuses “on the impact of interpersonal and social aspects of interaction on language learning” (Mackey, 2006: 440). Unlike interaction hypothesis, socioculturalism theory is not merely an ordinary interaction. The interaction itself is between a less skilled L2 learner with a more capable teacher or peer. Therefore, a language learning process can be successfully conducted by involving two or more learners to share their knowledge.
The fifth theory of second language acquisition is Universal Grammar. Universal Grammar (UG) is Chomsky’s term for the abstract principles that comprise a child’s innate knowledge of language and that guide L1 acquisition (Ellis, 2001: 65). This theory claims the existence of Language Acquisition Device in the brain which endows process of acquisition of language. Whereas some nativists argue that UG is “no longer available after a certain age and no longer directly available to help guide the second language learning process” (Mackey, 1994: 442). Therefore, learners have to depend on their own ability, like memorization to monitor their own progress in learning second language.

The last theory of second language acquisition is frequency based approach. This theory claims that first and second language acquisition employ similar regularities, such as “a range of cognitive systems (working memory, perceptual representations and attentional resources)” (Mackey, 1994: 444). This theory is also supported by several scholars who deduced that frequency based approach is acceptable because it engages with other approaches to first and second language acquisition.

4. Age

Age is a factor that has a significant role in the process of acquiring second language. Age has been an issue that most frequently considered as a factor which determines the success of second language acquisition. According to Snow and Hoefnagel-Höhle (1978) as cited in Ellis (2008: 105), “……although age improves language learning capacity, performance may peak in the teens, after which performance declines.” Further, it is supported by critical period hypothesis
which states that “there is a period when language acquisition takes place naturally and effortlessly” (Ellis, 2008: 107). Concisely, due to optimum age of second language acquisition which falls within the first ten years of life, adult learners may not be able to achieve a native-like speaking ability of a particular language.

5. Personality

Personality of an individual is highly affects one’s ability in acquiring second language. There are three points to discuss in scope of personality. They are extroversion or introversion, social skills and inhibition. In general, extrovert learners learn more rapidly and successful compared to those who are introvert. This opinion is supported by a research which was conducted in 1979 by Fillmore as cited in Ellis (2008: 120). Based on the longitudinal study of five Spanish-speaking children’s acquisition, Fillmore stated that social skills of the learners control the amount of the exposure to the L2. The more talkative and responsive the learners, the input and learning process will be better.

6. Motivation

One element that has a significant role in the process of acquiring second language is motivation. People decided to learn the second language because of the motivation. Without motivation, the results of the second language acquisition process will not be as good as the learner expected. Ellis (2001: 75-76) stated various kinds of motivation. First is instrumental motivation. This type of motivation will occur when one convinces that by mastering particular language,
then it can open the education and economic opportunity, obtain a scholarship abroad or pass the examination. Integrative motivation is the second type of motivation. It happens when one is interested in particular culture. The goal of this motivation is to be the member of the community by mastering the language. The third is resultative motivation, which is defined as a motivation from the learning experience. When one obtains a success in learning, then one’s motivation will be higher. Conversely, when one faces a failure, he or she will be less motivated to learn. The last motivation coined by Ellis is intrinsic motivation. This motivation emerges due to one’s interest in particular learning activity. One’s motivation can ebb and flow depends on the learning activity which one is interested in.

Furthermore, Brown (1981) as cited in Ellis (2008: 117) claimed three types of motivation, namely global motivation, situational motivation and task motivation. Global motivation is an overall depiction of learning’s objective. Meanwhile, situational motivation is a motivation which frequently alters depends on the situation where learning occurs. The last is task motivation which is defined as a motivation that arises for performing a particular task.

B. Theoretical Framework

The pedicab drivers attempt to communicate with the foreign tourist in order to attract the foreign tourist’s attention. As stated in the theoretical description, the researcher admits that the local language has a main role in the pedicab drivers’ daily communication. However, the Indonesian language is acknowledged as the national language of Indonesia and this research focuses on its influence on simplified structure of English. The communication between the
pedicab drivers and the foreign tourists still happens in English albeit the foreign tourists are speakers of other foreign languages, such as Deutsch, Spanish, Japanese and many more. It occurs due to the fame of English in this country.

English is widely used in Indonesia, particularly in tourism, because it deals with the foreign tourists who visit Indonesia. Therefore, the English used in the communication that happens among the pedicab drivers and the foreign tourists is different from English in general. The pedicab driver’s background knowledge of English creates the English which possesses simplified structure. The simplified structure of English can be classified into pidgin due the theory of Hartford (1997: 5) that stated a pidgin might occur because of the interaction of speakers who have dissimilar language. It is also supported by the theory of pidgin which is stated by Holmes (2001: 43) that pidgins are used almost exclusively for referential rather than affective functions. Consequently, the structure of the English in the conversation among the pedicab driver and the foreign tourist is less complicated compared to the general English.

The pedicab driver’s effort to acquire English happens in such an informal way. The pedicab drivers never experience a learning process in classroom. The learning process which is undergone is through learning by doing. The pedicab drivers are learning how to speak English from experiences when having conversation with the foreign tourists. Based on the experience, the pedicab drivers are learning by imitating the foreign tourists. As time goes by, the pedicab drivers are forming a habit to speak English and the ability is improving gradually. Therefore, every time the pedicab drivers see foreign tourists, they will
speak English spontaneously. The process of English learning of the pedicab drivers can be classified into behaviorist learning theory (Ellis, 2008: 21). In this theory, learning is a process of forming a habit, which can occur through two ways, imitation and reinforcement.

Age and personality are two important factors in acquiring second language. In average, the pedicab drivers’ age is adult, which has exceeded the critical period of learning. According to Snow and Hoefnagel-Höhle (1978) as cited in Ellis (2008: 105), “…..although age improves language learning capacity, performance may peak in the teens, after which performance declines.”

The age of pedicab drivers affects their ability in learning and speaking English. Therefore, a pedicab driver who can speak like a native speaker is rarely found. Discussing the personality factor in acquiring a particular language, the researcher is interested in knowing the pedicab drivers’ personality. As a person who offers his service to escort the foreign tourists, a pedicab driver is demanded to be a friendly, polite, extrovert, and communicative figure. Apart from definition of personality, a pedicab driver is expected to be able to “sell” himself to the foreign tourists in order to earn his living. Therefore, personality has a significant role in the process of second language acquisition due to social skill and extroversion owned by the pedicab drivers.

However, the motivation possessed by the pedicab can be classified into the instrumental motivation from Ellis (2001: 75-76). This type of motivation happens on those who want to open education and or economic opportunities. As workers in tourism world, the pedicab drivers are willing to learn English by
imitating and gaining experiences of speaking in English with the foreign tourists due to the instrumental motivation that they have. The only pedicab drivers’ purpose to speak English to the foreign tourists is to earn his living. It occurs because the pedicab drivers consider the foreign tourists as potential customers. Therefore, the pedicab drivers attempt harder to be able to speak English in order to persuade the foreign tourists. When communication occurs, it can open the opportunity for the pedicab driver to offer his service in escorting the foreign tourists and earn some money.
CHAPTER III
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This chapter is going to elaborate the methodology applied in this research as a means to answer the research questions. It consists of explanation of research method, description of research participants, description of research instruments, data gathering technique, technique in analyzing data and research procedure.

A. Research Method

This research was classified into a qualitative research based on basic underlying principle, which is stated as “a research which is based predominantly on non-numerical data, reveals that it can be subdivided into various different non numerical qualitative research techniques for gathering data, for example observations/field notes, case studies, diaries, etc” (Brown & Rodgers, 2002: 12). According to Ary, Jacobs & Razavieh (2002: 25), qualitative research is intended to obtain a holistic picture and depth understanding, rather than a numeric analysis of data. Supported by Miles & Huberman (1992: 1), qualitative data is a source of complete and firm explanation related to process of an event that occurs in environment.

There are several types of qualitative research and this research was classified into ethnography. Ethnography is “the in-depth study of naturally occurring behaviour within a culture or social group” (Ary et al., 2002: 444). Ethnographic research required several data gathering procedures in order to
achieve thorough and comprehensive findings, such as prolonged observation, interview, and study of documents or artefacts. Situation and context, in which the data was gathered, significantly assisted the researcher to interpret the obtained data. As an ethnographic research, the researcher applied two data gathering procedures. As an endeavour to answer the first research question, the researcher used interview to gain the meaningful data from the research participants. In particular, this research used a document analysis to answer second research question. Ary et al. (2002: 442) coined that document analysis aims at identifying specified characteristics of the material. The documents which were analyzed in this research were the transcripts of recorded conversation between pedicab drivers and foreign tourists. As a qualitative research, it focused on elaborating the influences of Indonesian language on English which were uttered by pedicab drivers.

A. Research Participants

Most of the pedicab drivers at Prawirotaman area were interacting easily with the foreign tourists. Compared to other pedicab drivers, the pedicab drivers in Prawirotaman were preferably using English to talk to the foreign tourists. The pedicab drivers’ main purpose in using English as the means of communication was to attract the foreign tourists’ attention, so that the foreign tourists were willing to use the pedicab drivers’ service to escort sightseeing around Yogyakarta.

Despite that fact, the researcher insisted on selecting pedicab drivers who can have a three to five minutes conversation fluently and eventually there were
twelve pedicab drivers who were eligible to be research participants. There were
two research questions to be answered in this research. The first research question
was intended to know how pedicab drivers use English. To answer this, the
researcher interviewed five of twelve research participants. Furthermore, the
research subject for the second research question was the transcribed
conversations between twelve pedicab drivers and foreign tourists. The researcher
analyzed the transcripts in order to obtain the Indonesian influences on English
simplified structure.

B. Research Instruments

In order to obtain the reliable data to figure out the research questions, the
researcher employed three different types of research instruments. They are
researcher as a human instrument, interview guide, and documents.

1. The Researcher as Human Instrument

In this research, the researcher had significant role in gathering the data.
Poggenpoel & Myburgh (2003) defined researcher as a human instrument when
the researcher becomes the one in obtaining the data from the respondents.
Another scholar, namely Drake (2006), also coined that researcher as a human
instrument is “when human beings act first as data collection instruments by
collecting large amounts of data using methods including detailed interview and
prolonged observation.” Furthermore, the researcher facilitated interaction
between pedicab drivers and foreign tourists. Concisely, the researcher became
the instrument in gathering the data, analyzing the data and interpreting the data into meaningful information.

2. Interview Guide

Interview was another instrument applied in this research. The researcher was convinced that drawing conclusion merely based on transcripts would not depict research findings and conclusion thoroughly. In *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English* (2001: 954), interview is defined as “a formal meeting at which someone is asked questions in order to find out whether they are suitable for job or course of study.” In this research, interview is functioned as a tool to collect subjects’ points of view, including opinions, beliefs and feelings related to particular situation openly (Ary et al., 2002: 434). The questions of the interview were expected to achieve information from the subjects that could not be obtained from the transcripts. The subjects expressed their feelings, viewpoints, beliefs, and opinions related to their experiences in acquiring English and escorting the foreign tourists. Therefore, appropriate questions that could persuade the pedicab drivers in answering the questions truthfully should lead to thorough information that could not be covered by transcripts of recorded conversation between pedicab drivers and foreign tourists. The obtained data from interview completed with transcripts of recorded conversation assisted the researcher to answer the research questions.

The type of interview which was employed in this research was semi-structured interview. This type of interview allows the researcher to alter the order of the questions although the framework has been obviously prepared
The interview offered several significances in assisting the researcher to gather the data. Due to the questions which were given to pedicab drivers, the researcher gained thorough information related to pedicab drivers’ social background, explicitly pedicab drivers’ origin, age, last education, time of working as a pedicab driver, experiences in acquiring English, and point of view about English.

3. Documents

In a qualitative research, the analyzed materials can be public records, textbooks, letters, films, tapes and so on (Ary et al., 2002: 27). In this research, the researcher was assisted by the documents in order to obtain the required data. The type of documents was the transcripts of recorded conversation between pedicab drivers and foreign tourists. Those documents became the key to answer the second research question.

Ellis & Barkhuizen (2005: 29) coined that recorded data should be transcribed before they are analyzed. Therefore, after obtaining the recorded conversation between pedicab drivers and foreign tourists, the researcher transcribed the record into written forms. From those transcripts, the researcher identified and found the influence of Indonesian language on English which was uttered by pedicab drivers to talk to foreign tourists.

C. Data Gathering Technique

To answer both of the research questions, the researcher gathered the data from twelve pedicab drivers at Prawirotaman area. The observation was
conducted on the 5th October 2010 and the interview was conducted on the next following day. The underlying reason of decision on selecting only twelve pedicab drivers as research participants was a fact which was faced by the researcher. During the data gathering process, the researcher found that albeit most of pedicab drivers in Prawirotaman were able to speak English, some of them were unable to produce a three to five minute conversation with the foreign tourists. Those pedicab drivers were not able to produce longer sentences and merely uttered several English words which could not create a conversation with the foreign tourists. In other words, some of the conversations could not fulfill required information. Therefore, the researcher selected only twelve pedicab drivers who could provide information through a three to five minute conversation.

In conducting observation, the researcher was assisted by three foreigners, namely F 1 from Latvia, F 2 from Canada and F 3 from Ukraine. Some of the foreigners, except F 2 who is a Canadian, were not originally native speakers of English. As we know, national language of Latvia and Ukraine is Russian. However, F 1 and F 3 used English while talking to the pedicab drivers in order to trigger an English conversation with the pedicab drivers. Before the foreign tourists conversed with pedicab drivers, a number of topics were given to the foreign tourist, namely asking for the direction to Kraton, asking direction to traditional market, and asking the pedicab drivers about Taman Sari water castle and its situation. The given topics functioned as a guideline for the foreign tourists to have three to five minutes conversation. In total, there were seven
recorded conversations which were converted into seven transcripts in which twelve pedicab drivers conversed with F 1, F 2, and F 3.

Furthermore, an interview was also conducted in order to complete the information related to pedicab drivers’ social background, feelings, opinions, viewpoints about English, their experience in acquiring English, and precise situations in which English was commonly used that could not be obtained from the transcripts. After conducting an observation and recording the conversation, the researcher interviewed the pedicab drivers on the next day. On that day, the researcher could meet five research participants only. The rest of them, seven persons, were cannot be found. It happened due to a mobility of pedicab drivers. The pedicab drivers were nomads who never work in regular schedules and rarely stay in simply one area. Therefore, based on the semi-structured interview, there were nine questions with five pedicab drivers as the interviewees. Nevertheless, the obtained information from the interview was variously significant and covered whole information needed.

D. Data Analysis Technique

In analyzing the data, there were three steps to be done. In first step, the researcher converted the recorded conversations between foreign tourists and pedicab drivers into written form. The transcripts of the conversation assisted the researcher in identifying Indonesian influences on the pedicab drivers’ English simplified structure. The researcher converted the record completely so that all the sentences and phrases spoken both by pedicab drivers and foreign tourists in the conversations could be read. However, the main focus was identifying the
Indonesian influences on the pedicab drivers’ sentences and phrases only. Besides the transcribed conversations, the researcher interviewed five pedicab drivers. The interview was conducted in order to answer the first research question of this research. The questions were related to pedicab drivers’ social background, experiences in joining a formal English training, perspective of English proficiency, and advantages of English. The data from interview were very useful for the researcher to complete information that could not be obtained from the transcripts.

Comparison was the main focus of the second step. In this step, the researcher compared and analyzed the similarities between the pedicab drivers’ English utterances and the Indonesian language. The traditional grammarians divided words into 10 classifications, namely noun, verb, adjective, adverb, pronoun, numeral, determiner, preposition, conjunction and interjection (Irawan, 1996: 16). Both Indonesian language and English own those classifications. The differences between Indonesian language and English can be found in inflection, the expression of grammatical time relation and the concept to indicate plural form (Quirk, 1973: 58). Additionally, the researcher also provided theories of pidgin from school of scholars to enable the classification step. These theories became a guideline for the researcher in conducting the second step of the data analysis technique.

Eventually, third step of the data analysis technique was identifying kinds of influences from pedicab drivers’ mother tongue, Indonesian language on English. After the researcher obtained overall sentences or phrases, the next step
was grouping all sentences and phases into five categories based on five characteristics of pidgin. The results of this step then presented in a form of a table.

E. Research Procedure

Firstly, in gathering the data, the researcher was assisted by foreign tourists to have conversations with the pedicab drivers in Prawirotaman. Before having a conversation with the pedicab driver, the foreign tourists were given several topics as the guideline for the conversation, namely asking for the direction to Kraton, asking direction to traditional market and the last was asking the pedicab drivers about Taman Sari water castle and its situation. While the pedicab driver and the foreign tourist conversed to each other, the researcher recorded the whole conversation.

Afterward, the researcher interviewed five pedicab drivers randomly in order to know the social background and other information that could not be obtained from the conversations, including the pedicab drivers’ social background, their experience in acquiring English, their point of view about English and the precise situation where English was commonly used. Having done with the previous steps, the researcher converted the recorded conversation into written form. Based on these transcripts, the researcher could identify all the English sentences and phrases spoken by the pedicab drivers. Following that, the researcher identified all sentences and phrases found in the transcribed conversations, particularly those contained Indonesian influences. Afterward, based on pidgin’s theories, including several characteristics of a pidgin which
were stated by several scholars, the researcher grouped overall findings. The results of the identification were presented in a form of a table. The results were classified into five categories based on five characteristics of a pidgin.

The research procedure is depicted through Figure 3.1 overleaf.
Figure 3.1 Research Procedure

- Giving several topics for foreign tourist as a guideline to have conversation with pedicab drivers.
- Recording the conversation between foreign tourists and pedicab drivers.
- Interviewing five pedicab drivers.
- Transcribing the recorded conversations.
- Identifying and classifying Indonesian influences in the transcriptions.
- Drawing conclusion of why pedicab drivers create simplified structure of English.
CHAPTER IV
RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter consists of elaboration on both research findings and discussion. This chapter presents two sections. The first section (A) concerns itself with description of how the research participants use English as a means of communication, which was gained from conducted observation. The second section (B) discusses the research findings, which also answers the second research question, the Indonesian influences on English of the pedicab drivers.

A. How Pedicab Drivers Use English while Talking to Foreign Tourists

As an endeavor to answer the first research question of how the pedicab drivers use English while talking to foreign tourists, the researcher conducted both observed on twelve pedicab drivers at Prawirotaman and interviewed five of them. The observation was conducted on the 5th October 2010 and subsequently followed by an interview on the next day. The observation was followed by recording the pedicab drivers’ conversation with the foreign tourists. Afterward, the researcher transcribed the record into written from. The obtained data from the interview assisted the researcher in answering the first research question.

The result of the interview conveyed significant information from the pedicab drivers that could not be obtained from the transcripts. The researcher presented the information in a form of table which can be seen in one of the appendices. The five interviewees were signified with R 12, R 3, R 8, R 4 and R 10. Related to the first question about origin of place, the data represented that
the pedicab drivers came from several areas in Yogyakarta. Two of them, R 12 and R 8, came from residential areas at Yogyakarta, namely Sorosultan and Karangkajen. Besides, three of the interviewees came from villages, namely Randubelang, Canden and Pundong. Concisely, the pedicab drivers were all Javanese.

Considering the fact that all of the interviewees were in the age of forty to sixty five years old, the researcher drew conclusion that most of the pedicab drivers in Prawirotaman who were able to speak English were working as a pedicab driver for years. The answers to the second question signified that the pedicab drivers’ ability of speaking in English was obtained from numerous experiences while escorting foreign tourists who visited Prawirotaman area. It was supported by information from the fourth question about their working time as a pedicab driver. Three of the interviewees, namely R 12, R 4 and R 3, have been working as a pedicab driver for more than thirty years, while R 8 has been working for twenty two years. The last interviewee, R 10, has been working for a year only. Related to the third question about educational status of the pedicab drivers, the highest level of education was Junior High School. Three of the interviewees graduated from Elementary School and one person, R 10, never joined a formal education at school. R 10, as the fact shown by the result of the transcript, was the only pedicab driver who had the shortest conversation with the foreign tourists (Transcript 5).

In order to be acquainted with information about pedicab drivers’ experience in joining English courses or other language training and the
advantages, the researcher proposed question number five and subsequently followed by questions number six and seven. Question number six was intended for those who used to join English courses or any language trainings. Meanwhile, the seventh question was aimed for those who did not join any language trainings and English courses. Based on the interview, three of the interviewees used to join an English training and a French training held by Tourism Department of Yogyakarta. R 12 and R 8 once joined a similar English training in 1990 which was held by Tourism Department of Yogyakarta. R 3 admitted that he used to join two English trainings and a French training from LIP. The other two interviewees admitted that they never participated in any language trainings before.

In general, based on question 6a, the pedicab drivers who used to join English trainings and a French training were slightly assisted by the training because they were able to know several vocabularies in daily conversation, know how to bargain, and understand what the foreign tourists said. Apart from this explanation, the pedicab drivers stated that the English and French trainings from Tourism Department of Yogyakarta were held more than ten years ago (1990) and most of them had forgotten the given materials. However, the experiences of interacting with the foreign tourists were mostly assisting their fluency and developing proficiency in English. Some of them also stated that they were unable to write and read. Nonetheless, these disabilities did not become obstacles in developing communication with the foreign tourists. Based on the interview, the pedicab drivers stated that the most essential thing in communication was to
understand what the foreign tourists said and vice versa. Therefore, a conversation might take place and every interlocutor could deliver ideas to other addressees as well.

On the other hand, based on question 7a, the researcher found that two interviewees who did not join any language trainings underwent a process of autodidact English learning. The learning process took place during interaction with foreign tourists. Both R 4 and R 10 were learning English through experiences when escorting foreign tourists with pedicab. R 4 admitted that he learned English through listening and imitating foreign tourists. On the other hand, R 10 said that he learned English mostly by listening to other pedicab drivers.

When the researcher asked about their English proficiency from their own perspective, which was represented by questions 6b and 7b, two of the interviewees, namely R 12 and R 3, stated that their English were good enough. R 8 and R 4 claimed that their ability in English was not good enough. The last one, R 10, admitted that his English proficiency was poor. This question was intended to distinguish perspectives of each pedicab driver related to English proficiency.

Research findings for the first research question were strongly related to theory of Second Language Acquisition. Based on the obtained data, the pedicab drivers possessed English which was dissimilar to English in general. This English simplified structure was less complicated compared to general English. The first research question of this research was intended to examine how the
pedicab drivers use English while talking to the foreign tourists. Based on the obtained data, the researcher found several interesting facts which should be highlighted. Evidence of these actualities could be found in the transcripts. Actually, the foreign tourists who assisted the researcher expected to have a pedicab driver for each conversation. Conversely, when a pedicab driver was having a conversation with the foreign tourists, the other pedicab drivers were suddenly interrupting the ongoing conversation. Hence, there were three pedicab drivers in one of the conversations and it can be found in the transcripts.

First, the data revealed that the pedicab drivers used English spontaneously. In other words, the pedicab drivers persuaded the foreign tourists first by greeting and asking in English. Furthermore, some of the pedicab drivers were offering a price in rupiah and telling several places that might attract the foreign tourists to use the pedicab drivers’ service. Although after several minutes the pedicab drivers knew that the foreign tourists were not originally coming from English speaking countries, the pedicab drivers continued the conversation in English. The pedicab drivers were demanded to become a model of good personalities. The pedicab drivers showed themselves as friendly, polite, and communicative figures. The only purpose of being a communicative figure was to earn his living by persuading the foreign tourists to use the service. The pedicab drivers regarded the foreign tourists as potential customers. This finding referred to a conclusion of the pedicab drivers’ attitude towards English. Due to the pedicab drivers’ spontaneous way in using English, the researcher determined that the pedicab drivers had positive attitude toward English. This positive
attitude towards English was mainly supported by one of the Second Language Acquisition theories, particularly motivation. The motivation possessed by the pedicab drivers was classified into instrumental motivation. In instrumental motivation, one is convinced that a language can be a tool to open an economic or education opportunity. Moreover, the pedicab drivers considered the foreign tourists as potential customers. In this case, for the pedicab drivers, the use of English as a means of communication might open economic opportunity or earn a living.

The simple vocabulary was second highlighted point of how the pedicab drivers used English while talking to the foreign tourists. The data conveyed such information related to the pedicab drivers’ tendency to use simple vocabulary in developing communication with the foreign tourists. Based on the conducted interview, the researcher found that the pedicab drivers had limited number of vocabularies. It occurred due to the absence of experiences in learning English formally. Albeit three of the interviewees admitted that they joined English trainings from the government, it was held more than ten years ago and they had forgotten the given materials. Therefore, sentences and phrases of the pedicab drivers were consist of simple vocabulary. The sentences below were examples of the use of simple vocabulary found in the transcripts.

No, but no job…but no job. You pay me, not too expensive. Only fifteen for two.

(R 3, Transcript 1)
Go and back…one man one thousand…eh twenty thousand…

(R 10, Transcript 5)

From the examples above, the pedicab drivers had deficiency in English knowledge, particularly the number of vocabulary. The sentences above showed that the pedicab drivers created sentences freely and ignored grammatical rules of English. Based on the sentences which were uttered by R 3, it signified that the pedicab drivers formed sentences with simple English words. For the second example, instead of using round trip terms, the pedicab drivers used go and back, which was defined as pulang and pergi in Indonesian. Even though the sentences were grammatically incorrect, there was information that could be grasped. Those sentences signified that the pedicab drivers were attempting to persuade the foreign tourists and offering prices.

The third finding was the use of base form. From the obtained data, the researcher found that most of the pedicab drivers uttered sentences and phrases which consisted of base form. It signified that the pedicab drivers employed simple form of English words in developing communication with the foreign tourists. In English, inflections of noun, verb, adjective, adverb, and genitive are acknowledged, while Indonesian does not have inflection. These two sentences below were found to have the use of base form and found in the transcripts.

Where are you go?

(R 4, Transcript 2)

Jalan Gejayan thirty minute

(R 10, Transcript 5)
From the first example, the fourth research participant omitted the -ing inflection. The word go was best replaced with going. Secondly, the pedicab driver omitted the –s inflection. The phrase thirty minute was best replaced with thirty minutes. To indicate plural form, Indonesian employed reduplication or simply understood by the context. Therefore, because of the deficiency in English knowledge, the pedicab drivers did not aware of omitting inflection.

The researcher also found additional information besides those three findings above. First, it was found that the pedicab drivers’ intonation and pronunciation were indeed influenced by style of local language. This happened due to the pedicab drivers’ social background. It was undeniable that the pedicab drivers grew up in local environment, so as the effect of the surroundings, the pedicab drivers were unconsciously apply their style of local language in the English. In the pedicab drivers’ local language, there are twenty inventory alphabets, namely ha, na, ca, ra, ka, da, ta, sa, wa, la, pa, dha, ja, ya, nya, ma, ga, ba, tha, nga (Abikusno, 1996: 104). Additionally, some English alphabets, such as /eks/ and /vi:/ are rarely found in the local language. Besides, several vowels such as /əʊ/ and /ɪə/ did not exist in the local language. English consonant, such as /θ/ also could not be found in the pedicab drivers’ local language. Therefore, in pronouncing some English words which contained such alphabets, vowels, and consonant, the pedicab drivers attempt to replace it with the closest sounds. Vowel /əʊ/ was replaced with /juː/ and /ɪə/ pronounced as /iː/. Furthermore, the pedicab drivers switched /eks/ to /keɪ/ and /vi:/ to /piː/. Due to absence of consonant /θ/ in the local language, the pedicab drivers changed it into /es/.
transcripts, some mispronounced words can be easily identified, such as pronouncing /klʊs/ instead of close (Transcript 1), /sepən/ instead of seven (Transcript 1), /drev/ for drive (Transcript 1), /hɜr/ for here (Transcript 1), /bɪlp/ for believe (Transcript 1), /kɒmplɛt/ for complete (Transcript 1), /səti/ instead of thirty (Transcript 2), /fʌstrəŋ/ instead of fasting (Transcript 3), /tʊmɒn/ instead of two month (Transcript 3), /rɪleɪk/ instead of relax (Transcript 4), /aɪ mɛs juː/ for how much you? (Transcript 4), /pæləs/ and /paləs/ instead of palace (Transcript 4), /ɑr/ instead of art (Transcript 4). Therefore, sometimes misunderstandings occurred during the conversation and it made the foreign tourists insert some Indonesian words so that the conversation could be continued as well.

The researcher also found that most of the pedicab drivers could not read and write. Based on the interview, R 8 claimed that he was the only person who could read and write in English though just little. The other interviewees confessed that the only ability in English was simply speaking. It showed that the absence of the pedicab drivers’ experience in learning English formally played a significant role in inability to read and write. It was showed by the interview result that the highest level of education of the pedicab drivers was Junior High School. Even though the pedicab drivers once joined an English training or a French training, it took place in 1990 or over ten years ago, and it did not improve the pedicab drivers’ ability in English thoroughly. It happened because the pedicab drivers had forgotten the given materials. Most of them also stated that a key point in developing communication with foreign tourists was to understand each other. Therefore, the inability to read and write did not become a
huge barrier for the pedicab drivers in developing communication with the foreign tourists.

Some significant information was gained from the interview. The interview conveyed information about the pedicab drivers’ age and learning experience. Based on the both observation and interview, all of the pedicab drivers were mature people and completely grown physically and well developed emotionally. Considering the fact which was strongly supported by the interviewees’ testimony of education level, the researcher found that the pedicab drivers would never achieve native-like speaker abilities in English. It was shown by the unique intonation and pronunciation of English among the pedicab drivers. A school of scholars stated that optimum age of Second Language Acquisition fell within the first ten years of life. Also, another opinion related to Second Language Acquisition was a slower process of an elder learner than younger one in mastering a second language. Based on the research findings, the researcher argued that behaviorist learning theory was the most suitable theory for what the pedicab drivers underwent. Behaviorist learning theory claimed that learning a habit of second language can be facilitated by imitation and reinforcement. The learning style of the pedicab drivers can be classified into behaviorist learning theory. In accordance with the presented data, the pedicab drivers learned English through imitating foreign tourists and other pedicab drivers. The pedicab drivers never joined any learning process in classrooms and the ability to speak English developed via hearing, imitating then practicing directly with the foreign tourists.
A. The Influences of Indonesian Language on Pedicab Drivers’ Simplified Structure of English

As an attempt to obtain reliable data to answer the second research question, “how does Indonesian language affect the use of English in the conversation between pedicab drivers and foreign tourists,” the researcher analyzed a document. This document was the record of conversation between pedicab drivers and foreign tourists which was converted into written form. There were seven transcripts of conversation between the twelve pedicab drivers and the three foreign tourists. In addition, the researcher did not analyze sentences from the foreign tourists because this research focused only on English which was uttered by the pedicab drivers.

In organizing the various evidences found in the transcripts, the researcher presented the data in a form of table. The table aimed to make the evidences into a readable one. Furthermore, the researcher inserted five characteristics of pidgin to group each of evidences. First characteristic of pidgin was an extreme reduction of inflectional morphology. Next was minimal number of prepositions and then followed by third characteristic, namely one wh-word for all questions. The fourth was invariant word order for questions and restricted number of vocabularies as the last characteristic. The pidgin characteristics of simplified structure of English among the pedicab drivers in Prawirotaman as well as the research participants were presented in Table 4.1 overleaf.
Table 4.1 The Indonesian Influences on Pedicab Drivers’ Simplified Structure of English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Characteristics of Pidgin</th>
<th>Sentences and Phrases Found in Transcripts</th>
<th>Number of Sentences and Phrases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Extreme reduction of inflectional morphology</td>
<td>R3: All market</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R6: Two kilometer Two month</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R8: Thirty minute Two person</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Minimal number of prepositions</td>
<td>R3: I can drive the traditional market I can drive in the new market Open until to five o’clock</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R4: Go UNY in the bus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R5: Bird market Bantul street Only twenty one people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R11: It’s cheap in two people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>One <em>wh</em>-question word for all questions</td>
<td>R2: What you looking for traditional market?</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R5: How many clock?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R6: How many time here?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R8: How much you? Where you go now? Where you from?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R12: How do you from?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Invariant word order for questions</td>
<td>R1: The market...<em>batik</em>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To eat?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R2: Just to see?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Characteristics of Pidgin</th>
<th>Sentences and Phrases Found in Transcripts</th>
<th>Number of Sentences and Phrases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R3: Already been Kotagede?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R4: UNY..university? You understand?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R5: Strong? Tomorrow, yes?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R8: Far...go? By becak? One becak or two becak?</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R9: You take becak over there?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R10: Gejayan go and back?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R11: You need a hotel? Home stay? Two people? \</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R12: Maybe you like a hotel? \ You like shopping? Batik painting or stamp? Like shopping batik? This your friend? \</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Restricted number of vocabularies</td>
<td>R1: Take here, don’t walking.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R3: Near Sultan palace, you have traditional market. Like shirt, like batik, like banana, papaya, something like that. Is this I think already close. You already very long time</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Characteristics of Pidgin</th>
<th>Sentences and Phrases Found in Transcripts</th>
<th>Number of Sentences and Phrases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R5:</td>
<td>Becak there, only three hours one day. Back three hours, six hours. Six clock.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R8:</td>
<td>After you move exhibition art and Malioboro street…. Only twenty no problem. Until finish in Malioboro street you know.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R12:</td>
<td>Many from German, Italy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on Table 4.1, the researcher found fifty four sentences which contained characteristics of pidgin. In general, all of the pedicab drivers definitely possessed simplified structure of English which was less complicated compared to English in general. For extreme reduction of inflectional morphology, the researcher found a similar concept from five sentences. The second characteristic was shown in seven sentences. Besides, only seven sentences represented the third characteristic of pidgin. There were twenty three sentences found in the transcripts as the evidences for the fourth characteristic. Additionally, twelve sentences were considered as the fifth characteristic of pidgin. Overall, those sentences emerged from all of the research participants and very suitable indeed for characteristics of pidgin coined by Mühlhäuser (1986) and Holmes (2001).
Besides, the researcher also provided elaboration on several sentences found in the transcripts, but unable to be classified into Table 4.1. The sentences and phrases were those which could not be understood without seeing the context when the conversation happened. Some of the sentences might evoke confusion for its meaning. Moreover, several phrases were also significantly indeed Indonesian style. As a qualitative research, the researcher considered essential to analyze these unique sentences and phrases deeper because phenomena of conversation between pedicab drivers and foreign tourists were very interesting to observe and an opportunity to dig information related to sociolinguistic scope as deep as possible.

Based on the obtained data, there were fifty four sentences found in the transcripts. Those sentences indeed contained characteristics of pidgin, namely extreme reduction of inflectional morphology, minimal number of preposition, one wh-word word for all questions, invariant word order for question and restricted number of vocabularies. These findings signified that English simplified structure possessed by the pedicab drivers can be classified into pidgin.

For the first characteristic, an extreme reduction on inflectional morphology, it was found that most of the pedicab drivers had a tendency to do a similar habit. Five sentences which were uttered by R 3, R 6 and R 8 contained a similar feature, specifically omission of (s) to indicate plural form. Inflection or plural suffix did not exist in Indonesian language. In Indonesian language, how to name a plural form is merely based on the context or reduplication. Therefore,
the pedicab drivers did not put (s) or (es) at several words. The phrases such as all market, two kilometer, two month, two person and thirty minute were the examples found in the transcripts. From those phrases, the pedicab drivers unconsciously omitted inflection (s). In fact, the correct form for those phrases should be all markets, two kilometers, two months, two persons and thirty minutes.

Limited number of preposition was the second characteristic in determining how the pedicab drivers use English while talking to foreign tourists. Four of twelve research participants uttered seven sentences that contained both omission and incorrect prepositions. From seven sentences, four of them were incorrect prepositions. These evidences showed that several pedicab drivers faced confusion in placing a preposition in a sentence during a conversation with the foreign tourists. From R3, there were sentences like “I can drive in the new market” and “open until to five o’clock.” R11 also uttered a sentence that was “It’s cheap in two people.” The prepositions used by R3 and R11 were considered as incorrect ones. The prepositions in at the first sentence of R3 should be replaced with to. In the second sentence, the use of preposition to was meaningless. Therefore, it should be omitted in order to obtain a correct sentence. Furthermore, the only sentence uttered by R11 was also mistaken. The preposition in should be replaced with for.

In spite of those erroneous sentences in the use of preposition, it was found that three sentences which contained omission of prepositions. One sentence was uttered by R3 and the rest were uttered by R5. The first sentence was “I can drive
the new market.” Moreover, the others were “Bird market Bantul street” and “Only twenty one people.” It can be seen that there were some missing prepositions in those sentences. Therefore, preposition to should be inserted in the first sentence. Preposition at and for should be put in both second and third sentences. From these findings, it signified that pedicab drivers had slight knowledge about preposition. The pedicab drivers underwent a learning process through interaction with foreign tourists. The communication experiences were developing their English ability from time to time, albeit only speaking ability. Therefore, the pedicab drivers might not recognize English grammar and related terms. Concisely, the pedicab drivers used preposition unconsciously and unaware of making mistakes.

The third characteristic was one wh-question word for all questions. Based on this feature, the researcher attempted to identify any questions which were proposed by the pedicab drivers to the foreign tourists during conversations. Hence, the researcher found seven sentences. The first one was a question asked by R 2. In the transcript, it was found that what was meant by R 2 was to know the reason why the foreign tourist was eager to know about a traditional market. Instead of using why, R 2 used what in forming the question. The other four questions used how in forming the question sentences. One of the research participants, R 5 uttered how many clock instead of what time, although a precise time was the purpose of his question. A question coined by R 12 was also incorrect. He formed a question sentence that was how do you from. However, the correct form was where do you come from. The other two sentences already
used “how” in forming the question. Nonetheless, several misunderstandings occurred when the pedicab drivers proposed the questions. For instance, R 6 asked *how many time here* to the foreign tourists. One of the tourists answered with first time. However, what was meant by R6 was how long the foreign tourists have been in Jogja. Another question was *how much you* which was coined by R 8. Found the question confusing, the foreign tourist interpreted the question wrongly. One of the tourists thought R 8 said *I miss you*, then few seconds later, the another tourist realized what was questioned by R 8. R 8 asked about the price that the foreign tourist wanted. Similar style also happened to the other questions. Moreover, the used question word was *where*. *Where you go now* and *where you from* were two questions proposed by R 8. Although those sentences were grammatically incorrect, the tourists understood what R 8 meant.

During a conversation, question and answer were two things that always occurred. Surprisingly, though the pedicab drivers’ English was different from English in general, both the foreign tourists and the pedicab drivers could understand each other. Both the foreign tourists and the interlocutors were delivering ideas effortlessly. As shown above in the third characteristic of a pidgin, no barriers found and occurred in the transcripts. Some misunderstandings occasionally occurred, but both of the speakers overcame it and continued the conversation as well. Albeit the pedicab drivers used one *wh*-word for all questions, the foreign tourists could easily understand what the pedicab drivers attempted to say. Compared to the number of sentences related to the use of one *wh*-word for all questions, the total number of sentences related to
fourth characteristic was higher. Based on the Table 4.1, there were twenty three sentences in total.

Astoundingly, all of the research participants uttered a question with invariant words, several examples were the market...batik?, just to see?, you understand?, you take becak over there?, Gejayan go and back?, home stay? and maybe you like hotel?. Based on the examples, one visible feature was the omission of question word. All of the questions were not using question word. The researcher found that the foreign tourists understood what the pedicab drivers uttered although the proposed questions were not using question word. Therefore, the researcher attempted to find what it was by scrutinizing the records. Afterward, it was found that in sentences which has purpose to ask something, the pedicab drivers used raising intonation at the end of the phrases or sentences. The raising intonation indicated that the phrases or sentences uttered by the pedicab drivers were a question. Concisely, although there were no question words used in forming a question, the foreign tourists understood what was meant by the pedicab drivers.

The last characteristic was the restricted number of vocabularies. Ordinarily, the pedicab drivers mastered simply several vocabularies which were considered as useful words in direct communication with foreign tourists. More than a few sentences were found in the transcripts, for instance, “Take here do not walking ( R 1); Near Sultan palace you have traditional market; Is this I think already close ( R 3); After you move exhibition art and until finish in Malioboro street you know (R 8).” Completely, there were twelve sentences from five
research participants found in the transcripts. From those examples, the researcher identified several words which were not appropriate. As shown by the first sentence, the phrase *take here* referred to the pedicab drivers’ offer in escorting the foreign tourists. Therefore, perhaps the pedicab drivers could not find any words that were appropriate enough to express the idea and decided to use *take*, which means *ambil* and *here* which means *di sini* in Indonesian language. Besides, the word *have* in second sentence was definitely incorrect. Meanwhile, what was meant by the pedicab driver was a possibility for the foreign tourists to see a traditional market. Therefore, the appropriate phrase to replace it was *can see*, so a complete sentence would be *near Sultan palace you can see a traditional market*.

At the third sentence, one of the research participants uttered a sentence which was started with *is this* though this sentence was a statement rather than a question. The research participant intended to inform the foreign tourists about a traditional market which had already closed at the moment. Consequently, the word *is this* should be replaced with *now*. A sentence *after you move exhibition art* was the fourth example. The word *move* in the sentence was not accurate and evoked ambiguity for its meaning. This sentence could be interpreted as if the foreign tourists would visit an exhibition art after another place or asked to move an exhibition art to another place. Therefore, the word *move* was best replaced with *go to*. The last sentence was the use of *until finish* phrase. This sentence was intended to explain to the foreign tourists about the last destination that the R 8
offered. However, the use of *until finish* was not appropriate. The phrase could be best replaced by *until we stop* or *we can stop at*.

Those five characteristics of pidgin coined by scholars were not adequate enough to explain several uninterpreted sentences and phrases found in the transcripts. It occurred because several sentences and phrases which were uttered by the pedicab drivers could not be grouped based on the available characteristics. Therefore, the researcher quoted the sentences and phrases of the pedicab drivers and the foreign tourists then explained the situation as well to avoid ambiguity or misinterpretation. There were five research participants who uttered unclassified sentences and phrases, namely R 3, R 5, R 8, R 10 and R 12. These sentences and phrases might evoke confusion, unless knowing and understanding the context and situation where the conversation took place.

OK, if there close, you promise with me, coming here, I can drive. Don’t take becak some people not me.

(R 3, Transcript 1)

Based on conversation above, R 3 expressed two perplexing sentences since it was grammatically incorrect. However, the researcher and the foreign tourists could interpret what R 3 intended to say because we were in the location of data gathering. One of the foreign tourists was asking a location of a traditional market, meanwhile, R 3 insisted on offering her to use the pedicab. Afterwards, R 3 showed the location and stated that if the traditional market was
already closed, the foreign tourist should return and use only R 3’s pedicab to visit another traditional market.

*Gejayan? Gejayan go and back? E, Gejayan go and back… seventy.*

(R 10, Transcript 5)

According to the example above, R 10 attempted to explain *round trip* by pedicab to Gejayan. Further, instead of using *round trip* terms, R 10 expressed it with *go and back*, which in Indonesian language, it was defined as *pulang pergi*.

*Becak? Now now looking looking*  

(R 5, Transcript 3)

Oh..*rilek* (relax) you know…*rilek* (relax) you know..I will just bike *rilek* (relax), you know… slowly slowly, you know.

(R 8, Transcript 4)

Like walking-walking?  

(R 12, Transcript 7)

The phrases like *now now looking looking, slowly slowly* and *walking walking* signified the influences of Indonesian language. In the national language of Indonesia, there were several words such as *lihat-lihat, pelan-pelan* and *jalan-jalan*. However, the research participants reduplicated the words because of the deficiency of English vocabularies. Therefore, instead of *sightseeing* and *be careful*, the research participants expressed *looking-looking, slowly slowly* and *walking walking*. 
The obtained data provided meaningful information to convey. As the answer to the second research question, the example of the pedicab drivers’ sentences and phrases were fully support the researcher’s conclusion. In total, there were fifty four sentences and phrases found in the transcripts. Based on the research findings through analyzing the transcribed conversations and interview, the researcher found that Indonesian language had a great influence on the English simplified structure of the pedicab drivers. The pedicab drivers unconsciously applied Indonesian grammatical rules while talking to the foreign tourist in English. This occurred because of the pedicab drivers’ lack of experiences in studying English formally which caused the deficiency of English knowledge, including grammar and vocabulary. This deficiency encouraged the pedicab drivers to replace unfamiliar words with any words that they knew and created sentences freely. Additionally, the pedicab drivers considered that grammar was meaningless in developing communication with the foreign tourists and the most important thing was to understand what the foreign tourists said and vice versa.
CHAPTER V
CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATION, SUGGESTIONS

Based on the findings of the analysis conducted to answer the research questions, some conclusions have been drawn and are presented in this chapter. Furthermore, suggestions related to the discussed topic are also elaborated in this chapter, particularly for those who may be interested in the similar topic.

A. Conclusions

An interview was conducted to obtain information related to the pedicab drivers as the answer to the first research question. From the research findings, the researcher found three interesting facts deal with the pedicab drivers’ way of using English. First point is a spontaneous way. Based on both observation and interview, the pedicab drivers were very active in attracting the foreign tourists’ attention. The pedicab drivers firstly persuaded the foreign tourists by greeting, offering and asking in English. Seen from the pedicab drivers’ point of view, the foreign tourists were regarded as potential customers. Thus, the pedicab drivers’ were actively approaching the foreign tourists while uttering English words. English in the pedicab drivers’ perspective was a means to create communication with the foreign tourists. Second fact is intonation and pronunciation. From the gathered data, English of the pedicab drivers was strongly influenced by Javanese language, particularly in intonation and pronunciation. Apart from the identity of Indonesian language as a national language, the fact remains that Javanese has greater influences on English which are uttered by the pedicab drivers. This was
the pedicab drivers created sentences and phrases freely and ignored the rule of English grammar.

The third finding was the use of base form. The pedicab drivers were unconsciously omitted the inflection of \(-s\) and \(-ing\) in almost every sentence and phrase during the conversations with the foreign tourists. The pedicab drivers did not aware of making such omission because of the absence of experiences in learning English formally. Eventually, those three findings, namely the spontaneous way, the use of simple vocabulary, and the use of base form were considered as the answer to the first research question.

The second research question dealt with the influence of Indonesian on English of the pedicab drivers. To answer it, the researcher analyzed the transcripts of recorded conversation. Following that step, the researcher classified the research findings based on five characteristics of pidgin. For the first characteristic, namely an extreme reduction of inflectional morphology, there were five sentences found in the transcripts. Seven sentences were found to have the second characteristic, namely minimal number of preposition. Besides, seven sentences were found for the third characteristic of pidgin, specifically one \(-wh\) word for all questions. Twenty three sentences were known to have the fourth characteristic, namely invariant word order for question. The last one was restricted number of vocabularies and there were twelve sentences found for that. In total, there were fifty four sentences that contained features of pidgin. Notwithstanding those findings, the researcher inserted several sentences that could not be understood unless the context and situation where the conversation
took place was known. Furthermore, in answering the second research question of “how does the Indonesian language affect the use of English while talking to foreign tourists,” the researcher was not only classified the sentences and phrases based on the characteristics of pidgin, but also stated that Indonesian language had a great influence on the English simplified structure of the pedicab drivers. When the pedicab drivers talked to the foreign tourists, they unconsciously applied Indonesian grammatical rules as well. It was showed by several sentences and phrases found in the transcripts. It occurred because of the pedicab drivers’ deficiency in English knowledge, such as vocabulary and grammar. Moreover, the pedicab drivers considered grammar as a meaningless feature in developing communication with the foreign tourists. Therefore, besides the abundance of Indonesian influences on the English simplified structure, the pedicab drivers had a tendency to replace unfamiliar words and to create sentences freely, without any English grammar rules.

A. Implication

As future teachers, after graduate from English Language Education Study Program, the university students are encouraged to be able in teaching English to the students. The future teachers are expected to have knowledge to design and to deliver English materials to students as well. The definition of students here becomes broader. The definition of students recently is not always referring to parties who undergo learning process formally at school. Considering the fact that the dissemination of English nowadays creates an obligatory for everyone to have both oral and written proficiencies, the future teachers are asked to be able in
teaching various students. One of the various students is a pedicab driver. As workers in tourism world, in which English holds significant role as a means of communication, the pedicab drivers are supposed to be able in interacting with foreign tourists who visit tourist attractions. This research is expected to be a significant guidance for parties who may be interested in teaching English to the pedicab drivers. Based on the research findings, such as the pedicab drivers’ perspectives of English and numerous common erroneous English utterances, it hopefully will assist the interested teachers or future teachers to design the material and to develop appropriate teaching techniques for the pedicab drivers.

B. Suggestions

These suggestions are addressed to other researchers, lecturers, and students who have interest in examining similar topic.

1. For Other Researchers

In this research, it is admitted that the local language has profound role in the pedicab drivers’ way of communication. Nevertheless, this research simply examines the influence of Indonesian. Therefore, the researcher encourages other researchers to conduct deeper research related to the influence of the local language on the pedicab drivers’ simplified structure of English with more participants and bigger areas.
2. For Lecturers

The phenomenon of pidgin is always become an interesting issue to observe. Moreover, pidgin is one of the subjects that is discussed in sociolinguistics course of English Language Education Study Program of Sanata Dharma University Yogyakarta. Until recent days, the students are given examples and explanation of pidgin that far from the students’ daily life. The examples found in the handout are mostly related to foreign with numerous terms to memorize. Therefore, many of the students consider sociolinguistics course as an uninteresting subject. This research offers new examples of pidgin, which is closely related to the students’ daily life. Thus, this research is expected to be one of the sources in sociolinguistics scope, so that the lecturers are assisted by provision of examples in pidgin.

3. For Students

As a student of the English Language Education Study Program, it is expected to have both oral and written proficiencies. Moreover, as future teachers, a high ability in English is a must. Nevertheless, errors are easily found and committed by the students because of effect of the mother tongue. Therefore, this research can be one of the sources for the students who may be interested in comprehending the influence Indonesian on simplified structure of English and those who may be interested in conducting a similar research.
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APPENDICES
THE INTERVIEW BLUEPRINT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect to Investigate</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Number of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The pedicab drivers’ social background:</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Origin</td>
<td>1. Where do you come from?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Age</td>
<td>2. How old are you?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Educational status</td>
<td>3. What is your last education?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Working time as a pedicab driver</td>
<td>4. How long have you been working as a pedicab driver?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Experience in joining a formal English training</td>
<td>5. Have you ever joined an English training or an English course?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Advantages of English</td>
<td>6. For those who answer “yes” for question no.5:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Pedicab driver’s perspective of his proficiency in English</td>
<td>a. Did the English training or the English course give advantages to your English mastery? Why? What kinds of advantages?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Place where English was learned</td>
<td>b. What do you think about your English?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Pedicab driver’s perspective of his proficiency in English</td>
<td>7. For those who answer “no” for question no.5:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Where did you learn about English?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. What do you think about your English?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# THE INTERVIEW RESULT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>R 12</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Where do you come from?</td>
<td>Sorosutan, UH 6/944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>How old are you?</td>
<td>65 years old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>What is your last education?</td>
<td>Elementary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>How long have you been working as a pedicab driver?</td>
<td>1978-2010 (32 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Have you ever joined an English training or an English course?</td>
<td>Yes, an English training from Tourism Department in 1990.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>a. Did the English training or the English course give advantages to your English mastery?</td>
<td>Yes, because I can have a conversation, bargain and understand what the tourist said. But it was long time ago, so I don’t remember anymore.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. What do you think about your English?</td>
<td>Good enough, because the most important thing is communication and I can only speak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>R 4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>R 10</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Where do you come from?</td>
<td>Randubelang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>How old are you?</td>
<td>59 years old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>What is your last education?</td>
<td>Junior High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>How long have you been working as a pedicab driver?</td>
<td>30 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Have you ever joined an English training or an English course?</td>
<td>Not yet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>a. Where did you learn English?</td>
<td>Autodidact, hear and imitate the tourists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. What do you think about your English?</td>
<td>Not really good, I just can have a conversation and the main point is me and the tourists understand each other.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TRANSCRIPT 1

F 2   : Can you help us? We are looking for traditional market.
R 1  : Mark?
F 2   : Market
R 1  : Market Beringharjo
F 2   : Do you know,,can you help us and tell us where it is?
F 1  : Just direction..the traditional market..pasar tradisional
R 1  : What are you looking for? The market..batik?
F 2   : Oo..no..ee..market..ee..to eat.
R 1  : To eat?
F 1  : Just traditional market. Where is it?
R 1  : ...............is near Malioboro.
F 2   : Near Malioboro? How can we....
F 1  : That’s too far
F 2   : Yeah...too far. We thought there is a market here. Like (not clear)
R 1  : Ha..neng kono ono eneng po? Ngamu...
R 2   : For a market,traditional market
R 1  : Pasar...
F 1  : Pasar tradisional..
R 2   : Pasar tradisionil...ya..market tradisionil...
F 2 & F 1 : Ya.....
F 2   : It’s just there?
R 2   : Ya...you take becak..little bit far. What you looking for the traditional market?
F 2   : Just something...
R 2   : Just to see?
F 2   : Yeah..just to see...
F 1  : Ya..ya..
R 1 & R 2 : Ooooo.....
R 2   : Arep ndelok-ndelok bung..
R 1  : Ha iyo...
R 2   : Yo tarik bung..
R 1  : OK
F 2   : Sorry, we’re just walking so we want to know like how far we have to go..so...
R 1 : Take here…don’t walking
F 2 : No, I walking…walking..
R 1 : OK, walking is OK. Up to you..
F 2 & F 1 : OK
R 2 : Nice batik
F 1 : Thank you
R 2 : Ra gelem to?
R 3 : I can drive the traditional market, five thousand only..but no job.
F 1 : Oh, no…
R 3 : Thank you very much you give me work, only five thousand.
F 1 : I’m sorry…maaf…
R 3 : Haha…you bagus Bahasa Indonesia ya?
F 1 : Ha…bisa…
R 3 : Sudah lama? Sudah lama?
F 1 : Satu bulan
R 3 : Oooo..disini? Di Jogja?
F 1 : Disini…ya…
R 3 : Tinggal dimana? Di hotel apa di rumah?
F 1 : Di depan UGM
R 3 : Ooo…di depan UGM
F 1 : Ya…
R 3 : Kamu itu saja….lihat pasar itu dekat Kraton. Dekat Kraton ada pasar tradisionil.
F 2 & F 1 : Yeah? Good….
R 3 : Near Sultan Palace, you have market tradisionil. Near Sultan Palace, you have long and big tradisionil market.
F 2 : OK
R 3 : Like shirt, like batik, like banana, papaya, something like that. Near Sultan Palace.
F 2 & F 1 : Oooo…
R 3 : Open until to five o’clock. Is this I think already close, but just from sepen (seven) until twelve thirty.
F 2 & F 1 : Oooo…
R 3 : This already close but this only small market. If you want to see, open, near Sultan Palace. Really. Big market, new market.the long street, long street. You have everything, like your batik, like shirt, komplet (complete)!
F 1 : (laughing)
F 2 : OK
R 3 : Really. Near Sultan Palace, this already close. If you don’t bilip (believe), I can drive this small market first. If close I can drive to new market.
F 1 : (laughing)
F 2 : He is very good.
R 3 : (laughing)….Ya…
F 2 : He is very good. Very….very good..a good businessman.
R 3 : No, but no job...(laugh)..but no job. You pay me, not too expensive. Only fifteen for two.
F 1 : Oooo…
R 3 : Small market, if open. In the …..if not open, I can drive in the new market.
F 1 : No, we will stay in this area. ..I’m…..we’re just…
R 3 : Or ten,,or ten…
F 1 : No…
R 3 : OK, now like that. You walk there first, if close.,no..no..no..you walking there first, if close you come here, I can drive in the new market. Only ten thousand for together.
F 1 : OK, wow very good.
R 3 : OK, also if you have time, I can drive to Kotagede. Already been Kotagede?.
F 1 : Kotagede??
R 3 : Kotagede....tidak suka?
F 1 : Oo..suka…
R 3 : Kotagede very nice.
F 2 : Never been there
R 3 : O,.ya?
F 2 : Never been there
R 3 : You,.already very long time…
F 2 : Yeah, but…in north…
R 3 : (laughing)...Ok, now you walk there first, if close you come here, I can drive the new market. The all market only round 300 meter.
F 1 : OK
R 3 : OK, if there close, you promise with me, coming here, I can drive. Don’t take becak some people not me (laughing)
F 1 : (laughing)..very good
R 3 : OK?
F 1 : OK
F 2 : Bagus
R 3 : Oya…sampai jumpa nanti.
TRANSCRIPT 2

R 4 : Where are you go?
F 2 : Actually, we…she has to go to UNY
R 4 : UNY? Ya…..
F 1 : It’s very far
R 4 : UNY….university?
F 2 : Ya…..
F 1 : Can you tell us to get there…or bus or something?
R 4 : Ehmm…
F 2 : Bus or something….is there a bus?
R 4 : Oo…go UNY in the bus..no..no..becak (laughing)..number two
F 1 : Number two?
R 4 : Number two….and ee..down UGM..ee..go in the bus to Prambanan..ya…
F 2 : O..okay..so two, take the bus to Prambanan
R 4 : You understand?
F 1 : Yeah..but where is the bus stop?
R 4 : Number two…
F 2 : Oo..
F 1 : You just say ..I want to…
R 4 : Eee…don’t…
F 1 : Okay…
R 4 : UGM..there a Prambanan, to Prambanan. Do you understand?
F 2 : Do I change buses? At Pramba..at UGM? Change? Change buses?
R 4 : Yes, change bus to Prambanan and ee..UNY
F 1 : Okay, so two different buses. One bus and then different bus.
R 4 : Two bus and one number two UGM take to Prambanan bus
F 1 : How much time does it take?
R 4 : Eee…three thousand go to UGM. Three thousand
F 2 : But…..time? Time?
F 1 : But time..jam..how much time?
R 4 : No time…(laughing). Go to UGM three thousand. No..no..no..time
F 1 : OK, but we need….
R 4 : Prambanan two thousand
F 2 : Twenty minutes….ee..or thirty minutes?
R 4 : Ee..seti..seti…seti minutes
F 1 : Thirty minutes?
F 2 : Yes...okay..okay..thank you terima kasih banyak
R 4 : (not clear)...... and go number two
F 1 : Okay,,,,this one?
R 4 : Oh, yes. There!
F 2 : later...nanti......nanti
Bus crew : Ra sido?
R 4 : Nanti?
F 2 : Ya, nanti
R 4 : Ya..ya..
F 1 : Thank you so much

TRANSCRIPT 3

R 5 : Ee..market traditional..there...endi sing goleki pasar tradisional?
R 6 : Ha..iki....(not clear)...Pasar Prawirotaman
F 2 & F 3 : Ya..ya..
R 6 : There Malioboro...
F 2 : Oo..tidak Malioboro..
R 6 : And bird market two kilometer, there
R 5 : Bird market only 3 kilometer.. bird market.. bird market Bantul street (not clear)
F 2 & F 3 : Ya..ya it is hot
R 5 : Becak to UNY. Enjoy it
F 3 : You must be strong
R 5 : Strong?
F 3 : Strong...(laugh)
R 5 : Becak, I have no money. Good for you, good for me. Ya? On this morning until now I have no money.
F 3 : Ooo..
R 5 : For eat because hungry
F 2 : Ya....(laughing)
R 5 : This money no to eat to drink
F 2 : Food and drink is very important..... very important
R 5 : I am fastring
R 6 : and the finish UNY, OK
R 5 : UNY? Ooo..seka UNY? UNY sekolahe po kuwi?
F 2 : Ya..she is..ee..have a class
R 6 : Oya, I know, how many time here?
F 3 : First time
F 2 : Ooo..no..two months
R 6 : Tumon (two month). I have bycicle and sepeda motor cycle
R 5 : Becak? Now now looking looking
R 7 : .......(not clear) guide guide very expensip. You can take my becak
F 3 : Ok, terima kasih ya...
R 5 : Ya...maybe tomorrow yes. Today is Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday tomorrow. Where? Borobudur Prambanan...one one day. Yes?
F 3 : How much does it cost to get to Borobudur?
R 5 : Oo..by bus only..only twenty one people. Be..Because very very far..ski..three kilometer
F 3 : And Prambanan?
R 5 : Prambanan only eight kilometer
F 3 : Eight kilometer?
R 5 : Eighteen... eighteen kilometer
F 3 : Yes...
R 5 : Becak there, only three hours one day. Back three hours, six hours.
F 3 : Ya..ya..
R 5 : Becak only one way one hundred thousand
F 3 : One way?
R 5 : Maybe tomorrow
F 3 : Maybe. We will come. We will here.
R 5 : I will wait here, tomorrow. You come here, yes?
F 3 : Okay
R 5 : How many clock? Ten or twelve? Because tomorrow morning I only starting yes
F 3 : and other days, you start somewhere else?today?
R 5 : No
F 3 : Today..ini..but..ee..
R 5 : Today is..
F 3 : Hari
R 5 : Hooh...
F 3 : Stay here?
R 5 : Hee.. stay here
F 3 : And other days? Somewhere?
R 5 : Only six hour. Six clock
F 3 : Okay
F 3 : Okay
R 5 : Thank you
F 3 : You’re welcome

TRANSCRIPT 4

F 2 : We just wanna know how far...
R 8 : Far..go? Where you go now?
F 2 : I wanna know how far it is to Malioboro.. 
R 8 : By becak?
F 2 : Ya..how far?
R 8 : From here, only Malioboro?
F 2 : Ya.. 
R 8 : Thirty minute.
F 2 : Thirty? Oh…okay, that’s far..
R 8 : One becak or two becak? One or two becak? 
F 2 : Ooow..no! That’s too far..
R 8 : Oh..rilek (relax) you know… rilek (relax) you know..I will just bike rilek (relax), you know… slowly slowly, you know.
F 3 : How much does it cost?
R 8 : Thirty enough for two.
F 3 : Thirty for two? 
R 8 : Ya..
F 2 : Oh…no…
R 8 : How much?…how much you?…how much? How much you?
F 3 : Miss you?
F 2 : Aaa..how much..
R 8 : How much you?
F 3 : Key…eee, twenty?
R 8 : Okay, last price twenty five. I love you. (you help me I help you…….)
F 3 : No no…we don’t love you..
F 2 : Hahaha…
R 8 : Normal price you know, twenty five for two..oke?
F 2 : No..we will just walk around..aha..this area for now…aha..and later ..........
R 8 : Because and then from by…and may be from here in the…from here…then maybe you look at the water pales (palace)..and then exhibition arr (art) and then after the Malioboro Street you know..only (street) you know…
F 3 : Where..where is e, water palace?
R 8 : Palace? Near near near palace you know..
F 3 : Deket Kraton?
R 8 : Ya, near near Kraton..
F 3 : Oh, yeah.. it’s not with Kraton
R 8 : No! water palace. After you move exhibition art and Malioboro street only twenty for two.. twenty five for two..
F 3 : Okay..how about it? (to F 2)
F 2 : Let us..let us think about it. Ya? okay..
R 9 : One becak or two becak?
R 8 : (to Driver 2) Piye, pak?
R 9 : Yo rapopo..aku yo wani.
R 8 : He’em wis, aku yo ra popo..
R 9 : (to F 2& F 3) Oke, you take becak over there?
F 2 : Oh no..no no..
F 3 : No thank you.
F 2 : We were just think..ya..
R 8 : Okay, twenty no problem. Oke, two person.
F 2 : No..later..later..
F 3 : Ya, we’ll stay here for now.
R 8 : Where you go now?
F 3 : E.. to...e..ssrs.
F 2 : E, the pasar tradisional..
R 8 : Okay, and then.. excuse me..after pasar tradisional and then maybe you look at the water palace, and then or the Malioboro Street. Because you can becak me over there you know..
F 2 : Ya..ya..okay..
R 8 : Where you from?
F 2 : Canada.
F 3 : Ukraine.
R 8 : Ooooh...Only twenty no problem. And then you look at exhibition art, and then the…
F 3 : Well, art exhibition?
R 8 : Ya.
F 3 : Where?
R 8 : E, near palace.. near water palace.
F 3 : Okay.
R 8 : Cause now open you know..
F 3 : Okay.
R 8 : Open now and then you…only two person twenty you know..
F 3 : Okay.
R 8 : Until finish in Malioboro Street you know.

TRANSCRIPT 5

R 10 : Forty.
F 3 : Forty? For two?
R 10 : Go and back..one man two thousand..eh, twenty thousand, and back twenty thousand
F 3 : For two people?
R 10 : Ha?
F 3 : Me and my friend? Is forty semua.
R 10 : He’emh.. one becak and two people. Ya?
F 3 : How long does it take to get there? No, how much time does it take to get there?
R 10 : Time? e, fifteen minute.
F 3 : Fifteen minutes?
R 10 : Yes.
F 3 : And to go to Gejayan?
R 10 : Gejayan?
F 3 : U’hum.. jalan Gejayan.
R 10 : Jalan Gejayan thirty minute
F 3 : And how much does it cost to get to Gejayan?
R 10 : E, Gejayan? E, fifteen..fifty..
F 3 : Fifty?
R 10 : Ya, fifty..
F 3 : Go there and then back here?
F 3 : Okay, I’ll think about it. Okay?

TRANSCRIPT 6

F 1 : Can you take us there?
R 11 : You need a hotel?
F 2 : No…I don’t think so…no hotel..
R 11 : Pardon?
F 2 : No hotel.
R 11 : Home stay?
F 2 : Home stay? A’a…just walking around..ya…But, emm…how much would it be?
F 1  : How much? how much it would be for both of us?
R 11 : Two people?
F 2 & F 1 : Ya, two people.
R 11 : Fifteen.
F 2 & F 1 : Fifteen? Oooow…
F 2   : But maybe that’s too much.
R 11 : Haha…normal.
F 2   : Normal…?
F 1   : No! we have taken becak before, it’s cheaper.
F 2   : Ya. What about, eem.. would you say ten thousand rupiah?
R 11 : Whaaa…fifteen.
F 2   : Fifteen? Eee…
R 11 : For two…for two people.
F 2   : Oh ya…what about…e, twelve thousand?
R 11 : Whaaa.. normal.. it’s cheap in two people.
F 2   : Emmm okay..
F 1   : Okay

TRANSCRIPT 7
R 12 : Duta or…..Duta?
F 1   : What did you say? Duta?
R 12 : Home stay?
F 1   : No! we just want to walk around.
R 12 : Woo…around..
F 1   : Ya…
R 12 : Maybe you like a hotel?
F 1   : No! we don’t need hotel.
F 2   : We live in Jogja, actually. We study Bahasa Indonesia. Ya, di UNY.
R 12 : Can you speak Indonesia?
F 2   : Bisa, sedikit.
R 12 : Ya.. dari mana? How do you from?
F 2   : I’m from Canada.
R 12 : Ke…?
F 2   : Ca-na-da.
R 12 : Kanada.
F 2   : Ya…it’s very far.
R 12 : America.
F 1   : Yeah, it’s in America.
F 2 : Are you originally from Jogja?
R 12 : Jogja!
F 2 : Oooh…okay.
R 12 : The palace
F 2 : Oooh, the palace? Wow!
R 12 : Jogja kampung.
F 2 : Ow, okay.
R 12 : You like shopping?
F 1 : Yeah, we love shopping! Ahahaha…
R 12 : Batik?
F 1 : Yeah! Do you know the good place for batik?
R 12 : Yess.
F 2 : No no! I don’t wanna go shopping for batik.
F 1 : (to F 2) I just wanna hear him talk.
R 12 : Batik painting or stamp?
F 1 : Painting.
F 2 : Oooow…yeah, it’s very beautiful here. How far away is it?
F 1 : How far?
R 12 : Oh, emmm…emmm.emmm…
F 2 : Okay…So, you have many tourist here?
R 12 : Yess, many…many…
F 2 : Many? Ooooh…She’s from Latvia, it’s in Europe.
R 12 : From?
F 1 : From Latvia.
R 12 : Batavia?
F 1 : Latvia…el…
R 12 : Oooh.
F 2 : Do we turn down the street?
R 12 : (Nod)
F 2 : Oooh, ya..Wooow…you’re very strong!!!
R 12 : Ahaha…yess…
F 2 : Are people from America or from Europe, the people that you meet?
R 12 : Yess. Many from German, Italy.
F 2 : Ooooh…This is my first time coming to…e…Prawirota-nam..hehehehe..
F 1 : Mine too..
R 12 : Like shopping Batik? Tirtodipuran.
F 2 : Ooooh, no!
F 1 : Not today..
F 2: Ya, we’ll just go to walk around.
F 1: Ya. She already got Batik…
F 2: Ya, hahaha.
F 1: Enough!
R 12: (Pointing at me) This your friend?
F 1: No!
F 2: No!
R 12: Here, Prawirotaman!
F 2: Ow, yeah?
R 12: Yess. Like walking-walking?
F 1 & F 2: Yeah…
F 2: Okay, thank you.
F 1: Thank you.
R 12: Oke.
F 2: Terimakasih.
R 12: Iya.