Celtic
A Journal of Culture, English Language Teaching, Literature and Linguistics

THE PERCEPTION BETWEEN JAVANESE AND MADURESE SPEAKER TOWARD THEIR DIALECTS IN ENGLISH CONVERSATION

[1]Abd. Syakur, [2]Wahyu Sudrajad*, [1]Sulistyaningsih, [1]Lailatul Musyarofah
[1]Master Program of English Education, STKIP PGRI Sidoarjo, Indonesia
[2]Department of English Literature, Universitas Kristen Cipta Wacana Malang, Indonesia

ABSTRACT

This study seeks to explore and analyze Javanese and Madurese speakers' use of their respective dialects in English conversation. In the framework of ethnically diverse Indonesian schools, certain Javanese and Madurese-speaker pupils may have trouble performing dialogue which is the reason why the researcher conducted this research. The data was online questionnaires then the result of the questionnaires was analyzed by quantitative method. The Javanese and Madurese students from three primary cities of Pasuruan, Lumajang, and Jember in East Java, Indonesia, were used as the focus of this study. At least 200 persons participated as questionnaire participants. The results of the data from online questionnaires show that the score gathered was 2118 for Javanese perception and 2576 for Madurese perception after that, 2118:3500 was 60% (neutral categorized). After the spread out of the questionnaires and measurements, the result showsboth Javanese and Madurese respondents did not have a problem with their dialects each other.

Keywords: *Perception; Javanese Dialects; Madurese Dialects; English Conversation*

ABSTRAK

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk eksplorasi dan Analisa persepsi antara dialektika penutur Madura dan penutur Jawa dalam komunikasi berbahasa inggris. Dalam konteks perbedaan dialektika etnis di sekolah-sekolah Indonesia. Alasan peneliti mengambil penelitian ini adalah: Seringkali penutur Jawa maupun penutur Madura terjadi salah tafsir atau miskomunikasi Ketika berkomunikasi terutama komunikasi dalam Bahasa inggris. Data yang diambil adalah data online kuesionair yang di sebarkan ke 200 partisipan yang tersebar di beberapa daerah diantaranya: Pasuruan, Lumajang dan Jember. Hasil dari perhitungan kuantitatif menunjukkan bahwa persepsi penutur Jawa terhadap lawan tutur Madura sebesar 2118, sedangkan persepsi penutur Madura sebesar 2576. Jika ditabulasikan menjadi 60% (kategori netral). Dari data dan hasil tersebut maka baik penutur Jawa maupun penutur Madura tidak terlalu bermasalah tentang dialektika satu sama lain.

Kata Kunci: *Persepsi; Dialek Jawa, Dialek Madura; Percakapan Bahasa Inggris*

E-ISSN: 2621-9158
P-ISSN:2356-0401

*Correspondence:
wahyuderajad19@gmail.com

Submitted: 9 September 2023
Approved: 27 Mei 2024
Published: 4 June 2024

Citation:
Abd.Syakur., Sudrajad, W., Sulistyaningsih, & Musyarofah, L. (2024). The Perception between Javanese and Madurese speaker toward their dialects in English conversation. *Celtic: A Journal of Culture, English Language Teaching, Literature and Linguistics, 11(1), 56-72.* Doi: 10.22219/celtic.v11i1.29096

INTRODUCTION

Recognizing a language entails grasping its cultural dimensions. According to (Chinh, 2013)the traditional emphasis in English language education has typically centered on the cultures of English-speaking nations. However, the rise of English as an international language (EIL) has resulted in significant shifts in English language teaching (ELT) methods. Instead of solely relying on native speaker proficiency and the target culture, contemporary ELT now strives to nurture learners into intercultural communicators in today's globalized world (Whisenand et al., 2006) as cited by (ALQAHTANI, 2015). Given the essential need to incorporate diverse cultures into ELT to equip students as effective intercultural communicators, the attitudes of students towards this matter hold considerable importance (Hasanah et al., 2019).

Within ethnically diverse Indonesian schools, certain students who use Javanese and Madurese languages may face challenges when participating in discussions, as reported by (Metin yurtbasi, n.d.)and referenced by(Ito, 2019). This observation pertains to the researcher's findings within the English conversation class:

JS: hi, I hope you are fine. By the way where do you want to go for the next holiday? (/haɪ/, /aɪ/ /həʊp/ /juː/ /ɑː/ /faɪn./ /baɪ/ /də/ /weɪ/ /weə/ /duː/ /juː/ /wɒnt / /tuː/ /gɔ/ /fɔː/ /də/ /nɛks/ / ˈhɒlədeɪ /?)

MS: I am good. Wow, I went to go to Ngebel lake, do you know Ngebel lake? (/aɪ/ /æm/ /gʊd./ /waʊ/, /aɪ/ /wɛntuː/ /gɔ/ /tu/ /ŋəbellɛk,/ /duː/ /juː/ /nɔ/ /ŋəbellɛk?/)

JS: What is ngebellek? (/wɒt/ /ɪz/ /**ŋəbəllɛk**/)

MS: (just silent and takes smartphone then searches for Ngebel Lake)

JS: it is great. The location is in Ponorogo, East java. Is it right? (/ɪt/ /ɪz/ / greɪt./ /ðə/ /lɔkesəɪn/ /ɪn/ /Pɔnɔrɔgɔ/, /iːst/ /ˈʤɑːvə/. /ɪz/ /ɪt/ /raɪt/?)

MS: yes, it is right. How do you know it? (/jɛs/, /ɪt/ /ɪz/ /raɪt/. /haʊ/ /duː/ /juː/ /kenɔw/ /ɪt?/)

JS: of course, I know it. Because my mother is from Ponorogo, and I ever went to Ngebel. (/ɒv/ /kɔːrs/, /aɪ/ /nəʊ/ /ɪt./ /bɪˈkɒuz/ /maɪ/ /mʌðər/ /ɪz/ /frɒm/ /Pɔnɔrɔgɔ/, / ænd/ /aɪ/ /ɛvə/ /wɛnt/ /tuː/ /ŋəbəl/.)

MS: I see, do you won to go with me there? (/aɪ/ /siː/, /duː/ /juː/ /wɔntuː/ /gəʊ/ /wɪð/ /miː/ /der?/)

JS: okay, I will akompany you to go there. Please contact me if you will go there. (/əʊ/ˈ/keɪ/, /aɪ/ /wɪl/ /əˈkʌmpəni/ /juː/ /tuː/ /gəʊ/ /ðer/. /pliːz/ ˈ/kɒntak/ /miː/ /ɪf/ /juː/ /wɪl/ /gəʊder./)

MS: thank you so much, I hope we will be happy. How about your next holiday? (/θæŋk/ /juː/ /səʊ/ /mʌʧ/, /aɪ/ /həʊp/ /wiː/ /wɪl/ /ˈhæpi/. /haʊ/ /əˈbaʊt/ /jɔː/ /nɛkst/ /ˈhɒlədeɪ/?)

JS: I want to go to Situbondo. Visit my grandfather house. (/aɪ/ /wɒnt/ /tuː/ /gəʊ/ tuː/ /Situbɔndɔ/. /ˈvɪzɪt/ /maɪ/ /ˈgrænd.fɑːðə/ /haʊs/)

MS: What will you do in Situbondo? (/ wɔːt / /wɪl/ /juː/ /duː/ /ɪn/ /Situbɔn.ndɔ/?)

JS: I will go to Pasir putih beach and play with a thousand sand. (/aɪ/ /wɪl/ /gəʊ/ /tuː/pasɪr putɪ/ /biːʧ/ /ænd/ /pleɪ/ /wɪð/ /ə/ /ˈθaʊzənd/ /sænd/.)

MS: It sounds good. Okay, thank you I hope we will be happy. (/ɪt/ /saʊndz/ /gʊd/. /ˈəʊˈkeɪ/, /θæŋk/ /juː/ /aɪ/ /həʊp/ /wiː/ /wɪl/ /ˈhæpi/.)

JS: Okay see you. Have a nice day. (ˈ/əʊ/ˈ/keɪ/ /siː/ /juː/. /hæv/ /ə/ / naɪs / /deɪ/.)

As seen in the conversation above (JS) for Javanese speaker (MS) for Madurese speaker most errors occur when student inaccuracy mostly occurs because students pronounce the words as they are written. There was a lack of perception when Madurese students produced ‘Ngebel lake’ it should be the word Ngebel and Lake being apart but the Madurese students saying ‘**ŋəbellɛk**’ indicates that Madurese mother tongue interference

of articulation and made a misperception. This phenomenon is related to (Davis et al., 2009) as cited by (Fauzi & Puspitorini, 2018) theories. The Madurese licit syllable roots when consonant meets consonant sometimes any pressure and it sounds like a double syllable.

As pointed out by (Ramadhani & Poedjiastutie, 2020) they may face difficulties in effectively communicating during conversations, which could lead to potential misunderstandings or problems. This situation arises when the speaker struggles to use words, idioms, dialects, phrases, or a combination of linguistic elements appropriately. (Labov, 2006)argues that "all learners of a foreign or second language employ strategies when processing new information and performing tasks in language classrooms, whether consciously or subconsciously."

The lack of awareness about the linguistic backgrounds of various racial and tribal groups, (Yavuz, 2012) as cited by (Dewi et al., 2020) argues that often resulting in racism, frequently leads to conflicts among these groups. These conflicts can have repercussions in various areas, including the development of the teaching and learning process. The meaning of diversity as defined by(Millen & Cobb, 2010)as referenced by(Wallace & Buil, 2023)argues that plays a significant role in shaping relationships. This statement emphasizes the notion that organizations can harness their potential and mitigate challenges related to diversity.

This pattern is often observed by researchers in multicultural English classes where students have different primary languages or mother tongues (Guo et al., 2013) Indeed, these students encounter difficulties in understanding English dialogues. Despite facing challenges in participating in conversations, these students don't remain silent; instead, they make physical gestures to indicate their intended speaker, as mentioned by (Hasanah et al., 2019). Hasanah also pointed out that when interlocutors find themselves in a situation where they do not understand each other, they may need to "negotiate and establish some common ground before continuing the interaction."

To address these communication issues between interlocutors, it is essential to employ various strategies to comprehend and convey the message of the conversation. (Ito, 2019). The growing demand for effective English communication skills worldwide has led to an increased need for English instruction, which serves as a valuable tool for promoting genuine communication and encouraging both the use of the target language and learner autonomy among language students (Fadilah, 2018).

(Kyndt et al., 2011) argues that students encounter challenges in English production due to their unique backgrounds, including diverse ethnic origins, upbringing within different family cultures, exposure to local languages, limited exposure to international contexts, and uncertainty about improving their English proficiency. Culture plays a significant role in influencing the process of learning and teaching English. Cultural elements contribute to students' sense of identity and self-concept, influencing their attitudes, self-esteem, social interactions, language usage, and other behavioral patterns(Reszy & Yuli, 2013). The ethnic and cultural backgrounds of students have a substantial impact on their English language learning abilities. When students have access to learning materials that align with their cultural background, their comprehension is higher compared to situations where the content is culturally incompatible (Faturrachman & Sulaiman, 2020). These variations can affect students' proficiency in engaging in English discussions in the classroom or pursuing English-related careers. Students often use Bahasa as means to bridge communication with individuals from different racial or ethnic backgrounds and primarily employ the local language within the context of their local knowledge.The study emphasized the relationship between these interferences and the

nature of both Javanese and Madurese languages, The text mentions that using materials aligned with students' cultural backgrounds can enhance comprehension.

However, it doesnot discuss the availability and effectiveness of such materials or the potential gaps in creating or providing culturally relevant teaching resources.It revealed that students often experienced misconceptions in communication and learning when dealing with foreign languages, emphasizing the distinctions between learning a foreign language and mastering one's native tongue. This research aims to investigate and analyze how Javanese and Madurese speakers employ their respective dialects in English discourse, specifically focusing on age, gender, and mother tongue, while disregarding factors such as nationality, religion, socioeconomic status, and social standing. The study also centers on the perceptions of both college and high school students to account for variations among these groups. Hopefully, students can improve their pronunciation, accent, stress, emotion, motivation, exposure, attitude, instruction, and intonation in English, and they can improve their personalities.

METHOD

The primary objective of this study is to investigate how Javanese individuals perceive the dialects spoken by Madurese speakers during English conversations and conversely, how Madurese individuals perceive the dialects spoken by Javanese speakers during English conversations. Data for this research was collected through questionnaires, and the outcomes were assessed through quantitative analysis. Quantitative analysis typically involves converting measurements into numerical values. In survey research, for instance, attitudes are frequently evaluated using rating scales, as explained by (Creswell, 2014)and cited by (Syakur et al., 2020).The study involved a minimum of 200 participants, including students from junior high schools, senior/vocational high schools, and both state and private universities. These students have been studying English since their primary school years and have accumulated experience in engaging in English conversations.

To gain validity and reliability, the researcher employed rater agreement, which consists of three raters, to achieve validity and reliability questionnaires. The outcome of the rater agreement will be assessed using Fleiss kappa. Fleiss' kappa (Fleiss et al., 1986) as cited by (Gwet, 2021)is a measure of inter-rater agreement used to determine the level of agreement between two or more raters (also known as "judges" or "observers") when the method of assessment, known as the response variable, is measured on a categorical scale. The kappa squaring relates conceptually to the degree of data correctness owing to congruence among the data collectors(Zhao et al., 2022).

The data source comprises unprocessed raw data, which has not undergone any transformation to become useful information. In this study, the data source pertains to the perceptions of Javanese and Madurese speakers regarding their respective dialects in English conversations. To gather primary data, an online questionnaire was administered through Google Forms, containing inquiries about the perceptions of Madurese and Javanese speakers. The participants included 200 students, ranging from junior high school to undergraduate level, who possessed more than three years of English language knowledge and came from diverse racial backgrounds, particularly Javanese and Madurese speakers.

The questionnaire was structured into two sections. The first section aimed to collect demographic information such as age, gender, educational background, and perceptions (see appendix1). The second section was designed to capture perceptions related to dialect usage. As outlined by(Romaine, 2010), the dialect indicator encompasses

three aspects: pronunciation, grammar, and vocabulary, and these elements were incorporated into the questionnaire (see appendix 2).

A series of questionnaires were distributed to participants, encompassing demographic details such as age, gender, educational background, and perceptions. The demographic data structure is adapted from(Kyndt et al., 2011), featuring age, gender, and mother tongue as the key questionnaire headings. The primary questions in the questionnaires will pertain to participant responses regarding their dialect preferences, while aspects like nationality, religion, socioeconomic status, and other factors weredisregarded. To gauge participant perceptions regarding Madurese and Javanese dialects in English conversations, a Likert scale were employed, assigning interval scores ranging from 1 (no applicability) to 5 (full applicability).

The collected questionnaire data were analyzed by calculating and measuring the frequency and percentage of participant responses, with SPSS 26 serving as the necessary tool for percentage measurement. Subsequently, participant perceptions were categorized by gender, age, and educational level, employing discriminant analysis, specifically canonical discriminant analysis (CDA). CDA represents a set of techniques that identify linear combinations of observed variables maximizing the differentiation of samples into distinct categories, as elucidated by(Rosário et al., 2008). It is designed to utilize the measured variables (as predictor variables) for predicting sample categories (also referred to as grouping variables, or response variables). Discriminant analysis aligns with a class prediction model, as explained by(Cox & Ferry, 1993) as cited by(Singh et al., 2023). Finally, the overall scores of participant responses were tabulated, following the methodology outlined by(Arikunto, 2007) cited by (Pasaribu & Hutabarat, 2023).

FINDINGS

The respondents for the questionnaires primarily consisted of a total of 200 individuals. The distribution of questionnaire responses included 100 students with Javanese as their mother tongue and 100 students with Madurese as their mother tongue. In terms of gender, there were 97 male respondents and 103 female respondents. These respondents were categorized into different educational levels, with 52 participants in junior high school, 64 participants in senior high school, 43 individuals enrolled as undergraduate students, and 41 respondents pursuing postgraduate studies.

Furthermore, the age distribution among the participants was as follows: 52 participants fell within the age range of 12-15 years, 64 individuals were aged between 16-18 years, 47 respondents had an average age of approximately 19-24 years, and 39 participants were aged between 25-41 years. The demographic data utilized in this study was adapted from(Kyndt et al., 2011), as referenced by (Resmini, 2019), focusing on age, gender, and educational background.

The first discussion is about Madurese perceptions of Javanese speakers. The Madurese speaker was 100 respondents connected with 7 statements including dialect points (vocabulary, grammar/syntax, and pronunciation) (Lloyd, 1999)as cited by (Romaine, 2010) as cited by (Kholik et al., 2019), the result of the data was measured by (Sugiyono, 2022). The listwise was explanatory below:

1. Perception by Gender

Among the participants, there were 97 males and 103 females. To break this down further, there were 50 males with Javanese as their mother tongue and 47 males with Madurese as their mother tongue. Additionally, there were 53 females with Javanese as their mother tongue and 50 females with Madurese as their mother tongue. The table below

illustrates the gender-based perceptions of both Javanese and Madurese students regarding various aspects of their dialects, including vocabulary, grammar, and pronunciation.

Table 1. Gender Group Statistic

No	Gender	No. Question	Mean	Listwise (N)
1.	Javanese students' male	Question 1.	4.28	50 participants
		Question 2.	3.84	
		Question 3.	2.74	
		Question 4.	2.72	
		Question 5.	2.40	
		Question 6.	2.44	
		Question 7.	2.28	
2.	Madurese student's male	Question 1.	3.80	47 participants
		Question 2.	3.00	
		Question 3.	2.61	
		Question 4.	2.42	
		Question 5.	2.10	
		Question 6.	2.44	
		Question 7.	2.17	
3.	Javanese student's female	Question 1.	4.69	53 participants
		Question 2.	3.58	
		Question 3.	2.71	
		Question 4.	2.75	
		Question 5.	2.49	
		Question 6.	2.77	
		Question 7.	2.49	
4.	Madurese student's female	Question 1.	4.36	50 participants
		Question 2.	3.04	
		Question 3.	1.68	
		Question 4.	2.32	
		Question 5.	1.88	
		Question 6.	2.28	
		Question 7.	2.12	

Table 1. above presents an analysis of the communication dynamics between Javanese and Madurese students in English conversations, focusing on various aspects, as outlined in the statements.

The table demonstrates that both Javanese and Madurese students frequently engage in English communication with each other (Statement 1). The contribution points reveal that Javanese males scored 4.28 with P>4, Madurese males scored 3.80 with P>3, Javanese females scored 4.69 with P>4, and Madurese females scored 4.36 with P>4. In essence, the measurements surpass both 3 and 4, indicating that both Javanese and Madurese students often contribute to English conversations with each other.

Regarding the clarity of communication in different mother tongues (Statement 2), the table indicates that Javanese males scored 3.84 with P>3, Madurese males scored 3.00 with P=3, Javanese females scored 3.58 with P>3, and Madurese females scored 3.04 with P>3. According to the Likert scale, the scores are around 3, suggesting that communication clarity in English for both Madurese and Javanese students is neutral, meaning it is neither strongly clear nor unclear.

Responses to vocabulary (Statement 3) suggest that both Madurese and Javanese speakers are not clear. The data reveals that Javanese males scored 2.74 with P<3, Madurese

males scored 2.61 with P<3, Javanese females scored 2.71 with P<3, and Madurese females scored 1.68 with P<2. According to the Likert scale, the responses of Javanese males, Madurese males, and Javanese females indicate that vocabulary comprehension when conversing in English with different mother tongues is unclear, while Madurese females scored 1, indicating a significant lack of vocabulary comprehension in English conversations.

Furthermore, in grammar (Statement 4), which is produced by both Javanese and Madurese speakers during English conversations, there is still a degree of misunderstanding. The table shows that Javanese males scored 2.72 with P<3, Madurese males scored 2.42 with P<3, Javanese females scored 2.75 with P<3, and Madurese students scored 2.32 with P<3, where grammar was not emphasized.

Additionally, misperceptions occur when producing vowels (Statement 5) in English conversations, indicating a lack of clarity. The data reveals that Javanese males scored 2.40 with a P value >2, Madurese males scored 2.42 with P>2, Javanese females scored 2.75 with a P value >2, and Madurese females scored 2.12 with P>2. These findings suggest that students tend to pronounce vowels unclearly.

Based on the questionnaire responses, most participants find consonants (Statement 6) pronounced by Javanese or Madurese speakers during English communication unclear. The data shows that Javanese males scored 2.44 with P<3, Madurese males scored 2.44 with P<3, Javanese females scored 2.77 with P<3, and Madurese females scored 2.28 with P<3. The average Likert scale value is 2, indicating disagreement or lack of clarity.

Furthermore, the syllables (Statement 7) produced by Madurese and Javanese speakers are not clear, as indicated by the data. Javanese males scored 2.28 with P<3, Madurese males scored 2.17 with P<3, Javanese females scored 2.49 with P<3, and Madurese females scored 2.12 with P<3. This suggests that syllables produced by Javanese and Madurese speakers lack clarity. Factors influencing word stress may include a lack of pronunciation training and a lack of knowledge about word stress rules. This phenomenon could be linked to the absence of specific stress placement rules in multi-syllabic words in both Javanese and Madurese. Consequently, students tend to pronounce syllables carelessly and place stress where they find it easiest to pronounce.

2. Perception by Age

Regarding the participants' age distribution, there were 52 individuals aged between 12-15 years, 64 participants in the 16-18 years age range, 47 individuals with an average age of 19-24 years, and 39 participants between 25-41 years old. The table below illustrates the perceptions of the respondents.

Table 2 Age Group Statistic

No	Age	No. Question	Mean	Listwise (N)
1.	12-15 years	Question 1.	4.48	52 participants
		Question 2.	2.57	
		Question 3.	3.76	
		Question 4.	3.48	
		Question 5.	3.84	
		Question 6.	3.63	
		Question 7.	3.94	
2.	16-18 years	Question 1.	4.57	64 participants
		Question 2.	2.77	
		Question 3.	3.85	

		Question 4. Question 5. Question 6. Question 7.	3.35 4.0 3.85 3.88	
3.	19-24 years	Question 1. Question 2. Question 3. Question 4. Question 5. Question 6. Question 7.	4.55 2.82 3.17 3.0 3.1 3.1 3.4	47 participants
4.	>25 years	Question 1. Question 2. Question 3. Question 4. Question 5. Question 6. Question 7.	4.55 2.47 2.42 2.44 2.84 2.57 2.73	39 participants

The table presented above provides insights into the communication patterns and perceptions of students in various age groups when engaging in English conversations. For students aged 12-15 years, it is evident that they frequently engage in English conversations (Statement 1), with a score of 4.48 and P>4. However, the clarity of communication between Javanese and Madurese interlocutors is lacking, as indicated by a score of 2.57 with P<3. Vocabulary usage is not ideal but understandable, with a score of 3.76 and P>3. Regarding grammar, vowels, consonants, and intonation distribution, the scores are neutral, suggesting that they are not excellent but still comprehensible. The measurements for grammar, vowels, consonants, and intonation are 3.84 (P>3), 3.63 (P>3), around 3.63 (P>3), and 3.94 (P>3), respectively.

Moving on to respondents aged 16-18 years, they often communicate with individuals from different backgrounds (Madurese or Javanese), scoring 4.57 with P>4 in Statement 1. However, there are some communication challenges, with a P value of 2.77 (P<3). Vowel distribution is clear at 4.0 with P=4. Vocabulary, grammar, consonant, and intonation distribution are clear but occasionally misunderstood, with average measurements around 3. Specifically, intonation scores 3.88 (P>3), grammar scores 3.35 (P>3), and both vocabulary and consonant distribution score 3.85 (P>3).

The age group of 19-24 years, respondents often communicate as interlocutors with different mother tongues (Javanese/Madurese), as evidenced by a score of 4.55 with P>4 in Statement 1. However, communication is not always clear, with a P value of 2.82 (P<3). Vocabulary, grammar, vowels, and intonation distribution scores hover around 3, indicating that they are understandable but occasionally unclear. Specifically, grammar scores 3.0 (P=3), intonation scores 3.4 (P>3), and vocabulary mastery, vowels, and consonant distribution score 3.1 (P>3).

For respondents aged over 25 years, both perception and communication towards Madurese and Javanese speakers are not clear. The communication they have conducted scores 2.47 with P<3. Vocabulary, grammar, vowels, consonant, and intonation distribution also have P values <3. Specifically, vocabulary scores 2.42 with P<3, grammar scores 2.44 with P<3, vowel distribution scores 2.57 with P>2, consonant distribution scores 2.57 with P>3, and intonation distribution scores 2.7 with P>2. However, their qualifications for perception are still high, with a score of 4.55 and P>4, indicating that they frequently engage

in communication with individuals from different mother tongue backgrounds (Javanese/Madurese).

3.Perception by Educational Level

The participants' perceptions are categorized based on their educational levels, as indicated in the demographic data. The data reveals that there were 42 students from junior high school, 61 respondents from senior high school, 48 participants from undergraduate programs, and 49 respondents from post-graduate programs. The findings regarding the participants' perceptions related to dialects are elaborated upon below:

Table 3 Educational Level Statistics

No	Education level	No. Question	Mean	Listwise (N)
1.	Junior High School	Question 1.	4.59	42 participants
		Question 2.	2.59	
		Question 3.	3.52	
		Question 4.	3.81	
		Question 5.	3.78	
		Question 6.	3.50	
		Question 7.	3.90	
2.	Senior High school	Question 1.	4.47	61 participants
		Question 2.	2.47	
		Question 3.	3.68	
		Question 4.	3.42	
		Question 5.	3.81	
		Question 6.	3.45	
		Question 7.	3.81	
3.	Undergraduate students	Question 1.	4.47	48 participants
		Question 2.	2.66	
		Question 3.	4.0	
		Question 4.	3.50	
		Question 5.	4.0	
		Question 6.	3.79	
		Question 7.	3.93	
4.	Post-graduate students’	Question 1.	4.59	49 participants
		Question 2.	2.59	
		Question 3.	3.61	
		Question 4.	3.46	
		Question 5.	3.81	
		Question 6.	3.63	
		Question 7.	3.65	

The data presented in the table above provides insights into the perceptions of students across different educational levels regarding dialects in English conversations: In junior high school, it is evident that participants frequently engage in conversations in different mother tongues (Javanese/Madurese), scoring 4.59 with P>4. However, there is a lack of clarity or occasional miscommunication when delivering messages in English, with a communication clearance score of 2.59 and P<3. In terms of vocabulary, grammar, vowels, consonants, and intonation distribution, the scores hover around 3. Specifically, the delivered vocabulary scores 3.52 with P>3, grammar scores 3.81 with P>3, vowels score 3.78 with P>3, consonants score 3.5 with P>3, and intonation scores 3.9 with P<4.

Senior high school students' perceptions towards Madurese/Javanese speakers' dialects are neutral, averaging a score of 3. Specifically, vocabulary scores 3.68 with P>3,

grammar scores 3.42 with P>3, vowels and intonation distribution scores 3.81 with P<4, and consonants score 3.45 with P>3. Students who often engage in conversations with different mother tongues report a high score of 4.47 with P>4, indicating that they frequently communicate with others. However, they also note occasional communication challenges, with a communication clearance score of 2.47 and P>2.

Among undergraduate students, occasional miscommunication in English conversations between Javanese and Madurese speakers is observed, as indicated by a communication clearance score of 2.66 with P<3. Vocabulary, vowels, and consonant distribution are rated neutral with an average score of 3. Specifically, vocabulary scores 3.5 with P>3, vowels score 3.79 with P<4, and consonants score 3.93 with P<4. Grammar distribution is clear with a P value of 4.0. Students who often engage in conversations with both Javanese and Madurese speakers rate their experiences highly, with a score of 4.59 and P>4.

Post-graduate students, who often communicate in English with Javanese or Madurese speakers, rate their experiences highly, with a score of 4.59 and P>4. However, they also note occasional communication challenges, with a communication clearance score of 2.59 and P<3. Vocabulary, grammar, vowels, consonants, and intonation distribution are rated as neutral with an average score of 3. Specifically, vocabulary scores 3.61 with P>3, grammar scores 3.46 with P>3, vowel distribution scores 3.81, consonant distribution scores 3.63 with P<4, and intonation scores 3.65 with P<4.

In summary, this study aimed to gain a deeper understanding of Madurese students' perceptions of Javanese speakers in English conversations and vice versa. The researcher administered questionnaires to 200 students spanning from junior high school to post-graduate levels.

Table 4. Madurese Perception

No.	Statements	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree
1.	I often communicate in English with colleagues from different mother tongues (Javanese)	60	37	3		
2.	I can communicate in English with colleagues of different mother tongues (Javanese).	4	19	31	32	14
3.	The vocabulary used by a person who speaks a different mother tongue is very familiar and easy to understand.	17	17	26	8	32
4.	The grammar of the interlocutor who speaks a different mother tongue is very good and clear.	5	42	41	10	2
5.	The interlocutor (Javanese) is very clear when pronouncing vowels.	20	55	20	5	

6.	The interlocutor (Javanese) is very clear when pronouncing consonants.	8	54	31	6	1
7.	The syllable or intonation of the interlocutor (Javanese) is very clear and easy to understand.	14	14	22	6	44

Total N= 100 participants
P value= Nx100%

Based on the data presented in the table above, the perceptions of Madurese respondents regarding various statements are as follows: In response to Statement No. 1, it is revealed that 97% of Madurese respondents communicate with Javanese speakers every day, 37% often communicate, and 3% are neutral or do not often engage in such conversations. This data indicates that the majorities of respondents frequently converse with individuals of different mother tongues. The findings are reliable and provide context for subsequent statements.

Concerning Madurese responses to Statement No. 2, out of 100 respondents, only 4 individuals expressed a strong level of clarity when communicating in English with Javanese speakers, 19 respondents found it clear, 31 had a neutral perception, 32 individuals found it unclear, and 14 respondents considered it strongly unclear. This implies that 46% of respondents had clarity levels below P<3, and 31% had a perception of P=3. In summary, Madurese participants generally did not find conversations in English with Javanese speakers to be clear.

Statement No. 3, based on responses from Madurese participants, reveals that 34% strongly agreed, 26% agreed, 26% were neutral, 8% disagreed, and 32% strongly disagreed with the statement. This indicates that 40% of respondents had a perception of P<3, 26% had a perception of P=3, and 34% had a perception of P>3. The data was collected from 100 Madurese participants, suggesting that a significant portion found the vocabulary delivered by Javanese speakers in English conversations to be unclear.

Regarding responses to Statement No. 4, the data shows that 47 participants strongly agreed, 42 agreed, 41 were neutral, 10 disagreed, and 2 strongly disagreed. This implies that 47% agreed with a perception of P>3, 41% had a perception of P=3, and 12% had a perception of P<3. These results suggest that the grammar used by Javanese speakers was generally perceived as good and clear by Madurese respondents.

The response to Statement No. 5, 75 respondents agreed, 20 were neutral, and 5 disagreed. This means that the majorities of Madurese respondents found the delivery of vowels by Javanese speakers to be clear, with 75% agreeing (P>3), 20% being neutral (P=3), and 5% disagreeing (P<3).

For Statement No. 6, Madurese respondents generally gave high scores to Javanese speakers when producing consonants in English conversations. Specifically, 62 respondents agreed (P>3), 31 were neutral (P=3), and 7 were not clear or disagreed (P<3). This data indicates that there were no significant issues when Javanese speakers produced consonants during English conversations, with the majority perceiving it as clear.

Finally, in response to Statement No. 7, Madurese respondents found Javanese syllables delivered in English conversations to be unclear. The data reveals that 28% agreed (P>3), 22% were neutral (P=3), and 50% disagreed (P<3) with the statement.

These findings provide valuable insights into the perceptions of Madurese respondents regarding various aspects of English conversations with Javanese speakers.

Table 5 Javanese Perception

No.	Statements	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree
1.	I often communicate in English with colleagues from different mother tongues (Madurese)	51	49			
2.	I can communicate in English with colleagues of different mother tongues (Madurese).	4	13	28	34	21
3.	The vocabulary used by a person who speaks a different mother tongue is very familiar and easy to understand.	8	13	18	36	25
4.	The grammar of an interlocutor who speaks a different mother tongue is very good and clear.	2	17	15	55	11
5.	The interlocutor (Madurese) is very clear when pronouncing vowels.	20	47	26	5	2
6.	The interlocutor (Madurese) is very clear when pronouncing consonants.	11	37	47	5	
7.	The syllable or intonation of the interlocutor (Madurese) is very clear and easy to understand.	6	11	13	46	24

Total N= 100 participants
P value= Nx100%

Based on the provided data, it can be observed that Javanese individuals frequently engage in English conversations with Madurese speakers. Specifically, 51 participants communicate with them daily, while 49 often engage in such conversations. This data demonstrates that all 100% of Javanese respondents often communicate with Madurese speakers in English, making it a reliable foundation for subsequent statements.

Regarding the responses to Statement No. 2, it is evident that Javanese respondents do not find conversations in English with Madurese speakers clear. Out of the 100 respondents, only 4 found it strongly clear, 13 found it clear, 28 had a neutral perception, 34 did not find it clear, and 21 found it strongly not clear. This indicates that 17 participants (13+4) perceived it as clear, 28 had a neutral perception, and 55 participants (34+21) did not find it clear. The percentages indicate that 17% had a perception of P>3, 28% had a perception of P=3, and 55% found it not clear with P<3.

Moving on to the Javanese perceptions regarding Statement No. 3, 8 participants strongly agreed, 13 disagreed, 18 had a neutral stance, 36 did not agree, and 25 strongly disagreed. This suggests that Javanese participants sometimes struggle with understanding the vocabulary when Madurese speakers deliver an English conversation. Specifically, 21 participants agreed, 18 were neutral, and 66 participants (36+25) did not find it clear. The

breakdown of scores reveals that 21% had a perception of P>3, 18% had a perception of P=3, and 66% found it not clear with P<3.

Concerning English grammar produced by Madurese speakers (Statement No. 4), Javanese participants provided scores of 19% with P>3, 15% with P=3, and 66% with P<3. In detail, 2 individuals strongly agreed, 17 agreed, 15 were neutral, 55 disagreed, and 11 strongly disagreed.

Statement No. 5 indicates that Javanese participants can understand Madurese vowels when they are produced in English conversations. The data shows that 67 participants (20+47) had a perception of P>3, 26 had a perception of P=3, and 7 (5+2) found it not clear with P<3. The percentages reveal that 67% had a perception of P>3, 26% had a perception of P=3, and 7% found it not clear with P<3.

Responses to Statement No. 6 suggest that Javanese respondents have no issues with Madurese speakers when it comes to producing consonants in English conversations. The data shows that 48 participants (37+11) had a perception of P>3, 47 participants had a perception of P=3, and 5 participants found it not clear with P<3. In terms of percentages, 48% had a perception of P>3, 47% had a perception of P=3, and only 5% found it not clear.

Lastly, in response to Statement No. 7, Javanese participants found Madurese syllables to be problematic. The data indicates that 17 participants (11+6) had a perception of P>3, 13 had a perception of P=3, and 70 participants found it not clear with P<3. In terms of percentages, 17% had a perception of P>3, 13% had a perception of P=3, and 70% found it not clear.

These findings highlight that the main challenge for Javanese participants when understanding Madurese speakers lies in the pronunciation of Madurese syllables, with 70% of participants finding it not clear.

DISCUSSION

The researcher spread out the online questionnaires to the 200 respondents including 100 Javanese respondents and 100 Madurese respondents, the questionnaires were adopted by (Kyndt et al., 2011). Then, to make a conclusion the data were analyzed by (Sugiyono, 2022) the theories is an overall criteria score is: the highest score x total statements x respondents, in this measurement overall highest score is 3500. In this section, the score gathered were 2118 for Javanese speaker perception towards Madurese speakers were 2118:3500. According to (Arikunto, 2007) as cited by (Pasaribu & Hutabarat, 2023). The tabulated scorewas 60% according to the criterium of measurement was a continuum categorized as:

700 (0%)	1400 (25%)	2100 (50%		2800 (75%)	3500 (100%)
SD	D	N	2118	A	SA

SD: Strongly disagree D: Disagree N: Neutral
A: Agree SA: Strongly Agree
The Highest score criteria x N total instrument x Total respondents

The score of 2118 is an interval categorized between neutral and agree but nearest from neutral. For another conclusion was:
1. If all participants strongly disagree
2. If participants agree 25%

3. If participants agree 50%
4. If participants agree 75%
5. If participants agree 100%

The percentage of measurements for Javanese perception towards Madurese dialects in English conversation is 60%, indicating that the perception of Javanese individuals towards Madurese dialects, as assessed through the 7 questionnaires, falls into the neutral category but leans towards agreement. This suggests that Javanese respondents do not encounter significant issues when dealing with Madurese speaker dialects during English conversations.

Conversely, Madurese responses towards Javanese dialects yielded a percentage of 73% (2576 out of 3500), placing them on the continuum as follows:

700	1400	2100		2800	3500
(0%)	(25%)	(50%)		(75%)	(100%)
SD	D	N	2576	A	SA

The score of 2576 was categorized as an interval between neutral and agree but nearest to agree. Then the percentage of 73% is 3 nearest of 4. It indicates the Madurese participants agree with 7 statements of the questionnaires, the Madurese respondents did not have a problem with Javanese speakers' dialects when conducted in English conversation.

This study delved into the differences between learning a foreign language and mastering one's native tongue, focusing on Javanese and Madurese speakers. Despite the inherent distinctions between acquiring a second language and fully grasping one's mother tongue, both groups in the study were neutrally categorized. Interestingly, the research did not uncover any significant misperceptions regarding this classification. This exploration sheds light on the complexities of language acquisition and proficiency, highlighting how individuals from diverse linguistic backgrounds navigate the processes of learning and mastering different languages. Understanding these nuances is crucial for comprehending the intricacies of language development and usage within various cultural contexts.

This study contrasted by (Kholik et al., 2019) that found as a consequence of the study, pupils experience communication and learning process misconceptions. Learning foreign languages/regions (second languages) is distinct from mastering one's speech. The qualities of learning a foreign language differ from those of learning one's mother tongue.

CONCLUSION

Based on the data from Javanese respondents, the score continuum reveals 2118 for Javanese perception, whereas Madurese perception stands at 2576. With Javanese perception accounting for 60% of the measurements, it suggests that Javanese respondents maintain a neutral standpoint, slightly leaning towards agreement, regarding their perception of Madurese dialects as evaluated through the 7 questionnaires. This implies that Javanese respondents generally do not encounter issues when dealing with Madurese speakers' dialects during English conversations.

On the other hand, Madurese perception, totaling 2576, falls within the spectrum between neutral and agreement, tending more towards agreement. With 73% of the measurements aligning with a rating of 3 out of 4, it suggests that Madurese participants generally agree with the 7 statements in the questionnaires. This indicates that Madurese

respondents do not face significant difficulties when conversing with Javanese speakers using their dialects in English conversations.

Considering the background information provided, the researcher concludes that based on dictionary definitions, both Javanese and Madurese speakers may exhibit phonetic inaccuracies when conducting conversations in English. However, after distributing the questionnaires and conducting measurements, the results indicate that both Javanese and Madurese respondents do not encounter problems with each other's dialects. It would be unfair to attribute phonetic inaccuracy in the Javanese or Madurese mother tongue as a predominant factor contributing to interference. Moreover, differences in research methodologies and data collection tools utilized in this study could hinder the ability to make direct comparisons.

It appears unjust to claim that inaccuracy in the Javanese or Madurese mother tongue predominantly contribute to interference. Furthermore, the dissimilarity in research methodology and data collection tools utilized in this study could impede the ability to make comparisons.

Hopefully, by knowing the perception of students in a diversity of mother tongues, the teacher or lecture can make open new views and new ways to approach the teaching-learning process, and also by knowing the students' perception, the learning goal can be raised.

REFERENCES

ALQAHTANI, M. (2015). The importance of vocabulary in language learning and how to be taught. *International Journal of Teaching and Education*, *III*(3), 21–34. https://doi.org/10.20472/te.2015.3.3.002

Arikunto, S. (2007). *prosedur penelitian suatu pendekatan praktik* (sixth). rineka cipta.

Chinh, N. D. (2013). Cultural diversity in english language teaching: Learners' voices. *English Language Teaching*, *6*(4), 1–7. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v6n4p1

Cox, T. F., & Ferry, G. (1993). Discriminant analysis using non-metric multidimensional scaling. *Pattern Recognition*, *26*(1), 145–153. https://doi.org/10.1016/0031-3203(93)90096-F

Creswell, jhon. w. (2014). *Research design : qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (A. Hutchinson (ed.); 4th ed.). SAGE Publications Asia-Pacific Pte. Ltd. https://fe.unj.ac.id/wp-content/uploads/2019/08/Research-Design_Qualitative-Quantitative-and-Mixed-Methods-Approaches.pdf

Davis, T. M., Shepherd, B., & Zwiefelhofer, T. (2009). Reviewing for exams: do crossword puzzle help in the success of student learning?. The Journal of Effective Teaching 9/2: 4-10. *The Journal of Effective Teaching*, *9*(3), 4–10. http://digital.library.wisc.edu/1793/34692

Dewi, M. K., Fahira, R., & Indriyati, S. (2020). Multiracial (Subrace Austronesian and Melanesian) Student Perception towards Diversity in Indonesia. *… Competitive Advantage (SCA)*, 404–423.

Fadilah, E. (2018). Willingness To Communicate in L2 By Using. *Jeels*, *5*(1), 23–48.

Faturrachman, Y., & Sulaiman, D. (2020). How Rural Instructor Implements English for Specific Purposes (Esp): Instructor'S Perception. *Celtic: A Journal of Culture, English Language Teaching, Literature and Linguistics*, *7*(1), 94. https://doi.org/10.22219/celtic.v7i1.9937

Fauzi, A. I., & Puspitorini, D. (2018). Dialect and Identity: A Case Study of Javanese Use in WhatsApp and Line. *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science*, *175*(1). https://doi.org/10.1088/1755-1315/175/1/012111

Fleiss, J. L., Williams, J. B. W., & Dubro, A. F. (1986). The logistic regression analysis of psychiatric data. *Journal of Psychiatric Research*, *20*(3), 195–209. https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-3956(86)90003-8

Guo, T., Liu, F., Chen, B., & Li, S. (2013). Inhibition of non-target languages in multilingual word

production: Evidence from Uighur–Chinese–English trilinguals. *Acta Psychologica*, *143*(3), 277–283. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.ACTPSY.2013.04.002

Gwet, K. L. (2021). Large-sample variance of Fleiss generalized kappa. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, *81*(4), 781–790.

Hasanah, L., Pradina, S., Hadita, A., & Putri, W. C. (2019). Sociolinguistic Influence in the Use of English as a Second Language (ESL) Classroom: Seeing from Onovughe's (2012) Perspective. *Elsya : Journal of English Language Studies*, *1*(1), 28–32. https://doi.org/10.31849/elsya.v1i1.2538

Ito, Y. (2019). Japanese EFL learners' perceptions of different accents in spoken English. *Australian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *2*(2), 61–82. https://doi.org/10.29140/ajal.v2n2.160

Kholik, K., Ridwan, M., & Hadi, S. (2019). Java Language in the Madurese Cross Culture. *ISLLAC : Journal of Intensive Studies on Language, Literature, Art, and Culture*, *3*(2), 190–200. http://journal2.um.ac.id/index.php/jisllac/article/view/10226/4659

Kyndt, E., Dochy, F., Struyven, K., & Cascallar, E. (2011). The perception of workload and task complexity and its influence on students' approaches to learning: A study in higher education. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, *26*(3), 393–415. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10212-010-0053-2

Labov, W. (2006). A sociolinguistic perspective on sociophonetic research. *Journal of Phonetics*, *34*(4), 500–515. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.WOCN.2006.05.002

Lloyd, M. (1999). On negotiating bodies and ecolinguistics: A response to Coupland et al. (1998). *Journal of Pragmatics*, *31*(9), 1231–1236. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(99)00043-0

Metin yurtbasi. (n.d.). *Teaching Sentential Intonation Through Proverbs - ScienceDirect*. Retrieved April 12, 2023, from https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1877042812019866

Millen, L., & Cobb, S. (2010). The Development of Educational Collaborative Virtual Environments for Children with Autism Introduction : Technology and Children with Autism Design for ASD experience within VIRART. *Interaction Studies*, *March 2015*, 7. http://www-edc.eng.cam.ac.uk/cwuaat/%0Ahttp://geniiz.com/wp-content/uploads/2012/01/11.pdf%0Ahttps://www.researchgate.net/publication/266874791_The_Development_of_Educational_Collaborative_Virtual_Environments_for_Children_with_Autism

Pasaribu, A. G., & Hutabarat, E. (2023). *Efforts to Enhance Student Learning Interest Through Combinations Learning Conventional Unconventional in Religious College Education*. *August*. https://doi.org/10.14428/thl.v7i1.6518

Ramadhani, W., & Poedjiastutie, D. (2020). Academic Culture Barriers Faced By English Department Students Joining International Internship Program. *Celtic: A Journal of Culture, English Language Teaching, Literature and Linguistics*, *7*(1), 83. https://doi.org/10.22219/celtic.v7i1.12533

Resmini, S. (2019). Efl Students' Perception Towards the Use of Bahasa Indonesia in an English Classroom. *ELTIN JOURNAL, Journal of English Language Teaching in Indonesia*, *7*(1), 12. https://doi.org/10.22460/eltin.v7i1.p12-22

Reszy, H. Y., & Yuli, T. (2013). Student of English Language Teaching Program of FBS UNP graduated on March 2013 Supervisor, visor, lecturer of FBS Universitas Negeri Padang. *Journal of English Language Teaching*, *1*(2), 1–10.

Romaine, S. (2010). *Society, Language* (third edit). oxford university press.

Rosário, M. F., Silva, M. A. N., Coelho, A. A. D., Savino, V. J. M., & Dias, C. T. S. (2008). Canonical discriminant analysis applied to broiler chicken performance. *Animal*, *2*(3), 419–424. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1751731107001012

Singh, G., Pal, Y., & Dahiya, A. K. (2023). Classification of Power Quality Disturbances using Linear Discriminant Analysis. *Applied Soft Computing*, *138*, 110181. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.ASOC.2023.110181

Sugiyono. (2022). *Metode penelitian pendidikan : (pendekatan kuantitatif, kualitatif dan R & D)* (Setiyawami (ed.); 3rd ed.). alfabeta. https://digilib.unigres.ac.id/index.php?p=show_detail&id=43

Syakur, A., Susilo, T. A. B., Wike, W., & Ahmadi, R. (2020). Sustainability of Communication, Organizational Culture, Cooperation, Trust and Leadership Style for Lecturer Commitments in Higher Education. *Budapest International Research and Critics Institute (BIRCI-Journal): Humanities and Social Sciences*, *3*(2), 1325–1335. https://doi.org/10.33258/birci.v3i2.980

Wallace, E., & Buil, I. (2023). Antecedents and consequences of conspicuous green behavior on social media: Incorporating the virtual self-identity into the theory of planned behavior. *Journal of Business Research*, *157*, 113549. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JBUSRES.2022.113549

Whisenand, T. G., Grove, J. L., & Dunphy, S. M. (2006). Accelerating Student Learning of Technology Terms : The Crossword Puzzle Exercise. *Journal of Information Systems Education*, *21*(2), 141–149.

Yavuz, F. (2012). The Attitudes of English Teachers about the Use of L1 in the Teaching of L2. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *46*, 4339–4344. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.06.251

Zhao, X., Feng, G. C., Ao, S. H., & Liu, P. L. (2022). Interrater reliability estimators tested against true interrater reliabilities. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12874-022-01707-5