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PREFACE

Assalamualaikum Wr. Wb.

The 9th (3LT) National Seminar is an annual Seminar on Linguistics, Literature and Language Teaching organized by Faculty of Letters, Universitas Pamulang. This year, the 9th (3LT) National Seminar held on October 24, 2018 brings the idea “Facing Challenges in Implementing Great Ideas in Linguistics, Literature and Language Teaching in Digital Era”.

On behalf of the committee, we would like to express our deepest gratitude to welcome the experts and speakers who are here despite their busy time. The number of participants were around 3000 participants joined with this event, including the presenters for parallel sessions.

This seminar becomes more prestigious since we have invited Keynote Speaker, Prof. Dr. I Dewa Putu Wijana, MA from UGM, and also the invited Plenary speakers, Dr. Furqanul Aziez from UM Purwokerto, Dr. Andreas Akun, M.Pd from Binus University and Habibullah Akbar, Ph.D from Universitas Esa Unggul, Djasminar Anwar, BA.,Pg. Dipl. MA and Dr Muhammad Ramdon Dasuki, Lc, MA from Universitas Pamulang.

This seminar provides a precious opportunity for lecturers, practitioners and experts in the field of Linguistics, Literature and Language Teaching, to share their knowledge with us.

I wish to thank to the Chairman of Sasmita Jaya Foundation for sustainable support, as well as Rector of Pamulang University and Dean of Faculty of Letters for insight motivation and encouragement support. Moreover, I wish to thank and congratulate the committee for their hard working and effort to prepare this seminar. I wish also thank to DKI Bank and BCA Bank as the sponsorship colleagues who has given their contribution to this conference. Thanks also goes to semarak.co as media partner.

Last but not least, we apologize for all inconvenience that may happen during the event.

Thank you very much and Warms regards,

Wassalamu’alaikum Wr. Wb.

Eka Margianti Sagimin, S.S.,M.Pd
Chair of Organizing Committee
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Distinguished speakers, honorable guests, lecturers, ELT colleagues, and students, I would like to extend the warmest of welcome to all of you attending the 9th National Seminar 2018.

At this time, I would like to express my profound gratitude to Ms. Eka Margianti Sagimin, S.S., M.Pd, the conference chair in preparing the 9th National Seminar 2018. I also would like to extend my deep gratitude to all the Organizing Committee members, who have expended a tremendous amount of time and energy to make this great event possible.
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I hope that everyone will find the presentation inspiring, enriching, innovative and insightful. Please, enjoy the conference. Thank you very much.

Wassalamu’alaikum Wr. Wb.

Hj. Djasminar Anwar, BA.Pg. Dipl.,M.A.
Dean of Faculty of Letters
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ABSTRACT
In the field of linguistics, controversies over definition of bilingualism have been emerging for many years. Until now, there is not a single definition of bilingualism because the experts use different criteria to decide the definition of the term. This paper is a discussion on the definition of bilingualism, based on a survey which was distributed to 15 respondents who were college students in Australia and have been engaged to some levels of two languages in their lives. Data collection was conducted to each of the participants by using a questionnaire. 15 scenarios taken from Hoffmann C. (1991) were stated in the questionnaire. Then, the participants ranked the scenarios by how they describe the definition of bilingualism more accurately. The findings then, were compared to description of the term 'bilingualism' based on the literature. The results from the participants show that the definition of bilingualism was based on the perspective of whether the speakers are children or adult. Furthermore, the findings indicate that bilingual competencies do not significantly influence the definition of bilingualism.
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INTRODUCTION
Bilingualism has been studied and discussed for many years and the research on this field has broadly developed. However, in the field of bilingualism and the research on language development controversies over the definition of bilingualism still occur. Experts use different criteria in describing bilingualism. There has been very complex aspects in describing bilingualism which lead to different definitions on what and who a bilingual is. Describing bilingualism is better to be done as a continuous variable compared to a categorical one (Luk & Bialystok, 2013). In the central point of differences, however, the literature shows that bilingualism is viewed based on the perspectives of four aspects: linguistics competence, cognitive aspect in relation to languages, the function of the languages in socio-cultural environment, and age-related aspect.
The general description of bilingualism from the linguistics perspective defines bilingualism as 'knowing two languages' (Valdez & Figueora 1994). The word knowing then was found to be divided into two perspectives: native-like proficiency and minimum proficiency of another language other than one's mother tongue. The first perspective, for example from Baker (2006, 2011) who stated that bilinguals are simply the people who are perfectly and equally proficient in two languages. This means those who are able to use the structure and the concept of another language without copying from their mother tongue and are native-like in both languages. The condition which is rare to find. On the other hand, some experts describe bilingualism as the minimum proficiency in one or more language skills: speaking, listening, reading, and writing (Macnamara, 1967) which also means that one of the languages can be dominant in a bilingual.

Bilingualism is also viewed from the cognitive perspective. The prior and prominent research on this perspective was conducted by Peal and Lambert (1962) that indicated significantly better performance of the bilingual group compared to the monolinguals on non-verbal tasks. In addition, bilinguals were indicated to be cognitively more flexible in general compared to the monolinguals based on the results of the tasks given to both groups. More current research on this perspective conducted by E. Bialystok's (2001) who found that there was no difference in the ability of monolinguals and bilinguals in controlling over a domain of knowledge. However, bilinguals exceeded more than monolinguals in a specific cognitive process, specifically in controlling attention.

From the sociocultural perspective, bilingualism is defined according to the ability to interact and communicate in more than one language in the real-life society (Mohanty, 1994). This is without considering the accuracy and the level of proficiency of the languages and without the biliteracy consent because most communication in the society occurs verbally. There is not enough discussion that explains whether the socio-cultural society includes socialization with schoolmates, teachers, or relatives other than family members.

Lastly, bilingualism is often connected with age, for example De Houwer (2015) who considered a bilingual as a person who simultaneously acquires two languages from birth until one year of age. Robust current research on the connection between age with the acquisition of a second language further shows how critical age affects the native-like performance of language
learners (Johnson and Newport 1989, Long 1990). In contrast, Birdsong and Molis (2001) found that four of their participants who arrived in the United States after they were 17 years could perform indistinguishable proficiency as the native speakers. Therefore, later Birdsong (2005) suggests that there is no certain point in age when a native-like proficiency can not be acquired.

Hoffmann C. (1991) described 15 scenarios to define bilingualism with respect to the perspectives of linguistics competence, cognitive-related, the function of the languages socio-culturally, and age-related. This paper discusses the 15 scenarios which was distributed as a questionnaire to 15 participants to describe the scenarios that most closely describe bilingualism.

The participants of the survey were 15 speakers who have been engaged to some levels of two languages in their lives. All of the participants were university students studying Applied Linguisticsc whose ages range from 25-30 years old. They should rank the scenarios from 1 to 5 based on the least bilingual scenario (rank 1) to the most bilingual scenario (rank 5). The scores then calculated and tabulated to find the average score of each scenario in order to find the most bilingual scenario according to the participants.

The scenarios (C. Hoffmann, 1991) are shown as follows:

1. the two-year-old who is beginning to talk speaking English to one parent and Welsh to the other;
2. the four-year-old whose home language is Bengali and who has been attending an English playgroup for some time;
3. the schoolchild from an Italian immigrant family living in the United States who increasingly uses English both at home and outside but whose relatives address him in Italian only;
4. the Canadian child from Montreal who comes from an English-speaking background and attends an immersion programme which consists of virtually all school subjects being taught through the medium of French;
5. the young graduate who has studied French for eleven years;
6. the sixty-year-old scholar who has spent a considerable part of her life working with manuscript and documents written in Latin;
7. the technical translator;
8. the personal interpreter of an important public figure;
(9) the Portuguese chemist who can read specialist literature in his subject written in English;
(10) the Japanese airline pilot who uses English for most of his professional communication;
(11) the Turkish immigrant worker in Germany who speaks Turkish at home and with his friends
and work colleagues but who can communicate in German in both written and the oral forms
with his superiors and authorities;
(12) the wife of the latter who is able to get by in spoken German but cannot read or write it;
(13) the Danish immigrant in New Zealand who has had no contact with Danish for the last fourty
years;
(14) the Belgian government employee who lives in bilingual Brussels, whose friends and relatives are
mainly Flemish speakers but who works in an entirely French speaking environment and whose colleagues in the office (whether they are Flemish or not) use French as well;
(15) the fervent Catalanist who at home and at work uses Catalan only, but who is exposed to Castilian Spanish from the media and in the street and has no linguistic difficulty in the latter language.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Data Calculation
There are 15 participants in this survey. The calculation is as shown below:

Scenario 1
Average = (1x1)+(3x4)+(4x1)+(5x9)/10
       = (1+12+4+45)/10
       = 62/10
       = 6.3

Scenario 2
Average = (2x1)+(3x6)+(4x7)+(5x5)/10
       = (2+18+28+25)/10
       = 73/10
Scenario 3
Average = (2x1)+(3x5)+(4x3)+(5x6)/10
        = (2+15+12+30)/10
        = 59/10
        = 5.9

Scenario 4
Average = (1x4)+(2x3)+(3x2)+(4x5)+(5x1)/10
        = (4+6+6+20+5)/10
        = 41/10
        = 4.1

Scenario 5
Average = (1x4)+(2x3)+(3x2)+(4x5)+(5x1)/10
        = (4+6+6+20+5)/10
        = 41/10
        = 4.1

Scenario 6
Average = (1x 5)+(2x1)+(3x4)+(4x4)+(5x1)/10
        = (5+2+12+16+5)/10
        = 40/10
        = 4.0

Scenario 7
Average = (1x3)+(2x2)+(3x5)+(4x3)+(5x2)/10
        = (3+ 4+15+12+10)/10
        = 4.4/10
Scenario 8
Average = \frac{(1 \times 2) + (2 \times 3) + (3 \times 5) + (4 \times 1) + (5 \times 4)}{10}
= \frac{1 + 6 + 15 + 4 + 20}{10}
= \frac{46}{10}
= 4.6

Scenario 9
Average = \frac{(1 \times 2) + (2 \times 2) + (3 \times 4) + (4 \times 5) + (5 \times 2)}{10}
= \frac{2 + 4 + 12 + 20 + 10}{10}
= \frac{48}{10}
= 4.8

Scenario 10
Average = \frac{(1 \times 2) + (2 \times 2) + (3 \times 4) + (4 \times 4) + (5 \times 3)}{10}
= \frac{2 + 4 + 12 + 16 + 15}{10}
= \frac{49}{10}
= 4.9

Scenario 11
Average = \frac{(1 \times 1) + (2 \times 2) + (3 \times 1) + (4 \times 5) + (5 \times 6)}{10}
= \frac{1 + 4 + 3 + 20 + 30}{10}
= \frac{58}{10}
= 5.8

Scenario 12
Average = \frac{(1 \times 3) + (2 \times 3) + (3 \times 7) + (4 \times 2)}{10}
= \frac{3 + 6 + 21 + 8}{10}
= \frac{38}{10}
= 3.8

Scenario 13
Average = (1x 3)+(2x6)+(3x3)+(4x2)+(5x1)/10
= (3+12+9+8+5)/10
= 37/10
= 3.7

Scenario 14
Average = (2x2 )+(3x3 )+(4x6)+(5x4)/10
= (4+9+24+20)/10
= 57/10
= 5.7

Scenario 15
Average = (2x2)+(3x6)+(4x5)+(5x2)/10
= (4+18+ 20+10)/10
= 52/10
= 5.2

Average numbers from the calculation above are listed in table 1 and the scores of each question are shown in Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2
Scores of The Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Rank 1</th>
<th>Rank 2</th>
<th>Rank 3</th>
<th>Rank 4</th>
<th>Rank 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There are some interesting findings to discuss in this part. The discussion is going to be separated in two parts. First is the scenarios which the participants thought as the most bilingual. The second part is the scenarios which the participants found as least bilingual along with the writer opinion and comments on the scenarios.

The most bilingual scenarios based on the participants

From table 2, there 9 people out of 15 who thought that scenario 1 is the most bilingual.

Scenario 1 = the two-year-old who is beginning to talk speaking English to one parent and Welsh to the other.

In this scenario, the child who speaks two different languages with the parents are thought as perfectly bilingual. The fact that the participants focus on the two different languages rather the the factor of age is quite surprising. There two significant factors in determining bilingualism here. Firstly, at the age of two, children have just started to learn language. Their language production is of course very limited and usually has simple structure. However, the participants failed to see the age factor in this scenario. Although reports have shown that children who acquired the second language before six years of age were able to achieve native-like competence (Long,1990), the child in scenario is only two years old and has just began to learn how to talk. Therefore, the child competency in the language might not developed at the level of proficiency yet. It would be too soon to consider the scenario as a perfect bilingual condition. Secondly, based on the competence of micro skills (speaking, writing, listening and reading), the two-year old child is definitely not
competence yet. Except in a moderate fluency of speaking and listening, this child has not be able to write and read yet. Macnamara (1969) claimed that in order to measure the degree of bilingualism, it should not be seen as a unitary component but as the degree of competence in sub-components or the four micro-skills (speaking, writing, reading and listening).

The second interesting finding is from table 2 which shows that more than a half of the participants ranked 4 for scenario 2

Scenario 2 = the four-year-old whose home language is Bengali and who has been attending an English playgroup for some time.

From the perspective of age, the child has developed his or her speaking ability at a broader range ability compared to a two-year old child. Thus, this might be the factor that was put into consideration when choosing the answers. The condition that the child has started school (that use a different language than the home language) might also become a significant factor. The fact that the participants chose this scenario as the 4th ranked rather than 5th has drawn some assumptions. The first is that the statement of 'some time' might be the reason why the participants ranked this scenario as 4 rather than 5. 'Some time' is the indicator that the child has not been in the exposure of the second language for enough time to be proficient. According to Birdsong and Molis (2001), contextual factors such as exposure to the amount of language production is important in indicating language performance. The second assumption is that at the age of four, children's spoken skill is stronger than writing or reading skills. In many studies (e.g. Gardner 2001; Dornyei and Clement 2001), participants asses the nativeness of a speaker by bot only the sample of speech but also a sample of writing. Then, in general assumption, we will find a four-year old child has not reach the level yet. The third is that because Bengali is the only language spoken at home, this language becomes more dominant than English which is only spoken for some time at school.

Scenario 2 is also the most bilingual scenario that was chosen by the participants based on the average score (see table1).

The least bilingual findings based on the participants

Based on the average score, the participants thought that scenario 13 is the least bilingual.
Scenario 13 = the Danish immigrant in new zealand who has had no contact with Danish for the last forty years.

The assumption is that this scenario was chosen as the least bilingual because after ‘forty years’ without contact with the native language (Danish), language attrition will strongly occur. It refers to the term passive or recessive bilinguals where a person is gradually losing a language competence because of disuse (Chin & Wigglesworth, 2007). Forty years is a very long time and it what makes the erosion of language and the competency is disappearing.

CONCLUSION

Scenarios 1 and 2 which were chosen as the most bilinguals show the condition when the two languages are used in balance in life. Moreover, scenario 3 and 11 are also amongst the highest five based on the average scores. In scenario 3:

(3) the schoolchild from an Italian immigrant family living in the United States who increasingly uses English both at home and outside but whose relatives address him in Italian only; was chosen because the child uses English in both school and social environment and at the same time continuously using Italian with relatives. In this case the exposure of the two languages happens in balance in his life.

Lastly in scenario 11:

(11) the Turkish immigrant worker in […] germany who speaks Turkish at home and with his friends and work colleague, but who can communicate in German, in both the written and the oral forms, with his superiors.

In this scenario being a Turkish, and as an adult one, he is able to write and reading Turkish at the same competency with his oral production. If this immigrant is able to speak and write in German, it means that he is also competence is the second language.

In summary, the participants' choices of the most bilinguals scenarios are mostly not based on the perspective of whether the speakers are children or adult. The results from the participants indicate that the age factors and the minor skills competency do not significantly influence
bilingual competencies. The findings suggest that the balanced use of the two languages in the scenarios was chosen as the ones that describe bilingualism more accurately.
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