The speech varieties of the Lampungic cluster of southern Sumatra are listed as nine separate languages in the 15th edition of the Ethnologue (Gordon 2005). This paper seeks to clarify the number of languages and their grouping within the cluster in light of research such as Walker (1975) and Mitani (1980). The sociolinguistic survey methods used during recent research among the Lampungic peoples are described, including a Rapid Appraisal Recorded Text Test (Stalder 1996, O’Leary 1994). The conclusions of this sociolinguistic analysis are then compared with the results of other linguistic survey techniques used to study the Lampungic cluster. The author examines the divergent conclusions that can be drawn from one survey method over against another, attempting to draw conclusions from the whole corpus of available information. Finally, the implications of this sociolinguistic survey to mapping out the languages of these descendants of Si Pahit Lidah ‘Bitter Tongue’ are presented.

1. Background

Previous research among the Lampungic speech varieties of southern Sumatra has yielded a significant variety of conclusions regarding the number of languages and dialects within the cluster and the relationship among those speech varieties. Most of this research, however, has focused not on the Lampungic cluster as a whole, but on one or more speech varieties within the cluster. Consequently, the research done in each area has used neither the same methods of investigating language identity nor the same criteria for defining languages, clusters or groups of dialects. Furthermore, works that have looked at the whole Lampungic cluster or large parts of it have normally used an approach that measures similarities and differences among speech varieties according to one set of criteria only, such as lexicostatistics or clan histories.

Without a clear, overall understanding of the relationships between speech varieties, governmental authorities and other institutions interested in local language development and education will be unable to maximize the existing similarities to save time and resources. Likewise, it will be nearly impossible to minimize difficulties in language development resulting from differences between the various speech varieties within the cluster if a comprehensive overview of the cluster’s internal similarities and differences is not conducted beforehand.

Toward this end, a broad linguistic and sociolinguistic survey of the entire Lampungic cluster was conducted between 2003 and 2005 by SIL International Indonesia Branch in cooperation with the Center for the Study of Humanities and Cultures of the Indonesian Institute of Sciences (PMB-LIPI). This research was designed to holistically answer questions about language identity and dialect clustering, as well as to train members of SIL and LIPI.
in various language survey methods. These language surveys have employed a number of language survey tools, as described below.

By looking at the relationships between speech varieties from a number of angles, a more complete picture of the linguistic and sociolinguistic situation of the Lampungic cluster has emerged. This paper supports the argument that studies leading toward language identification will yield more complete results if a number of sociolinguistic factors are combined with linguistic factors in comparing speech varieties.

Rapid Appraisal research constituted the overall framework of this survey. Rapid Appraisal research is limited in scope and depth, mainly because it is limited in time. The goal is to gain a broad and basic understanding of large areas in short amounts of time. This research is foundational and is meant to be followed by more focused, in depth research and analysis.

This paper attempts to explain the Lampungic speech varieties in light of sociolinguistic data gathered during the field investigation mentioned above. The current paper expands upon sociolinguistic data and analysis presented in brief in Anderbeck, Hanawalt and Katubi (2005), which gives a treatment of the cluster more in the light of historical comparative and lexicostatistical analyses. A full treatment of the LIPI-SIL survey of the Lampungic speech varieties will be available in Hanawalt, Tarp and Husain (forthcoming).

In this investigation, our definition for LANGUAGE is borrowed from the 15th edition of the Ethnologue:

‘Not all scholars share the same set of criteria for what constitutes a ‘language’ and what features define a ‘dialect’. The Ethnologue applies the following basic criteria:

- Two related varieties are normally considered varieties of the same language if speakers of each variety have inherent understanding of the other variety at a functional level (that is, can understand based on knowledge of their own variety without needing to learn the other variety).
- Where spoken intelligibility between varieties is marginal, the existence of a common literature or of a common ethnolinguistic identity with a central variety that both understand can be a strong indicator that they should nevertheless be considered varieties of the same language.
- Where there is enough intelligibility between varieties to enable communication, the existence of well-established distinct ethnolinguistic identities can be a strong indicator that they should nevertheless be considered to be different languages.’ (Gordon 2005:8)

2. Previous Lampungic research

A work that has contributed to the higher classification of the Lampungic varieties is Dyen (1965). On the basis of shared lexical items he classifies the Lampung group as a member of the MALAYIC subfamily, which was in turn under the SUNDIC family. It was in his work that the term Sundic was first used to describe the Malayic and Lampungic families.

Ross (1995) gives twenty-four groups for the Western Malayo-Polynesian languages. Ross notes, ‘Group 18 contains only Lampung, of extreme south-east Sumatra. Although it has been suggested in the past that it belongs to the Malayic group, current opinion regards it as not yet classified (Blust, pers. comm., Nothrofer 1985)’ (1995:78).
Adelaar (2005), starting from Ross’s (1995) internal classification of the Western Malayo-Polynesian region, makes several adjustments to it to come up with a configuration of Western Malayo-Polynesian languages. He also places Lampung in its own branch, parallel to Javanese and Malayo-Sumbawan among many others.

Anderbeck (this volume) delineates a list of phonological innovations that establishes Lampungic as a distinct subgroup vis-à-vis other Western Malayo-Polynesian languages, such as geographically contiguous Malay dialects. He demonstrates that Ranau and Kayu Agung, both of whose status has been disputed in the past, should be considered Lampungic.

Walker (1975) approaches the entire Lampungic cluster from a lexicostatistical perspective. Figure 1 illustrates the internal classification of the Lampungic speech varieties according to Walker’s lexicostatistical analysis.

Figure 1. Walker’s classification of Lampungic subgroups and dialects

Mitani (1980) classifies the cluster’s internal relationships through some degree of historical comparative investigation; he also sees two major groups, Nyo and Api, but he denotes Komering as a language distinct from Lampung Api. He also notes the local accounts that the Kayu Agung group migrated into the area more recently from eastern Lampung. Udin et al. (1990:xiv) give a map of the dialects of the Lampungic group, after quoting the general consensus that the Lampung language consists of two main dialects, Api (Pesisir) and Nyo (Abung and Tulangbawang). Their map groups the Lampung subdialects in this way, noting that the following subdialects share more similarities than differences:
1) Kayu Agung and Komering Ilir
2) Komering Ulu and Ranau
3) Way Kanan (Jelma Daya)
4) Sungkai
5) Pesisir Krui and Belalau
6) Pesisir: Semangka, Pesisir Teluk, Meninting, and Melinting
7) Pubian
8) Abung
9) Tulangbawang

The classification of Komering as a separate language or as a dialect of a larger Lampung language has been disputed by various sources. For example, Foley (1983) lists Komering as a language distinct from Lampung, whereas Fernandes and Sudirman (2002) take issue with this decision and claim that Komering should be listed as a dialect of equal status to the other Lampungic speech varieties.

According to the 15th edition of the *Ethnologue*, the Lampungic cluster consists of nine languages subdivided into two groups: Abung and Pesisir (Gordon 2005:435-7). The *Ethnologue* listing attempts to synthesize the conclusions of several researchers including Walker (1975) and Mitani (1980) to create the language inventory they have published. Their reason for placing Ranau in the Abung group is unclear. Gordon (2005), however, removes Ranau from the list of Malay dialects, as was the case in previous editions. Gordon’s (2005) classification is shown in Table 1.

Table 1. *Ethnologue* 15th edition entries for the Lampungic cluster (Gordon 2005)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grouping</th>
<th>Variety</th>
<th>Ethnologue Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Komering</td>
<td>KGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krui</td>
<td>KRQ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lampung</td>
<td>LJP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pesisir, Southern</td>
<td>PEC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pubian</td>
<td>PUN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sungkai</td>
<td>SUU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kayu Agung</td>
<td>VKY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abung</td>
<td>ABL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranau</td>
<td>RAE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Works dealing with individual isolects include Walker’s (1976) description of the Way Lima dialect of southern Lampung Province and Abdurrahman and Yallop (1979) on Komering. Since 1985, almost twenty articles and monographs have been published on what the authors call Lampung dialects in conjunction with the Indonesian government’s Center for the Establishment and Development of Language (Pusat Pembinaan dan Pengembangan Bahasa). Of these, Aliana et al. (1986) describe thirteen speech varieties within Lampung Province. This work includes estimated population data and Swadesh
100 word lists for all thirteen varieties. They perform a type of lexicostatistical analysis on the data which reports the number of Swadesh 100 words in each speech variety which hold basically the same form across most or all of the varieties. The percentage of such items that have a similar or identical form across the different varieties is given for each speech variety. Though they suggest possible subgroupings or lexical similarity based upon this data, we see it as being more useful in pointing toward the most central variety in Lampung Province. Their results demonstrated that Talang Padang had the highest number of such similar words at 76 percent, while the variety they call Jabung had the fewest such words at 41 percent, followed closely by the Nyo varieties (1986:65).

A sociolinguistic study on language shift in Lampung may be found in Gunarwan (1994). Gunarwan concludes that language shift to Indonesian is taking place in some of the domestic domains of life in Lampung communities.

Lampungic-Indonesian dictionaries include Noeh and Fadilah (1979), Hadikusuma (1994) and Junaiyah (2001).

3. Research sites

Our research teams visited twenty-seven Lampungic sites in the provinces of South Sumatra and Lampung. This included sites along the Komering River in South Sumatra Province, in the Lake Ranau region around the border of South Sumatra and Lampung, and throughout most of Lampung Province. The locations of these research sites are shown in Table 2 and in the accompanying Map 1. The codes listed in the table and on the map are used throughout this paper in referring to specific LIPI-SIL research sites. These codes are designed to follow the name of the local speech variety, as opposed to the village name.

Table 2. LIPI-SIL Lampungic research sites and codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Speech variety</th>
<th>Major dialect subgroup</th>
<th>Subdistrict</th>
<th>Regency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KAGA</td>
<td>Kayu Agung Asli</td>
<td>Kayu Agung Asli</td>
<td>Kayu Agung Asli</td>
<td>Kota Kayu Agung</td>
<td>Ogan Komering Ilir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAGP</td>
<td>Paku</td>
<td>Kayu Agung/Kayu Agung Pasar</td>
<td>Kayu Agung</td>
<td>Kota Kayu Agung</td>
<td>Ogan Komering Ilir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KMI</td>
<td>Pulau Gemantung</td>
<td>Komering Ilir</td>
<td>Komering Ilir</td>
<td>Tanjung Lubuk</td>
<td>Ogan Komering Ilir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KMI1</td>
<td>Adumanis</td>
<td>Komering Ulu</td>
<td>Komering Ulu</td>
<td>Cempaka</td>
<td>Ogan Komering Ulu Timur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KMI2</td>
<td>Perjaya</td>
<td>Komering Ulu</td>
<td>Komering Ulu</td>
<td>Martapura</td>
<td>Ogan Komering Ulu Timur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KMI3</td>
<td>Damarpura</td>
<td>Komering Ulu</td>
<td>Komering Ulu</td>
<td>Simpang</td>
<td>Ogan Komering Ulu Selatan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAY1</td>
<td>Tihang</td>
<td>Daya</td>
<td>Daya</td>
<td>Lengkiti</td>
<td>Ogan Komering Ulu Selatan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAY2</td>
<td>Gunung Terang</td>
<td>Daya</td>
<td>Daya</td>
<td>Buay Sandang Aji</td>
<td>Ogan Komering Ulu Selatan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAN</td>
<td>Pilla</td>
<td>Ranau</td>
<td>Ranau</td>
<td>Banding Agung</td>
<td>Ogan Komering Ulu Selatan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>Speech variety</td>
<td>Major dialect subgroup</td>
<td>Subdistrict</td>
<td>Regency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SKU3</td>
<td>Tapak Siring</td>
<td>Lampung Pesisir/</td>
<td>Api</td>
<td>Sukau</td>
<td>Lampung Barat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sukau/Sukau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SKU2</td>
<td>Negeri Ratu</td>
<td>Lampung Pesisir/</td>
<td>Api</td>
<td>Sukau</td>
<td>Lampung Barat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sukau/Sukau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SKU1</td>
<td>Buay Nyerupa</td>
<td>Lampung Pesisir/</td>
<td>Api</td>
<td>Sukau</td>
<td>Lampung Barat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sukau/Sukau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KRU</td>
<td>Banjar Agung</td>
<td>Lampung Pesisir/Krui</td>
<td>Api</td>
<td>Pesisir Tengah</td>
<td>Lampung Barat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEL</td>
<td>Kota Besi</td>
<td>Lampung Peminggir/</td>
<td>Api</td>
<td>Batu Brak</td>
<td>Lampung Barat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Belalau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WKN</td>
<td>Mesir Udik</td>
<td>Lampung Api/Way</td>
<td>Api</td>
<td>Bahuga</td>
<td>Way Kanan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kanan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SKY</td>
<td>Banjar Ketapang</td>
<td>Lampung Api/</td>
<td>Api</td>
<td>Sungkai Selatan</td>
<td>Lampung Utara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sungkai</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUB</td>
<td>Negeri Kepayungan</td>
<td>Lampung Api/Pubian</td>
<td>Api</td>
<td>Pubian</td>
<td>Lampung Tengah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPD2</td>
<td>Sukaraja</td>
<td>Lampung Pesisir/</td>
<td>Api</td>
<td>Talang Padang</td>
<td>Tanggamus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Talang Padang</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPD1</td>
<td>Sukanegeri Jaya</td>
<td>Lampung Pesisir/</td>
<td>Api</td>
<td>Talang Padang</td>
<td>Tanggamus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Talang Padang</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KTAG</td>
<td>Kandang Besi</td>
<td>Lampung Pesisir/Kota</td>
<td>Api</td>
<td>Kota Agung</td>
<td>Tanggamus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agung/Semangka</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAL</td>
<td>Tengkujuh</td>
<td>Lampung Pesisir/Kiali</td>
<td>Api</td>
<td>Kalianda</td>
<td>Lampung Selatan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>nda/Rajabasa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JBG</td>
<td>Jabung</td>
<td>Lampung Jabung</td>
<td>Jabung</td>
<td>Jabung</td>
<td>Lampung Timur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEL</td>
<td>Nibung</td>
<td>Lampung Nyo/Melinting</td>
<td>Nyo</td>
<td>Gunung Pelindung</td>
<td>Lampung Timur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SKD</td>
<td>Nyampir</td>
<td>Lampung Nyo/Abung/</td>
<td>Nyo</td>
<td>Bumi Agung</td>
<td>Lampung Timur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sukadana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABG2</td>
<td>Terbanggi Besar</td>
<td>Lampung Nyo/Abung</td>
<td>Nyo</td>
<td>Terbanggi Besar</td>
<td>Lampung Tengah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABG1</td>
<td>Blambangan Pagar</td>
<td>Lampung Nyo/Abung/</td>
<td>Nyo</td>
<td>Abung Selatan</td>
<td>Lampung Utara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kotabumi (?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGL</td>
<td>Ujung Gunung</td>
<td>Lampung Menggala/</td>
<td>Nyo</td>
<td>Menggala</td>
<td>Tulang Bawang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Nyo)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. Under ‘Speech variety’, the most general but local name is used. A ‘/’ between two entries denotes alternate names for the local speech variety.
2. ‘Major dialect subgroup’ is as reported locally.
3. In Indonesian, ‘subdistrict’ is *Kecamatan*.
4. In Indonesian, ‘regency’ is *Kabupaten*.
Map 1. LIPI-SIL Lampungic research sites
4. Sociolinguistic survey tools used

In order to more completely and accurately understand the complexities of inter-dialectal relationships within the Lampungic cluster, we have employed a number of different sociolinguistic and linguistic research tools within a Rapid Appraisal survey framework. The aspects of these tools that relate to language identity and dialectology are discussed here; in addition, these tools also seek to gain a basic grasp of language use in specific domains and language attitudes. Katubi (this volume) investigates some of the aspects of language shift and language vitality found through this research. A fuller explanation together with templates for each tool listed here may be found in Hanawalt, Tarp and Husain (forthcoming).

As is demonstrated below, the use of multiple tools to gain an understanding of the language and dialect distribution within an area is more desirable than simply relying on the results of a single tool.

4.1. Sociolinguistic questionnaires

4.1.1. Procedure

Sociolinguistic questionnaires help answer questions regarding language use and vitality, language shift, dialectology, and language attitudes.

Administering these questionnaires in a group format allows the researchers to gather the opinions of several people at once, as well as gather the group consensus—which is a good indicator of popular sentiments and attitudes. It also reduces the need for a rigorous screening process of informants, as would be necessary for questionnaires given to individuals. Some questionnaires, however, effectively represent the responses of one individual who may have been the most vocal or most respected member of the group. We asked that volunteers for this questionnaire be native to the village and speak the vernacular as their first language.

We also used maps of the area as a reference during questionnaire sessions. The groups pointed out where the same, similar or different language varieties are spoken on the maps, or in response to place names mentioned by the researcher. not all questions were asked in all locations; some questions were added during later stages of the survey.

4.1.2. Presentation of results

4.1.2.1. Language choice

Table 3 through Table 5 display the results obtained for the question of what language people from the site surveyed use when they meet a stranger who speaks the dialect in question. See Table 2 for research site codes; other abbreviations introduced in these tables include PL (Palembang Malay), BI (Indonesian, Bahasa Indonesia), BL (Lampung, Bahasa Lampung, always refering to the dialect of that locale), Kom (Komering) and Meng (Menggala). The terms ‘Pesisir Barat’, ‘Pesisir Tanggamus’ and ‘Pesisir Selatan’ in Table 4 are included to point out that each of these local speech varieties falls within what the people of Lampung call the Pesisir area; the names given to the groupings used here are offered for clarification and do not represent alternate speech variety names used locally. A formula such as ‘2/2=BI 1/2=Kom/BL’ is to be read as both of the two groups of
informants from this locale reported that they use Bahasa Indonesia, while one group out of the two reported that they also use Komering/Lampung.

Table 3. Language choice in inter-ethnic or inter-dialectal situations: South Sumatra Province

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sites surveyed</th>
<th>Kayu Agung Asli</th>
<th>Kayu Agung</th>
<th>Komering Ilir</th>
<th>Komering Ulu</th>
<th>Daya</th>
<th>Ranau</th>
<th>Lampung Pesisir</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KAGA</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>BI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAGP</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>PM or BI</td>
<td>1/2 = PM</td>
<td>1/2 = PM</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>BI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KMI</td>
<td>1/2 = BI or Kom/KAA</td>
<td>BI</td>
<td>1/2 = PM</td>
<td>1/2 = PM Kom</td>
<td>1/2 = PM</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1/2 = Kom/BL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KMI</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Komering</td>
<td>3/4 = Kom/Daya</td>
<td>1/4 = BI or PM</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2/3 = BI</td>
<td>Kom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KMI</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Daya/Kom</td>
<td>3/3 = Daya/Bl</td>
<td>3/3 = BI</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2/3 = BI</td>
<td>Daya/BL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KMI</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Ranau/Kom</td>
<td>1/3 = Ranau; 2/3 = BI</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Ranau</td>
<td>Ranau</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. ‘KMU’ combines research sites KMU1, KMU2 and KMU3 (see Table 2). Mitani mentions a fourth sub-dialect, Komering Buay; however, our research did not confirm its existence. The word *buay* is the local word for Indonesian *marga* ‘clan’.
2. ‘Daya’ combines research sites DAY1 and DAY2 (see Table 2).
Table 4. Language choice in inter-ethnic or inter-dialectal situations: Lampung Province

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WKN</td>
<td>Api</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>BI</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>BI</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>BI</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>Meng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pesisir Barat</td>
<td>Api</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2/3 = BI</td>
<td>1/3 = BL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SKY</td>
<td>Api</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>BI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUB</td>
<td>Api</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>BI</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>BI</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pesisir Tanggamus</td>
<td>Api</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>BI</td>
<td>BI</td>
<td>BI</td>
<td>2/3 = BI</td>
<td>1/3 = BL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pesisir Selatan</td>
<td>Api</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>BI</td>
<td>BI</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>BI</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JBG</td>
<td>Jabung</td>
<td>BI</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>BI</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>Meng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEL</td>
<td>Nyo</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>BI</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>BI</td>
<td>BI</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>BI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABG1</td>
<td>Nyo</td>
<td>2/3 = BI</td>
<td>1/3 = BL</td>
<td>BI</td>
<td>BI</td>
<td>BI</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>2/3 = BL</td>
<td>1/3 = BI</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGL</td>
<td>Nyo</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. ‘Pesisir Barat’ is a geographic cover term which includes research sites SKU3, SKU2, SKU1, KRU and BEL (see Table 2).
2. ‘Pesisir Tanggamus’ is a geographic cover term which includes research sites TPD2, TPD1 and KTAG (see Table 2).
3. ‘Pesisir Selatan’ is a geographic cover term which includes research site KAL (see Table 2).
Table 5 unites the responses from several areas into single categories and reports the broad patterns in responses found throughout the groups.

Table 5. Language choice in inter-ethnic or inter-dialectal situations: between provinces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sites surveyed ↓</th>
<th>Ranau</th>
<th>Komering/Daya</th>
<th>Lampung Pesisir (Api)</th>
<th>Lampung Nyo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ranau</td>
<td>Ranau</td>
<td>2/4 = Ranau/Komering 2/4 = BI</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>2/3 = BL 1/3 = BI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Komering/Daya</td>
<td>Daya/Ranau</td>
<td>12/19 = Kom or Daya 4/19 = LWC and/or own language 3/19 = LWC-BI or BP</td>
<td>4/8 = BI 3/8 = BI and/or own language 1/8 = own language</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lampung Pesisir (Api)</td>
<td>BI</td>
<td>3/4 = BI 1/4 = BL</td>
<td>14/20 situations = BL 6/20 = BI</td>
<td>12/17 situations = BI 5/17 = BL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lampung Nyo</td>
<td>BI</td>
<td>3/6 = BL 3/6 = BI</td>
<td>25/30 situations = BL 5/30 = BL</td>
<td>15/19 situations = BL 4/19 = BI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1.2.2. Language similarity mapping

Boone and Stalder (2003) note that any two speakers of the same or related varieties may delineate either a wide or narrow area where their speech variety is spoken, based on their personal language and ethnic attitudes. Linguistic and social awareness also vary between speakers, and influence their perspective on linguistic boundaries. Keeping the above principle in mind, the emic mapping of dialects below cannot be considered a quantitative description of where these varieties are spoken. Emic understanding of dialectology in this area is probably also connected to clan distinctions. The following maps describe the emic perspective of the respondents, in response to two questions: ‘Where is the language and dialect spoken exactly the same as yours?’ and ‘Where do the people speak a dialect that is a little different from yours, but still easily understood?’

4.1.2.3. Ethnic identity

Understanding emic ethnic identification can give clues to dialect and language boundaries. Respondents were asked the question: ‘Do you originate from the same ethnic group as group ____?’ or the variant, ‘Did your ancestors originate from the same ethnic group as group ____?’

In general the Lampungic groups of South Sumatra identify ethnically with each other and with the Pesisir people in Lampung Province. The scope of ethnic inclusion varied from the all-inclusive KMI, to those in KMU1, who only identified ethnically with other Komering.

The group interviewed in KMI showed the most perspicuous understanding of ethnic relations, claiming relation to the Kayu Agung Asli, all Komering, Daya and Lampung Pesisir. They did not include Kayu Agung in the list, which lines up with the theory that the Kayu Agung people originally migrated from a Nyo area of Lampung, and are therefore more distinct from the Api dialect chain to which Komering and Kayu Agung Asli link.
Map 2. Areas where the speech variety is reported to be exactly the same