
The Knowledge Level of Housewives about Serving Ayam Betutu

Agus Darma Yoga Pratama, Mirsa Umiyati*

Program Studi Magister Ilmu Linguistik, Universitas Warmadewa, Bali

*mirsa.umiya2@gmail.com

Published: 30/04/2021

How to cite (in APA style):

Pratama, A. D. Y. & Umiyati, M. (2021). The Knowledge Level of Housewives about Serving Ayam Betutu. *Retorika: Jurnal Ilmu Bahasa*, 7(1), 58-68. doi: <https://doi.org/10.22225/jr.7.1.3284.58-68>

Abstract-This study analyzed the knowledge level of housewives about serving Ayam Betutu/Chicken Betutu as a Balinese specialty. The population in this study was 103 housewives who lived in Banjar Buaji Anyar, Sumerta Kelod Village. The data were collected using direct interviews and standardized questionnaires. The data processing was performed using the SPSS program, while a descriptive statistic was used to analyze the data. Based on the results of data analysis, the study showed that the knowledge level of housewives about serving Chicken Betutu was still very good. Definitely, this is a very good thing for the preservation of Chicken Betutu as special food, and especially Chicken Betutu has become a culinary icon from Bali. The good knowledge level of housewives about serving Chicken Betutu can be a trusted source for the younger generation if they want to know about Chicken Betutu, starting from the basic ingredients, the manufacturing process, tools, to the taste of the Chicken Betutu.

Keywords: Balinese Specialties, Gilimanuk Chicken Betutu, Gianyar Chicken Betutu

I. INTRODUCTION

Food and language are two important elements that cannot be separated in human life. Both can bring meanings that vary from one culture to another. Language plays an important role in cultural exploration such as in food. Food and language are parts of the social activities of people who build their world of life by displaying attitudes, identities, values, norms, and beliefs. Therefore, the benefits of food are not only as a means of human biological survival, but also as a means of showing identity or social status, and language, in this case, becomes a tool for transmitting meanings and information. The language and food can be explored using Culinary Linguistic Pedagogy, which is the study of food from a linguistic perspective (Fitrisia dkk., 2018). Furthermore,

Montanari (2006) adds that food is culture, which shows that food is part of the culture. Montanari (2006) argues that food is a culture when it is created and even on a "show" because in its serving humans use various natural combinations with unusual processes. Food is a culture when it is served because the natural ingredients obtained are processed with tools and even technology. Food is a culture when it is eaten because even though humans are omnivores, they also considered a lot of things in consuming the right food. Bali is a place that has a lot of potentials, not only for tourism and culture (Suradnya, 2006) but also for the typical food in the area (Suardani, 2013). There are a variety of Balinese specialties, including Ayam Betutu, Babi Guling (spit roast pig), Sate Lilit (minced meat satay), Nasi Jinggo (a simple dish

that consists of steamed rice and several complements and side dishes), Nasi Tepeng (rice mixed with several herbs and is usually eaten during Nyepi Day), Sate Plecing (spicy satay that doesn't use peanut sauce or soy sauce), Tum Ayam (chicken that is wrapped using banana leaf), Komoh (grilled satay of beef with coconut fries), Rujak Bulung (Balinese food that uses seaweed as a base), Rujak Kuah Pindang (a combination of several fresh fruits using fish broth), Sate Kakul (satay which is a basic ingredient using snail), Lawar (a mixture of vegetables, coconut and minced meat mixed with rich herbs and spices), and Nasi Campur Bali (a scoop of rice accompanied by small portions of a number of other dishes. Chicken Betutu is also one of the Balinese specialties. Uniquely, this Balinese food is found in every district and there are various ways of processing it, starting from the most popular is the Gilimanuk Chicken Betutu to the oldest, 90 years old, in Ubud by Pak Sanur.

Chicken Betutu is one of the popular foods originating from Bali which has a unique taste because it contains a lot of spices in it. The numerous types of herbs and spices used are the hallmark of Chicken Betutu. Chicken Betutu is made by grilling in the husk fire which has been previously seasoned with herbs and spices. This is done so that the herbs and spices seep into the meat. Balinese people are very familiar with Chicken Betutu because most Balinese people work as traders who sell this food, and Balinese people who are predominantly Hindu, usually in religious events, often use Chicken Betutu as an offering to Ida Hyang Widhi Wasa/God Almighty, and the results of the offering are eaten together. Betutu is Balinese cuisine as a result of the influence of the Majapahit culture (Nazarotin, 2020). Betutu is a side dish made from whole chicken or duck filled with spices. Traditional betutu chicken is cooked in a unique and complicated way, and takes a long time. In the past, this Betutu was served during traditional ceremonies. According to Putu Okta Damayanti, a Balinese and owner of Men Tempeh restaurant, Betutu comes from the word 'be' which means chicken or meat, and the word 'tutu' which means a dish that is still dry and then boiled 'nyat-nyat'. There are two types of typical Chicken Betutu that are popular in Bali, namely the Gilimanuk Chicken Betutu and the Gianyar Chicken Betutu. Even though these two types of Chicken Betutu use herbs and spices,

the taste is very different. The taste of Gilimanuk Chicken Betutu is spicier because it uses cayenne pepper in its serving. Meanwhile, Gianyar Chicken Betutu is more delicious and not spicy. The seasonings and spices used are more complete than the Gilimanuk Chicken Betutu.

According to Sukerti et al. (2016), several types of Balinese specialties include (a) Main Food such as Nasi Tulen, Nasi Moran Gadung, Nasi Moran Keladi / Taro, Moran Sele Sawi, Mengguh, Blayag, Tipat Srosob; (b) Side Dishes include Serapah, Sate Celeng, Timbungan, and others, (c) Vegetables include Urab Paku, Urab Beans and others. However, of the many typical foods that have been described, Chicken Betutu is one of the Balinese specialties, which has not been mentioned above, even though Chicken Betutu is the easiest to find. Chicken Betutu can be found in luxury hotels, restaurants, and food stalls (Purna & Dwikayana, 2019). Balinese specialties are one of Bali's leading potentials that need to be optimized to help increase the tourism sector in Bali and improve the welfare of the community. However, the popularity of Balinese specialties, unfortunately, cannot compete with foreign foods that enter Bali in the form of franchises. This is due to the lack of information on this typical Balinese food for the community (Lumanaw, 2018). Therefore, the increase in purchasing power of foreign foods causes the food franchise business to develop so fast compare to local specialties (Astuti, 2005).

While regional income from the culinary side is still low, data from the Foreign Investment Board, ironically, shows a very significant increase in the entry of foreign franchises to Bali in the culinary sector. If this condition is allowed to continue, it will cause the younger generation to prefer fast food from abroad rather than typical regional food. The long-term impact of this condition is that the ingredients, processes, and methods of Balinese food preparation are no longer controlled and recognized. In the tourism sector, the long-term impact will be even worse, namely the dominance of foreign culinary delights in culinary tourism in Bali. Therefore, hard efforts are needed starting from preserving the special terms in Balinese culinary delights to the documentation stage, so as to preserve Balinese culinary delights for future generations. In culinary linguistic theory, these specific terms

will be divided into special ingredients in the presentation of Balinese specialties, unique and certain verbs in the process of making Balinese specialties, as well as other unique grammatical categories related to the Balinese culinary world. Of the several existing Balinese specialties, Chicken Betutu was specifically the object of this study.

There are several previous studies related to this research, which examine culinary linguistics such as the research of [Adiasih & Brahmana \(2017\)](#) discussed traditional food and young people's (the students) perceptions of these traditional foods. Another similar study also examines the level of knowledge about food, namely [Sempati's study \(2017\)](#), which discusses about receptions and behaviors of adolescents towards traditional and modern foods. Furthermore, [Fuad & Hapsari \(2020\)](#) also reviewed a similar study which discussed traditional food lexicon in the Javanese language as a reflection of Javanese local wisdom.

Based on the above background, the purpose of this study was to analyze the knowledge level of housewives about serving Chicken Betutu as typical Balinese food.

II. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The concept of food and drink today is not only related to things that function to fill the stomach but its understanding shifts to environmental, health, and cultural issues. In the context of health, humans are encouraged to eat nutritious foods and contain high levels of healthy substances. According to the Balinese, the most common food, especially Balinese food, is Nasi Campur Bali. The typical Nasi Campur Bali food is synonymous with complete side dishes, including vegetables, side dishes, and always have the fried peanuts. This food is typically eaten by hand instead of using cutlery such as a spoon. Several studies related to culinary linguistics have been conducted, including research by [Kotthoff \(2013\)](#); [Fellner \(2013\)](#); [Ankerstein & M. Pereira \(2013\)](#); [Gerhardt \(2013\)](#); [Diemer & Frobenius \(2013\)](#). [Kotthoff \(2013\)](#) compared drinking toasts. The comparing contexts are studies of toast practice in Georgia, Russia, and Sweden, where the baking tradition is central to everyday life, and Germany and the Netherlands, where baking plays a relatively smaller role. Toasts are generally characterized as 'doing culture'; so that this research succeeded in finding the

relationship between the culture and the tradition of baking in Georgia, Russia, and Sweden. The study also found that foreigners tended to adapt to funny toasts and/or meet minimal genre standards, which was met with acceptance by the host culture. This practice indexes affiliations and connections as well as differences ([Ankerstein & M. Pereira, 2013](#)). [Fellner \(2013\)](#) analyzed the function of culinary nostalgia in dislocation narratives in the discussion of three contemporary texts by multi-ethnic North American authors. He reveals that the resurgence of food acts more than as a language to express nostalgia, as it serves to structure the narrator's ambivalent relationship with ethnicity. As a sender of influence, it is said that narrative descriptions of food and food preparation involve culinary citizenship ([Ankerstein & Pereira, 2013](#)).

[Ankerstein & Pereira \(2013\)](#) examined psycholinguistics and linked this study to one of the fields of pure linguistics, namely morphology. The results of their analysis showed that hunger for words was a psychiatric study of English speakers' sense of vocabulary. The research also showed that participants' knowledge of taste was much greater than the use of suggested taste words. The morphological nature of this lexeme and its use were explored through the search for collocation in COCA (Corpus of Contemporary American English), [Ankerstein & M. Pereira \(2013\)](#). [Diemer & Frobenius \(2013\)](#) analyzed lexical, syntactic, and interactive features in food blogs in the CMC (computer-mediated communication) genre using a hybrid approach. Their quantitative study by the Food Blog Corpus (FBC) forms the basis for lexical and syntactic analysis, which provides information on CMC usage, frequency, and phenomena. Their research results also present innovative vocabulary and spelling data related to food, food-related jargon, special vocabulary and grammar patterns of food as well as discourse markers and the values and meanings contained in any information about food.

There are several other studies about food that relate it to social factors, such as gender, identity, power, daily interactions, the process of serving food, and the structure of the language used ([Counihan & Kaplan \(2013\)](#); [Szatrowski, 2014](#)); [Aisyah, Abdullah, & Nezu \(2015\)](#) conducted a study with the aim of comparing the purchase intention of Japanese

food products between students who studied and those who did not learn Japanese at universities. There were a total of 199 responses that could be analyzed using the independent sample T-test and one-way analysis of variance. The results showed a significant difference in purchase intentions of Japanese food products between the group who did not learn Japanese and those enrolled in Japanese language classes at universities. However, there is no significant difference in purchase intention of Japanese food products among different levels of Japanese language proficiency groups (Aisyah et al., 2015). Other research is also reviewed by Hadiyaniyah (2016) which describes the lingual form, naming, lexicon meaning, and the basic ingredients of Sundanese traditional food in Kuningan Regency. From the research results, it was revealed that (1) Sundanese traditional food typical of Kuningan found there were 73 names of traditional food. Based on the lingual form, the classification of Sundanese traditional food names includes basic words, affixes, rephrases, compound words, and abbreviated words. (2) naming, there is the name of food based on imitation of sound, based on equations, based on ingredients, based on the place of origin, based on the mention of specific characteristics, based on some assumptions, and arbitrariness. (3) the meaning of the lexicon, all the names of Sundanese traditional food are nouns. (4) the name of Sundanese traditional food in Kuningan Regency based on its ingredients, rice, rice flour, glutinous rice, glutinous rice flour, cassava, aci, flour, beans, sweet potatoes, corn, and other ingredients.

III. METHOD

This study was designed using a survey sample cross-sectional study. The study population was housewives in Banjar Buaji Anyar, Sumertha Kelod Village, East Denpasar District, Denpasar City, Bali, totaling 103 people. 103 housewives were chosen as the sample of this study because most of them work as traders or have business selling in the food sector. Meanwhile, the number of samples was determined based on the Slovin formula and

collected by using a systematic random sampling technique. The Slovin formula is a formula used in calculating the minimum number of samples. The research variables included (1) Biodata of the respondent (occupation, native or non-native population, education level, length of time married, number of family members); (2) Aspects of the basic ingredients of Balinese Chicken Betutu; (3) Types of tools for making Balinese Chicken Betutu; (4) The process/method of making Balinese Chicken Betutu. Data were collected using a standardized questionnaire-based direct interview technique. The interviewers were 4 (four), students of Master of Linguistics Postgraduate Program Warmadewa University, while the respondents were housewives from Banjar Buaji Anyar, Sumertha Kelod District, East Denpasar District, Denpasar City, Bali. Completely filled questionnaires, before processing (inputting, cleaning, and analyzing), were coded first. Data processing was carried out on a computer using the SPSS program. Eventually, the data were analyzed descriptively.

IV. RESULTS

Traditions that still exist today reflect the culture of a community group. In Bali, for example, many traditions that have been passed down from generation to generation are still attached to the people until now, for example, a typical food that is so synonymous with Bali, namely Chicken Betutu. This food has existed since the Majapahit era until now, it is still sustainable and has become an icon of Balinese specialties for tourists visiting Bali. Therefore, this study discussed the knowledge level of housewives about serving Chicken Betutu as typical Balinese food.

1.1. Characteriscis of Responden

The study population was 103 people. Of these 103 people, it turns out that the average age is 38.63 years, with a median value of 39.00 with a standard deviation of 13,450, as shown in Table 1 below.

Table 1
Distribution of Housewives by Age

Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Median	Minimum	Maximum
38.63	103	13.450	39.00	2	75

Based on education, the data showed that the majority (41.7%) of housewives graduated from college, followed by housewives who graduated from high school amounted to

38.8%, graduated from junior high school amounted to 7.8%, and those who did not complete elementary school were 3.9% (see table 2).

Table 2
Distribution of Housewives by Education

		Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Valid	Didn't finish Elementary School	4	3.9	3.9	3.9
	Elementary School Graduate	8	7.8	7.8	11.7
	Junior High School Graduate	8	7.8	7.8	19.4
	High School Graduate	40	38.8	38.8	58.3
	College Graduate	43	41.7	41.7	100.0
	Total	103	100.0	100.0	

Based on the type of work, the data shows that the majority (40.8%) of housewives' occupations are categorized as "other", followed by "housewife" amounting to 32.0%, followed

by housewives who are "non-civil servants" totaling 19.4 % and those who work as "civil servant" amount to 7.8% (see table 3).

Table 3
Distribution of Housewives by Occupation

		Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Valid	Housewife	33	32.0	32.0	32.0
	Civil Servant	8	7.8	7.8	39.8
	Non-Civil Servant	20	19.4	19.4	59.2
	Other	42	40.8	40.8	100.0
	Total	103	100.0	100.0	

The Popularity Level of "Gilimanuk Chicken Betutu" and "Gianyar Chicken Betutu"

Popularity is measured by the respondent's level of knowledge about (1) the type of material; (2) the manufacturing process; (3) the types of Equipment Used and (4) the types of Flavors of Gilimanuk Chicken Betutu and Gianyar Chicken Betutu. Based on the results of the analysis, the level of popularity of 'Gianyar Chicken Betutu' and 'Gilimanuk Chicken Betutu' can be seen in tables 4 and 5. Based on table 4, it is found that the level of popularity of Ayam Betutu Gilimanuk, namely: 20.4% "very often hear" chicken Betutu Gilimanuk with a frequency of 21 out of 103 housewives who were careful; 53.4% "often hear" Ayam Betutu Gilimanuk with a frequency

of 55 out of 103 housewives. Meanwhile, 17.5% "rarely heard" Gilimanuk Chicken Betutu with a frequency of 18 out of 103 housewives and 8.7% "never heard" Gilimanuk Chicken Betutu with a frequency of 9 out of 103 housewives. Based on table 5, it is found that the level of popularity of the Gianyar Chicken Betutu is 19.4% "very often hear" the Gianyar Chicken Betutu with a frequency of 20 out of 103 housewives studied; as many as 35.0% "often hear" with a frequency of 36 out of 103 housewives of Gianyar Chickens Betutu. Meanwhile, 21.4% "rarely hear" Gianyar Chicken Betutu with a frequency of 22 out of 103 housewives, and 24.3% "never hear" Gianyar Chicken Betutu with a frequency of 25 out of 103 housewives. For further information, see tables 4 and 5 below.

Table 4
The Popularity Level of the Gilimanuk Chicken Betutu

		Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Valid	Very often Hear	21	20.4	20.4	20.4
	Often Hear	55	53.4	53.4	73.8
	Rarely Hear	18	17.5	17.5	91.3
	Never Hear	9	8.7	8.7	100.0
	Total	103	100.0	100.0	

Table 5
The Popularity Level of the Gianyar Chicken Betutu

		Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Valid	Very often Hear	20	19.4	19.4	19.4
	Often Hear	36	35.0	35.0	54.4
	Rarely Hear	22	21.4	21.4	75.7
	Never Hear	25	24.3	24.3	100.0
	Total	103	100.0	100.0	

The Knowledge Level of Respondents about the Ingredients (noun), Tools (noun), and the Process of Serving Gianyar Chicken Betutu and Gilimanuk Chicken Betutu

The level of knowledge of respondents in this study covers ingredients (nouns), tools (nouns), and the process of serving Gianyar Chicken Betutu and Gilimanuk Chicken Betutu. Based on the data and results obtained regarding the respondent's level of knowledge of the ingredients (nouns), tools (nouns) and the process of making Gilimanuk Betutu Chicken, it can be explained, in table 6, that as many as

68.1% "very often" the basic ingredients of Gilimanuk Chicken Betutu with the frequency of 64 out of 103 respondents. Meanwhile, 23.4% "often hear" the basic ingredients of the Gilimanuk Chicken Betutu with a frequency of 22 out of 103 respondents. As many as 5.8% "rarely hear" the basic ingredients of "Gilimanuk Chicken Betutu" with a frequency of 6 out of 103 respondents and 1.9% "never hear" the basic ingredients of "Gilimanuk Chicken Betutu" with a frequency of 2 out of 103 respondents.

Table 6
The Knowledge Level of Basic Ingredients for Serving Gilimanuk Chicken Betutu

VX4REG (The Knowledge Level of Basic Ingredients for Serving Gilimanuk Chicken Betutu)

		Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Valid	Very Good	64	62.1	68.1	68.1
	Good	22	21.4	23.4	91.5
	Not Good	6	5.8	6.4	97.9
	Not very Good	2	1.9	2.1	100.0
	Total	94	91.3	100.0	
Missing	System	9	8.7		
Total		103	100.0		

In Table 7 it can be seen that 20.2% have a very good understanding of the process with a frequency of 19 out of 103 respondents

of making Gilimanuk Chicken Betutu; 60.6%

with a frequency of 57 out of 103 respondents have a good understanding of the process of making Gilimanuk Chicken Betutu. Meanwhile, 18.1% with a frequency of 17 out of 103 respondents who poorly understood the process of making Gilimanuk Chicken Betutu and only 1.1% with a frequency of 1 in 103 respondents who understood very poorly the basic ingredients of Gilimanuk Chicken Betutu. Furthermore, in table 8, the respondent's level of knowledge about the making tools of the Gilimanuk Chicken Betutu is described. It is known that 35.1% with a frequency of 33 out of

103 respondents have a 'very good' understanding of the tools used in making 'Gilimanuk Chicken Betutu'. Meanwhile, 42.6% with a frequency of 40 out of 103 respondents have a 'good' understanding of the tools used in making Gilimanuk Chicken Betutu. Furthermore, 18.1% with a frequency of 17 out of 103 respondents 'poorly' understood the tools used in making Gilimanuk Chicken Betutu, and only 4.3% or with a frequency of 4 out of 103 respondents 'very poorly' understood the tools used in making Gilimanuk Chicken Betutu.

Table 7
The Knowledge Level about the Serving Process of Gilimanuk Chicken Betutu

VX5REG (The Knowledge Level about the Serving Process of Gilimanuk Chicken Betutu)

		Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Valid	Very Good	19	18.4	20.2	20.2
	Good	57	55.3	60.6	80.9
	Not Good	17	16.5	18.1	98.9
	Not very Good	1	1.0	1.1	100.0
	Total	94	91.3	100.0	
Missing	System	9	8.7		
Total		103	103	100.0	

Table 8
The knowledge Level about the Tool for Making Gilimanuk Chicken Betutu

VX6REG (The knowledge Level about the Tool for Making Gilimanuk Chicken Betutu)

		Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Valid	Very Good	33	32.0	35.1	35.1
	Good	40	38.8	42.6	77.7
	Not Good	17	16.5	18.1	95.7
	Not very Good	4	3.9	4.3	100.0
	Total	94	91.3	100.0	
Missing	System	9	8.7		
Total		103	103	100.0	

The knowledge level of respondents on the taste of Gilimanuk Chicken Betutu can be seen in table 9. 76.6% with a frequency of 72 out of 103 have a 'very good' understanding of the taste of Gilimanuk Chicken Betutu. Meanwhile, 20.2% with a frequency of 19 out of

103 respondents have a "good" understanding of the taste of Gilimanuk Chicken Betutu, 3.2% with a frequency of 3 out of 103 respondents "poorly" understand the taste of Gilimanuk Chicken Betutu.

Table 9
The knowledge Level of the Taste of Gilimanuk Chicken Betutu
VX7REG (The knowledge Level of the Taste of Gilimanuk Chicken Betutu)

		Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Valid	Very Good	72	69.9	76.6	76.6
	Good	19	18.4	20.2	96.8
	Not Good	3	2.9	3.2	100.0
	Total	94	91.3	100.0	
Missing	System	9	8.7		
Total		103	100.0		

Based on the results of this study, the knowledge level of ingredients (nouns), tools (nouns), and the process of making Gianyar Chicken Betutu can be seen in table 10. 21.8% with a frequency of 17 out of 103 respondents have a 'very good' understanding of the taste of Gianyar Chicken Betutu. Meanwhile, 60.3% with a frequency of 47 out of 103 respondents have a 'good' understanding of the taste of Gianyar Chicken Betutu. Furthermore, 16.7% with a frequency of 13 out of 103 respondents 'poorly' understand the taste of Gianyar Chicken Betutu, and only 1.3% with a frequency of 1 out of 103 respondents 'very poorly' understand the

taste of Gianyar Chicken Betutu. In table 11, it can be seen that 2.6% with a frequency of 2 out of 103 respondents have a 'very good' understanding of the tools used in making Gianyar Chickens Betutu. Furthermore, 26.9% with a frequency of 21 out of 103 respondents have a 'good' understanding of the tools used in making Gianyar Chicken Betutu. Next, 59.0% with a frequency of 46 out of 103 respondents 'poorly' understand the tools used in making Gianyar Chickens Betutu, and only 1.3% with a frequency of 1 in 103 respondents 'very poorly' understand the tools used in making Gianyar Chicken Betutu.

Table 10
The Knowledge Level of the Taste of Gianyar Chicken Betutu
PRBGIA (The Knowledge Level of the Taste of Gianyar Chicken Betutu)

		Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Valid	Very Good	17	16.5	21.8	21.8
	Good	47	45.6	60.3	82.1
	Not Good	13	12.6	16.7	98.7
	Not very Good	1	1.0	1.3	100.0
	Total	78	75.7	100.0	
Missing	System	25	24.3		
Total		103	103	100.0	

Table 11
The Knowledge Level about the Tools for Making Gianyar Chicken Betutu
PABGIA (Knowledge Level about the Tools for Making Gianyar Chicken Betutu)

		Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Valid	Very Good	2	1.9	2.6	2.6
	Good	21	20.4	26.9	29.5

	Not Good	46	44.7	59.0	88.5
	Not very Good	9	8.7	11.5	100.0
	Total	78	75.7	100.0	
Missing	System	25	24.3		
Total		103	100.0		

In table 12, the respondent's knowledge level of the basic ingredients of the Gianyar Chicken Betutu is presented. Therefore, it can be explained that 62.8% with 49 out of 103 respondents have a 'very good' understanding of the basic ingredients of the Gianyar Chicken Betutu. Meanwhile, 17.9% with a frequency of 14 out of 103 respondents have a 'good' understanding of the basic ingredients of the Gianyar Chicken Betutu. Furthermore, 15.4% with a frequency of 12 out of 103 respondents 'poorly' understand the basic ingredients of the Gianyar Chicken Betutu, and 3.8% with a frequency of 3 out of 103 respondents 'very poorly' understand the basic ingredients of the

Gianyar Chicken Betutu. Table 13 also shows the respondent's knowledge level of the Gianyar Chicken Betutu serving process. 62.8% with a frequency of 49 out of 103 respondents understand 'very well' the process of making Gianyar Chicken Betutu. Furthermore, 17.9% with a frequency of 14 out of 103 respondents understand 'well' the process of making Gianyar Chicken Betutu. Meanwhile, 15.4% with a frequency of 12 out of 103 respondents 'poorly' understand the process of making Gianyar Chicken Betutu, and 3.8% with a frequency of 3 out of 103 respondents 'very poorly' understand the process of making Gianyar Chicken Betutu.

Table 12
The Knowledge Level about the Basic Ingredients of the Gianyar Chicken Betutu
PBBGIA (The Knowledge Level about the Basic Ingredients of the Gianyar Chicken Betutu)

		Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Valid	Very Good	49	47.6	62.8	62.8
	Good	14	13.6	17.9	80.8
	Not Good	12	11.7	15.4	96.2
	Not very Good	3	2.9	3.8	100.0
	Total	78	75.7	100.0	
Missing	System	25	24.3		
Total		103	103		

Table 13
The knowledge Level about the Process of Making Gianyar Chicken Betutu
PBBGIA (The knowledge Level about the Process of Making Gianyar Chicken Betutu)

		Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Valid	Very Good	49	47.6	62.8	62.8
	Good	14	13.6	17.9	80.8
	Not Good	12	11.7	15.4	96.2
	Not very Good	3	2.9	3.8	100.0
	Total	78	75.7	100.0	
Missing	System	25	24.3		
Total		103	103		

V. DISCUSSION

Based on the results above, the knowledge level of housewives in making Chicken Betutu as Balinese food is generally good. The average level of respondents' knowledge of the ingredients, tools, processes, and taste of the Gilimanuk Chicken Betutu is good. This shows that on average the respondents still know the ingredients, tools, processes, and taste of the Gilimanuk Chicken Betutu. Meanwhile, the level of respondent's knowledge of the ingredients, process, and taste of the Gianyar Chicken Betutu is good on average, but the level of respondent's knowledge of the tools used in making Gianyar Chicken Betutu is still not good. Based on these results, this study shows similarities to the results of research conducted by [Sempati \(2017\)](#) which examined the perceptions of adolescents in the Village of Mantrijeron on traditional and modern food. Adolescents in the Village of Mantrijeron had sufficient perceptions of traditional food and modern food. However, the results of this study also show differences from the results of research conducted by [Adiasih & Brahmana \(2017\)](#) which examined traditional food and the perceptions of young people, namely students' perceptions of traditional East Java food. Students did not really understand what traditional food is and why it is necessary to eat traditional food. This was due to a lack of understanding of the terms used in these traditional East Javanese foods.

VI. CONCLUSION

From the results and discussion of the knowledge level of housewives about serving Chicken Betutu as Balinese food, it can be concluded that the knowledge of housewives about serving Chicken Betutu is still very good. This is definitely very beneficial for the preservation of Chicken Betutu as special food, and even Chicken Betutu has become a culinary icon from Bali. With good knowledge of housewives on the manufacture of Chicken Betutu, this can be a trusted source for the younger generation if they want to know about Chicken Betutu, starting from the basic ingredients, the manufacturing process, the tools used, to the taste of the Chicken Betutu.

REFERENCES

[Adiasih, P., & Brahmana, R. K. M. R. \(2017\).](#) Persepsi terhadap Makanan Tradisional Jawa Timur: Studi Awal terhadap Mahasiswa

Perguruan Tinggi Swasta di Surabaya. *KINERJA*, 19(2), 114.

- [Aisyah, A., Abdullah, Z., & Nezu, M. \(2015\).](#) Japanese Food Product Purchase Intention: Comparing Students With and Without Japanese Language Learning Experience. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 172, 596–602.
- [Ankerstein, C. A., & M. Pereira, G. \(2013\).](#) Talking about taste (pp. 305–316) in Gerhardt, C., Frobenius, M., & Ley, S. (Eds.). (2013). *Culinary Linguistics: The chef's special*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin Publishing Company.
- [Astuti, D. \(2005\).](#) Kajian Bisnis Franchise Makanan Di Indonesia. *Jurnal Manajemen dan Wirausaha*, 7(1), 83–98.
- [Counihan, C. ., & Kaplan, S. L. \(2013\).](#) *Food and Gender*. Amsterdam: Harwood Academic Publishers.
- [Diemer, S., & Frobenius, M. \(2013\).](#) When making pie, all ingredients must be chilled. Including you (pp. 53–82). doi:10.1075/clu.10.02die in Gerhardt, C., Frobenius, M., & Ley, S. (Eds.). (2013). *Culinary Linguistics: The chef's special*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin Publishing Company.
- [Fellner, A. M. \(2013\).](#) The flavors of multi-ethnic North American literatures (pp. 241–260). doi:10.1075/clu.10.10fel in Gerhardt, C., Frobenius, M., & Ley, S. (Eds.). (2013). *Culinary Linguistics: The chef's special*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin Publishing Company.
- [Fitrisia, D., Sibarani, R., Mulyadi, & Ritonga, M. U. \(2018\).](#) Traditional food in the perspective of culinary linguistics. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Development*, 5(2), 24–27.
- [Fuad, A. D., & Hapsari, Y. T. \(2020\).](#) Leksikon Makanan Tradisional dalam Bahasa Jawa sebagai Cerminan Kearifan Lokal Masyarakat Jawa. *Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Dan Sastra*, 19(1), 27–36.
- [Gerhardt, C. \(2013\).](#) Food and language – language and food (pp. 3–50) in Gerhardt, C., Frobenius, M., & Ley, S. (Eds.). (2013). *Culinary Linguistics: The chef's special*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin Publishing Company.
- [Hadiyanayah, Y. N. \(2016\).](#) Leksikon Makanan Tradisional Sunda di Kabupaten Kuningan (Kajian Etnolinguistik). *Lokabasa*, 7(1), 94.
- [Kotthoff, H. \(2013\).](#) Comparing drinking toasts – Comparing contexts (pp. 211–240) in Gerhardt, C., Frobenius, M., & Ley, S. (Eds.). (2013). *Culinary Linguistics: The chef's special*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin Publishing Company.
- [Lumanaw, N. \(2018\).](#) Pengembangan Makanan Tradisional Bali pada Pasar Malam di Pasar

- Sindu, Sanur, Bali. *Jurnal Ilmiah Hospitality Management*, 9(1), 83–92.
- Montanari, M. (2006). *Food Is Culture*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Muliana, I. N. (2020). Ideologi di Balik Iklan Komersial Berbahasa Bali. *Jurnal Kajian Bali (Journal of Bali Studies)*, 10(2), 417.
- Purna, I. M., & Dwikayana, K. (2019). Betutu Bali: Menuju Kuliner Diplomasi Budaya Indonesia. *Patanjala: Jurnal Penelitian Sejarah Dan Budaya*, 11(2), 265.
- Sempati, G. P. H. (2017). *Persepsi dan Perilaku Remaja terhadap Makanan Tradisional dan Makanan Modern*. Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta, Yogyakarta.
- Suardani, M. (2013). Analisis Keputusan Pengunjung Membeli Ayam Betutu pada Rumah Makan Ayam Betutu Khas Gilimanuk di Tuban Bali. *Soshum: Jurnal Sosial Dan Humaniora*, 3(2), 202–211.
- Sukerti, N. W., Marsiti, C. I., & Suriani, N. M. (2016). Reinventarisasi Makanan Tradisional Buleleng sebagai Upaya Pelestarian Seni Kuliner Bali. *Jurnal Ilmu Sosial Dan Humaniora*, 5(1).
- Suradnya, I. M. (2006). Analisis Faktor-Faktor Daya Tarik Wisata Bali dan Implikasinya Terhadap Perencanaan Pariwisata Daerah Bali. *SOCA: Jurnal Sosial Ekonomi Pertanian*, 6(3), 43993.
- Szatrowski, P. E. (2014). *Language and Food: verbal and non-verbal experience*. Philadelphia: John Benjamin Publishing Company.
- Zuryani, N. (2020). Sosio-Agrikultur Bali untuk Gastronomi Berkelanjutan di Indonesia. *Jurnal Kajian Bali (Journal of Bali Studies)*, 10(2), 627.