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ABSTRACT

The use of Javanese language by 10 - 11 years old children in Kendal Central Java experienced some imperfection especially from the diction, grammatical, and semantic aspects. This research took the sample from 5th grade children in SDN 3 Kutoarjo, Kendal Central Java. This research used qualitative method by describing the language aspects which were resulted by the 5th grade children in oral story by using pictorial media. The analytical technique in use was direct method which was the direct analysis on language aspects such as vocabularies, grammatical, and its meaning. The data collection was collected by recording, listening, and taking note in order to collect the representative data. According to some analysis, it could be known that in Javanese language ability by the 10 to 11 years old children frequently did the imperfection, especially in vocabulary, grammatical, and meaning aspects.

Introduction

Speech and language are often being jumbled up, but actually both of them have differences. Bicara or speech is the verbal expression that includes about articulation, how the words are formed by speech muscles (smooth muscles) (Chaer, 2010). While the definition of language is broader, referring to the entirety of expressing and receiving information meaningfully. Despite of the problems in the development of both are different, they can be overlapping each other. For the example, children with the language development can pronounce words well but they cannot arrange the words in sentence-making. Otherwise, the children can use words to express their idea but the articulation is not clear (Hadiwidjojo, Vera Itabiliana K.: 2008).

Speech tendly concerns with the delivered information, so that the language principals become less of attention. In speech, people often do not concern with the grammatical aspects, like sentences or vocabularies. This matter will be more clearly shown in children's speech or children's interaction because children experience the phase of language development. Therefore, it will be significantly different if the children’s speech is compared with the adult's speech. This matter is suitable with the phase of children’s language development which can be seen through the table below:
Table 1
Children's Language Development (Vera Itabiliana K. Hadiwidjojo, 2008)

| Child's Age | Language Development |
|-------------|----------------------|
| 6 months old | Responding to the name-calling. Responding to the people’s voice by doing a head turning or looking at the voice source. Responding relevantly with angry or friendly voice. |
| 1 year old | Using one or more meaningful words if craving for something, or it can pieces words such as “mam” for terms of eating. Undertasting the simple instruction such as “duduk” (sit down, please Pronouncing out the first meaningful word. |
| 18 months old | Reaching 5-20 vocabularies, mostly noun. Always repeating words or sentences. Being able to follow the instruction such as “Tolong tutup pintunya” (Close the door, please!) |
| 2 years old | Being able to mention some name of things surrounding. Combining 2 words into short sentence such as "Mama Bobo" (Mama's Sleeping). Reaching 150-300 vocabularies. Being able to respond the instruction “Tunjukkan telingamu” (show your ears, please!) |
| 3 years old | Knowing the part of body. Using 3 words in one sentence. Reaching 900-1000 vocabularies. Being able to mention name, age, and gender. Being able to answer simple queston about his/her surrounding environment. |
| 4 years old | Knowing the animals' name Mentioning things in books or magazines. Learning about colours Being able to repeat 4 digits of number Being able to repeat 4 syllables words. Repeating words, phrases, and phrases interestedly. |
| 5 years old | Being able to use descriptive words or adjective. Understanding antonym, big-little, smooth-rough Being able to count to 10. Speaking clearly unless there is any problem in pronounciation. Being able to follow 3 instructions at the same time. Undertansing the time concept : morning, afternoon, evening, tomorrow today, and yesterday. Being able to repeat 9 words sentence. |

According to the table of Children’s Language Development above (table 1), it can be concluded that in 5 years old ages, children are already able to start making sentences, or arranging some vocabularies, although the grammatically are not perfect yet (compare with Manik, A.A.R.B, 2020). It will be more perfect in the language use for the children if it is compatible with their age development. Because the children's age development is also followed by their intelligence development. Or in other words, the children's intelligence development is also followed by their language and linguistic development (can be compared with Basaria, 2017). The linguistic intelligence is the well ability in speaking and writing. A person with the linguistic intelligence has the ability in using words effectively both of verbal or written (Aqib, 2008).
This is very interesting for the researcher to observe about the linguistic intelligence for the over five years old children. The researcher takes notice about the language development of the 10 to 11 years old children or 5th grade elementary school children in Kendal Central Java. The language that will be observed is Javanese language that is used in story telling by giving pictures to the children and then the pictures with storyline will be told by them.

**Research Methods**

This research used qualitative method by describing the data and its phenomenon. The data were collected by recording and taking notes. The data was in words arrangement or Javanese language sentences which is used in story telling by the 10 to 11 years old boys and girls in Kendal Central Java. The sampling technique which was used by the researcher is random sampling by choosing the samples randomly. The chosen samples were ten children from 5th grade elementary school in SDN 3 Kutoarjo, Kendal. Those children consisted as 5 girls and 5 boys.

After that, the classified data would be analyzed by using direct method by analyzing the data directly from the language features itself. In other words, it was called as analyzing the data without focusing on external aspects from the language (Sudaryanto, 2001).

**Results and Discussion**

The data which were received from the ten 5th grade children from SDN 3 Kutoarjo Kendal were transcribed based on the reality without correcting and fixing the language. From those 10 children’s language, it was found that there were two dialects in their use, namely Kendal dialect and Javanese dialect. Beside of that, every children showed their difference in their fluency in language ability also the different story telling technique. For more details in this part, it is needed to be shown about the transcribed data from those 10 children.

1. **Grammatical Errors**

   According to the sentences which were pronounced by 10 children above, each student had their errors in grammatical aspect, both in terms of morphology or syntax (can be compared with Hanafi, 2020).

   a. **Morphological Errors**

      Morphological errors were mostly done by Meyla Pratitins in pronouncing words *menjaba* (go out) and *dikirakku* (I think). The pronunciation of words *menjaba* was considered as unfamiliar in Javanese Language. The word refered to the meaning of “go out”. The word *dikirakku* was considered as the misuse of prefixes and suffixes, it was in prefixes *di-* and suffixes –*ku*. The word *dikirakku* were reffered to the meaning as “I think”. Shela Putri Mardina pronounced word *banyunan* (water) which was supposed to be “banyon” (water). Beside of that, both of words *banyunan* or *banyon* (water) were contextually not suitable. As for the words that were
pronounced by the boys were correct in terms of morphology. However in terms of syntax and semantic, there were several words which were not suitable.

b. Syntax and Semantic Errors

From 10 students, almost all of them were experiencing the syntax and semantic errors (can be compared with Candra, 2019). Only one student who had good sentence arrangement which closed to normal, he is Santoso Putro. The others could be explained as below:

a) Budi Santosa

1) *Anjingku nggoleki neng omah tawon ‘anjingku mencari di sarang tawon’*

‘My dog was searching at the honeycomb’

This sentence is correct in structure, but in terms of meaning it looks inelegant because *nggoleki neng omah tawon ‘mencari di sarang tawon’* (was searching at the honeycomb) impress as searching in a big room, so the dog is able to enter the room about searching freely in that place.

2) *Aku tinggal nggoleki neng jero wit ‘saya meninggalkan(nya) mencari di dalam pohon’*

‘I left (her/him/it) searching inside of the tree’

This sentence’s structure is correct, but in terms of meaning is illogical, especially the use of phrase *neng njero wit ‘di dalam pohon’* ‘inside of the tree’. This matter contains the meaning that the tree has a space or big room whereas it means *neng wit ‘di pohon’* ‘at the three’.

3) *Aku kejlungup neng jurang, jebule banyu ‘saya terjerambab di jurang, ternyata air’*

‘I fell down to the abyss, it turned out to be water’

The formation of this sentence feels illogical, because there are two clauses which are not well-arranged. The first clause is *Aku kejlungup neng jurang ‘saya terjerambab di jurang’* ‘I fell down to the abyss’, but then there is the second clause ‘ternyata air’ ‘it turned out to be water’. This matter happened because during the students’ speech, they did the ellipsis in some parts of sentence. That sentence would be suitable if it became “*Aku kejlungup neng jurang, jebule jurang kuwi mau isine banyu* ‘Saya terjerembab di jurang, ternyata jurang tersebut dipenuhi air’ ‘I fell down to the abyss, but it filled with water’”

b) Handoyo Utomo:

1) *Banjur aku metu neng cendhela. ‘Then I go out the window’*

The sentence uses the wrong preposition, the word *neng* or ‘in’. It should be replaced with *saka* or ‘from’, so the correct sentence is: *Banjur aku metu saka cendhela ‘Then I go out of the window’.*

2) *Gugukku tiba, toplese pecah ‘My dog fall, the jar is broken’.*

This sentence has two unrelated clauses, so the sentence seems illogical. This is because the speaker is placing inappropriate sentence structure. The sentence has
the right basic sentence structure if the speaker changed to: *Gugukku tiba, mecahke toplese* 'My dog fall, it broke the jar'.

c) Aji Ashari

1) *Aku karo gugukku tak tinggal turu* 'My dog and I, I let it sleeps’

The sentence has inappropriate meaning, from the structure aspect and the meaning is unclear. In the sentence, the object placement and the predicate are incorrect, so the sentence is disordered.

2) *Jebule ora kodhok, jebule tikus* 'It is not a frog, it is a mouse’.

The sentence has an inaccurate placement of sentence structure, which are the word *ora* or ‘no’ and the word *jebule* on the second clause. The word *ora* should be placed before the verb, while the noun paired with the word *dudu* or ‘not’. The word *jebule* or ‘evidently’ on the second clause should be replaced with the word *nanging* or ‘but’. Thus, the sentence will be: *Jebule dudu kodhok, nanging tikus* ‘It is not a mouse, but a frog’.

d) Ilham Maulana

*Aku nggoleki neng jejer watu,...* ‘I searched in the lined stone,...’

From the sentence above, the speaker said an incorrect phrase order, the wrong phrase is *jejer watu*. The order of the phrase it should be *watu jejer* or ‘stone lined’. So, the correct sentence is: *Aku nggoleki neng watu jejer* ‘I searched in the stone lined’.

e) Kautzar Aulia

*Aku mlayu neng watu gocekan wit, jebul kidang* ‘I run on the rock holding on to the tree, it is deer’

The sentence has an illogical clause order, because the speaker cut off the certain part of the sentence. The sentence can be said as correct sentence if the speaker said: *Aku mlayu neng watu gocekan wit, jebul dudu wit nanging kidang* ‘I run on the rock holding on to the tree, but it is not a tree, it is a deer’.

f) Rofiatun

*Guguke tiba, toplese pecah.*

This sentence has similar case that happened to Handoyo Utomo. The relationship between the first clause and second clause is unrelated. It would be a logical sentence if the sentence orderes into: *Guguke tiba, marahi toplese pecah* ‘The dog fall, it caused the jar broke’.

g) Ajeng Safitri

*Gugukku tiba, toplese pecah*. ‘My dog fall, the jar is broken’

This sentence has similar case with the data above.

h) Meyla Pratitis
Kewan-kewan kuwi jenenge kodhok karo guguk ‘Those animals are called frog and dog’

Structurally, the sentence above had no errors, but it contains an illogical meaning. Which is the word jenenge or ‘the name’ is usually used for the title name, not to mention the kind of something. So the correct sentence is: Kewan-kewan kuwi yaiku kodhok karo guguk ‘Those animals are called frog and dog’.

i) Shela Putri M
Aku ditumpakke kidang ‘I am lifted to the deer’

The sentence above has context errors, because in the actual circumstances no one does the action as in the sentence. The context in the sentence only shows the event that accidentally happened.

Based on the explanation above, it can be said that almost all of the students experience grammatical errors, either morphologically or syntactically. This is normal in children of primary school age, who are still classified as experiencing language development.

2. Unfamiliar Vocabulary

In the data above, there are ten male and female students who still use unfamiliar vocabulary, especially words from Indonesian language or Indonesian code mixing in the Javanese (can be compared with Muhassin, 2013; and Sadono, 2014). Borrowing Indonesian language occur in almost all female students, and partly happen in male students. It can be seen in the table of unfamiliar vocabulary of male and female student below:

| Number | Male Students | Borrowing Words | Javanese Words | Number | Female Students | Borrowing Words | Javanese Words |
|--------|---------------|-----------------|----------------|--------|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|
| 1      | Budi S        | lewat anjing tapi | hwat asu/guguk nanging | 1      | Kautzar Aulia   | sarang | susuh/omah |
| 2      | Handoyo U     | tapi Anjing     | nanging asu/guguk | 2      | Rofiatun        | anjing sarang | asu/guguk susuh/omah |
| 3      | Santosa P     | Tapi nanging    | sarang sampe nganti | 3      | Ajeng S         | sarang | susuh/omah nganti |
| 4      | Meyla P       | anjing sarang  | asu/guguk susuh/omah | 4      | Meyla P        | anjing sarang | asu/guguk susuh/omah |
| 5      | Shela P       | anjing sarang pepohonan | asu/guguk susuh/omah | 5      | Shela P         | anjing sarang | asu/guguk susuh/omah |

Number of Borrowing Words 6

Number of Borrowing Words 10
From the table 2 above, it can be seen that the use of borrowing words is mostly used by female students, while the male students are less.

**Conclusion**

Based on the data analysis which have been explained above, the conclusion are follows: 1) male and female students from grade 5 in the age of 10 – 11 years old, in general, they often made mistakes in the use of language, both grammatically and in the terms of its meaning; 2) in determining word choice, male students were rarely use borrowing words from other languages, while the female students still frequently used the borrowing words, especially Indonesian; and 3) male students could be seen as the Javanese language speakers who were more active than female students.

**References**

Aqib, Zaenal. 2008. *Sekolah Ramah Anak. Mencegah Kekerasan dalam Sekolah*. Bandung: Yrama Widya.

Basaria, Debora. 2017. “Emotional Intelligence in Adolescences with Javanese (Study in Yogyakarta Special Region)”. The Asian Conference on Education 2017 (Official Conference Proceedings).

Chaer, Abdul. 2010. *Linguistik Umum*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta

Hadiwidjojo, Vera Itabiliana K; Purba, Jefri Fernando; Sianturi, Indra Sunandi. 2008. *“Tanya Jawab Seputar Perkembangan Anak”*, Jakarta: Bhuana Ilmu Populer

Hanafi. 2020. “Contrastive Analysis: A Case for Noun Affixes of Indonesian Language and Banten Javanese Language”. JELTS Vol. 3 No. 2 (2020): 64-72

Manik, A.A.R.B. 2020. *“Bahasa pada Anak Usia 5 Tahun: Kajian Psikolinguistik”*. JURNAL SASINDO (Program Studi Sastra Indonesia FBS UNIMED) Vol. 9, No 2 (2020)

Muhassin, Muhammad. “Pemerolehan Bahasa Awal Anak”. English Education: Jurnal Tadris Bahasa Inggris. Vol 5, No 1 (2013): 12-25

Pramita, Candra; Basri, Irfani; Agustina. 2019. “Pemerolehan Bahasa dari Segi Fonologi, Sintaksis Dan Semantik Anak Usia 3;5 Tahun”. Jurnal Edukasi Khatulistiwa: Pembelajaran Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia. Volume 2 no 2 (2019): 8-12

Sadono, Kundaru and Rahmadi, Muhammad. 2014. “A Sociolinguistics Study on the Use of the Javanese Language in the Learning Process in Primary Schools in Surakarta, Central Java, Indonesia”. International Education Studies, vol. 7no.6(2014):25-30

Sudaryanto. 2001. *Metode dan Aneka Teknik Analisis Bahasa*. Yogyakarta: Dutawacana University Press.