

Frog, Where Are You?: A Study on Bahasa Indonesia Interference in Javanese Children's Speech

DOI:10.22515/ljbs.v6i2.3628



DIAN WAHYUNIANTO

dianwahyunianto@umm.ac.id

Language Center

Universitas Muhammadiyah Malang

Malang, Indonesia

submitted: 7/5/2021 revised: 12/10/2021 accepted: 23/10/2021 published: 12/11/2021 pages: 101-114

ABSTRACT

The coexistence of Bahasa Indonesia and Javanese has become an issue in the Javanese language preservation. Such strong contact is finally resulting in bilingual individuals in which language interference often occur. In this study, however, is aiming at describing how and why Bahasa Indonesia is interfering Javanese in Javanese children speech. By using task-based approach by Grosjean, this study manipulated language production in Javanese children using wordless narrative book *Frog, Where Are You?* created by Mercer Mayer. The results show that Bahasa Indonesia is interfering Javanese in phonic, morphological, syntactic, lexical, and even semantic aspects. Nevertheless, lexical level interference is the most noticeable interference since both language share quite similar structure. It is believed that, in sociolinguistics perspective, Bahasa Indonesia has gradually shift Javanese gradually. It is also seen that Javanese children with strong exposure of Bahasa Indonesia are eventually perceive more Bahasa Indonesia structure than Javanese.

Key words: bilingualism, language contact, language interference, Bahasa Indonesia, Javanese

INTRODUCTION

The coexistence of Bahasa Indonesia and local languages in Indonesia has caused local language shift cases (Anderson 1996; Cohn & Ravindranath 2014). The number of the speakers of Bahasa Indonesia even keep increasing and is predicted to escalate gradually until 2040 (Cohn & Ravindranath 2014). This will result in the decreased number of local language speakers that will also lead to language endangerment. There is growing body of literatures that recognizes that local languages have been shifted even in the smallest context which is family interaction (Ardila, Agustine & Rosi 2018; Mardikantoro 2012; Munandar 2013; Nugroho 2011). Concluding this phenomenon, Javanese is one of the local languages affected by the collision with the official language, Bahasa Indonesia.

As a matter of fact, Bahasa Indonesia which occupies the 'throne' as a national language is generally used in formal and semiformal contexts. It is including education context, political context, and other governmental contexts. Constitutionally, Law no. 24 of 2009 on the National Flag, Language, Emblem and Anthem, especially in the articles 25 to 44, seems to strengthen the power of Bahasa Indonesia (Republik Indonesia 2009). Moreover, in education context, article 29 stipulates that Bahasa Indonesia must be used as main language of instruction. It eventually creates strong language contact between Bahasa Indonesia and local languages in the school-aged children due to more exposure to the national language at school. The so-called language contact is the situation when certain community are being familiar with two or more languages that coexist in equal terms (Bondarko 2000 Weinreich 1968). Of course, given case would bring up the existence of bilingualism as results of the language contact.

Bilingualism study resulted from language contact are mostly seen as sociolinguistic phenomenon (Arua & Magocha 2002; Caldas & Caron-Caldas

2002; Fishman 1968; Hidayat & Setiawan 2015; Kartikasari 2019; Kundharu 2006). However, Paradis (2005), Wei (2009), and Walters (2005) added some point that bilingual phenomenon can also be explained using psychological or psycholinguistic perspective since it also happens personally. Given that bilingualism is social as well as personal phenomena, previous studies have proven that bilingual individuals tend to have difficulties in maintaining two languages simultaneously (Ardila, Agustine & Rosi 2018; Hidayat & Setiawan 2015; Kharkhurin 2007; Sukoyo 2012). In other words, equally strong mastery of two or more languages by an individual will certainly lead to colliding language rules that make a speaker seem to make a mistake or language use deviation making mutual interference between languages.

There are three level of interference that is believed to appear in bilingual community. They are phonic interference, grammatical interference, and lexical interference (Weinreich 1968). Those three level of interference are also used in previous studies to investigate the pattern of interference in certain language (Ardila et al. 2018; Baykalova et al. 2018; Mariyana 2011; Mulyani 2014; Sukoyo 2012). This study, in the other hand, is aiming at describing Bahasa Indonesia Interference in the Javanese occurred in the Javanese children affected by language contact phenomena. It is because such interference nowadays has become serious matters in Javanese speakers.

During the latest decade, a number of researches on interference of Bahasa Indonesia in Javanese speech increased (Mardikantoro 2012; Munandar 2013; Nugroho 2011; Sukoyo 2012). However, the explanation of the causes of language interference in those studies has tended to focus on sociolinguistic and textual aspects. Thus, this research will also include the causes of language interference in psycholinguistic aspects since language interference and bilingualism are also psycholinguistic phenomena (Paradis 2005). The psycholinguistics perspective is really beneficial in explaining the cause of language interference occurred in the Javanese children. Before explaining the causes, this research will first describe the forms or patterns of Bahasa Indonesia interference in Javanese language speech of Javanese children in the lexical, phonological, morphological, and syntactic levels. Therefore, the objectives of this study are describing linguistics pattern of interference of Bahasa Indonesia in Javanese as well as answering why such thing happens by using sociolinguistics and psycholinguistics perspective.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study used descriptive qualitative methods in order to explain thoroughly the language interference happened in the Javanese children speech. The flexibility of qualitative approach is beneficial to explore more on the phenomena happened in the Javanese children speech. As stated by Dornyei (2007) that qualitative approach is way more open in various possibilities happen during the research. Besides, combining with descriptive method, the explanation on the social context of this study was given comprehensively. Researcher in descriptive qualitative research put all of the efforts on taking notes in details the data formed as written data or audio-visual data (Subroto 2007).

The data were collected using task-based method to manipulate the participants in producing language interference naturally. This method was firstly suggested by Grosjean in 1997 to find out code-switching happened in French-English bilingual (Walters 2005). In this study, the method was done by using the wordless story book entitled *Frog, Where Are You?* created by

Mercer Mayer (1969). This book was chosen since there are number of studies using it in order to obtain the research objectives which is language production by the children (Bennett-Kastor 2002; Cameron & Wang 1999; Reilly et al. 2004).

In implementing the study, the researcher undertook some steps. The first was preparing the wordless book entitled *Frog, Where Are You?* to be read by the children. Secondly, the children as subjects of this study were selected by seeing some criteria, such as, Javanese speaker and being in 3rd to 6th grade of elementary school. This education levels were chosen by considering that in their ages the children are considered to be an intermediate level of their mother tongue. The researcher also selected children from two different areas which are Surakarta and Kediri considering there would be similarities in their accents. After recorded everyone, the researcher interviewed each of the children to find out their language preference. The analysis processes started from transcribing the recorded speech then determining the interference parameters using Javanese dictionaries (Poerwadarminta 1939; Prawiroatmodjo 1981; Purwadi 2004). The interferences were then classified based on the linguistics units which are lexical interference, phonological interference, morphological interference, and syntactic interference.

RESULTS
Overview on
Language
Production

At the first glance on the results, with the total of 8 children and 29 series of pictures in the *Frog, Where Are You?* book, the children had successfully produced sentences to retell the story in Javanese. The research stopped at 8 children only because those 8 children commonly made similar sentences and interference at similar 'place'. Regardless the fact that all children could produce such spoken narrative in 'sufficient' sentences, it was found that sentences quantity produced by the children were still less than the pages of the books. It indicates that the children also did combination of two pages to make 1 sentence. The results obtained in children sentences production are presented in *Table*.

Table: Number of Javanese Sentences Produced by the Children

Speaker	Sentence(s)	Average
Male		
P	17	
K	14	
D	17	
A	17	16.25
Female		
F	23	
R	20	
N	23	
M	18	21.00
Total	149	18.63

The *Table* above is quite revealing in several ways. First, the sentence production in Javanese by the children is averagely 18.63 sentences ranging from 14 sentences to 23 sentences. As it is already mentioned, the sentences produced by the children are less than the total page numbers of the book. Secondly, given that fact, it can be seen as small assumption that the children

had difficulties in elaborating ideas in telling stories using wordless book especially in Javanese, their mother tongue. However, such conclusion cannot be obtained completely without further investigation which only focuses on children sentence production in Javanese. Thus, as what is stated in the objectives of this study, the Bahasa Indonesia interference found in the children Javanese speech in retelling story will be explained in the section below.

Phonic Interference

This type of interference is described as 'sound substitution' by Weinreich (1968). The sound or 'phonic' as he mentioned is part of the imperfect assimilation between L1 and L2. This imperfect assimilation is represented in the mispronunciation a speaker of certain language does. However, such mispronounced words usually are mistaken as accent or perceived as 'real word' (Raettig & Kotz 2008; Schmid & Yeni-Komshian 1999). In Indonesian context, the well-known accent Javanese tend to have is called as *medhok*. In fact, such phenomenon actually is considered as phonic interference.

Phonic interference occurred in this study was the least to be found since all of the subjects, the children, are native speaker of Javanese. Thus, the way they expressed each word was normal as typical Javanese kids. This is what is broadly believed that the native speakers would not easily fall to make mistakes in their own language speaking. However, Javanese alveolar consonant [d] and retroflex [ɖ] were mistakenly used interchangeably. In the words *wedhi* which means sand and *wedi* which means afraid were found to be mistakenly spoken by the subjects. For further explanation, the following is the description of the datum.

(1) *Bar ngono, David nggoleki ning wedi* [wədi:]

(Later on, David was searching in the **sand/afraid**)

In sentence (1), the speaker was mistakenly used the alveolar [d] for the retroflex [ɖ] in the word *wedi*. It is, undeniably, affecting the meaning of the word. As it is supposed to mean sand which is pronounced as [wəɖi:] (written orthographically as *wedhi*), following the context of the story, the speaker pronounced it as [wədi:] which means 'be afraid' (written orthographically as *wedi*). The speaker, who used wrong phoneme, was resulting in the unusual sentence creation. Even worse, it is contextually unacceptable. It occurred since the speaker got enormous number of Bahasa Indonesia interference in which such language does not accommodate voiced retroflex stop phoneme, [ɖ] and only has voiced alveolar or dental variants of [d] (Soderberg & Olson 2008). Thus, in Indonesian context, those two phonemes have no significant difference in terms of use. It only gives variations in such language and provides, not to mention, an accent to the speaker leading to *medhok* stereotypical. Meanwhile, in Javanese, those two phonemes affect the meaning of the words.

The second phonic interference occurred in this study is little bit dilemmatic. It is due to, instead of phonic interference of Bahasa Indonesia in Javanese, what really happened was the other way around. However, the datum here is also included in lexical interference as actually it is. Another unique fact about this datum is that it occurred several times in 4 speakers indicating that such error happens frequently. This phonic interference is considered as vowel interference. The following is the description of the datum.

- (2) *Raihan digodak rusa* [ru:sɔ]
(Raihan was chased by a **deer**)

As already explained above, sentence (2) is also classified as lexical interference since in Javanese, the word for deer is *kidang*. Nevertheless, the error happened frequently as 4 speakers mispronounced the word several times in their story. *Rusa* is Bahasa Indonesia word for deer which is supposed to be pronounced as [ru'sɑ]. Meanwhile, what happened in this study is that the speakers kept pronouncing it as [ru:sɔ]. The speakers, who mistakenly pronounced [ɑ] as [ɔ], were having incomplete comprehension of Javanese resulting in generalizing that most of Bahasa Indonesia words which ends with open syllable [ɑ], mostly end with open syllable [ɔ] in Javanese equivalents. Taking example of words in Bahasa Indonesia such as, *singa* which means lion, pronounced as [si:ŋɑ], is pronounced as [si:ŋɔ] in Javanese, and word *dada* which means chest, pronounced as [dada], is pronounced as [dɔdɔ] in Javanese. Although, that knowledge is not completely wrong, it is partially correct, especially when it refers to the case of sentence (2).

Regarding to this problem, the phenomenon which occurred in sentence (2) will be explained once again in lexical interference section. In addition, following the order of interference in Weinreich (1968), subsection below is description and further explanation of grammatical interference of Bahasa Indonesia occurred in Javanese speech of Javanese children.

Grammatical Interference

Grammatical interference is covering two types interference. They are morphological interference and syntactic interference. Those two aspects of linguistics are believed to be overlapping each other in terms of interference and are problematic among the linguists since both talks about language structure. Henceforth, Weinreich (1968) decided to combine morphological and syntactic interference as grammatical interference considering overlapping structural point of view towards language interference.

In this study, there are grammatical interference of Bahasa Indonesia occurred in Javanese speech produced by the children. Those grammatical interferences found in this study were divided into morphological interference and syntactic interference taking account on what aspects were interfered. The first sub-section, therefore, is presenting morphological interference of Bahasa Indonesia occurred Javanese speech of children. The following is the morphological interference description and analysis.

Morphological interference

To distinguish this section with the upcoming subsection describing the syntactic findings, it needs to be highlighted that in this section, the main issue is the word-related interference occurred in Javanese children speech. As it is a word-related interference, morphological interference, however, is crisscrossing with lexical interference as in classification proposed by Weinreich(1968) divided into two which are simple words and compound words or phrases. The latter is the one closely related to morphological interference.

In this study, the first and the most frequent case happened in terms of morphological interference is related to the suffix *-é* in Javanese. Such suffix is to be added to noun and become possessive or determiner phrase marker of definite element (Baroroh 2020; Davies & Dresser 2005). In addition, the realization of suffix *-é* varies with *-né* in which *-é* is used when it is glued to the closed syllable noun while *-né* is used with open syllable noun. This, of

course, should be used as bound morpheme compounded with noun, Javanese noun. For clear picture on how this thing works, the following are the data where such morphological interference occurred.

(3) *toples-é pecah ning wedhi*
 jar-DEF broken on sand
 (The jar broke into the sand)

(4) *rusa-né ngerém ndadak*
 deer-DEF brake sudden
 (The deer suddenly stopped)

Regarding to the explanation above, both (3) and (4) are the data which consist suffix *-é* and its variation *-né* functioned as definite article. In (3) and (4), it is used partially correct since the suffix *-é* and *-né* succeeds the noun *toples* which means jar and *rusa* which means deer. The other condition that makes those two data are partially correct is that in (3) the speaker used *-é* for noun that ends with closed syllable and in the use of *-né* in (4) for noun which ends with open syllable. However, the suffix which stands as bound morpheme belonging to Javanese ironically is compounded with Bahasa Indonesia words. The noun *toples* in (3) and *rusa* in (4) are definitely Bahasa Indonesia words that in Javanese equivalent they are supposed to be *lodhong* for jar and *kidang* for deer as it is already mentioned in previous section. Therefore, the grammatical interference, specifically morphological interference, in those two sentences is the existence of Bahasa Indonesia words as free morpheme attached with Javanese bound morpheme, suffix *-é* and *-né*. Same thing happened in the exact same suffix functioned as possessive construction as what the following data described.

(5) *Bar no Mirza neng ndhuwur kepala-né rusa*
 After that Mirza on above head-POS deer
 (After that, Mirza was on the deer's head)

Given that suffix *-né* in (5) is functioned as possessive determiner. One of the common position of possessive construction in Javanese is that the head noun attached by suffix *-é* and *-né* is followed by possessor (Davies & Dresser 2005). However, the first task of the children was completely failed since they combined free morpheme of Bahasa Indonesia and bound morpheme of Javanese resulting on morphological interference in their speech. In (5), the speaker said 'kepala' instead of *endas* or *sirah* for head as *kepala* is actually coming from Bahasa Indonesia, especially with the way the speaker pronounced it as [kəpala]. Hence, as the previous data described, these ones are also considered morphological interference by the existence of Bahasa Indonesia words as free morpheme attached by Javanese suffix as bound morpheme.

The structure of syntactic interference of Bahasa Indonesia in Javanese speech will be explained in the following section.

Syntactic interference

In the previous section, it is already described and explained the morphological interference of Bahasa Indonesia in Javanese spoken by the children. Repeating what has been said in the beginning of grammatical interference section, the syntactic and morphological aspects of interference are overlapping most of the time. This study is no exception. Such overlap and crisscross section come not only inside grammatical interference, but also in most of all interference. It is believed that certain thing happened due to the

fact that language is complex system. However, what is defined as syntactic interference is grammatical relation interference (Weinreich 1968). Weinreich (1968) added that the interference in grammatical relation is consisting order, modulation, as well as agreement and dependence.

In this study, on the other hand, only few data classified as syntactic interference were found. It is due to many similarities between Javanese structure and Bahasa Indonesia which both come from same root (Sudaryanto 1979). However, the researcher found 1 syntactic interference resulting ineffective sentence. In (6), it is the one datum found in this study in which the speaker did redundancy in saying what it is supposed to mean bird. Interestingly, the speaker did such redundancy in two different languages, Bahasa Indonesia and Javanese. The following depicts what is found in this study.

(6) *Bar ngono David dikejar karo manuk* (*burung hantu)
 After that David PV-chase with bird (*owl)
 (After that, David was chased by owl)

It is completely clear in (6) that the speaker was not only having Bahasa Indonesia interference in his sentence, but the speaker also made slight error. This datum can also be classified as lexical interference due to inclusion of a phrase *burung hantu* which is Bahasa Indonesia for owl that coexist with the word *manuk* which means bird in Javanese. What can be analyzed as syntactic interference is that coexistence of two words with the same exact meaning, *manuk* and *burung*. It results in redundancy which makes the sentence sounds ineffective. Besides, what the speaker wanted to describe is owl which in Javanese usually called *koko beluk*, *manuk ceguk* or *manuk uwuk*. The latter is what the speaker was supposed to mention since it has word *manuk* in the phrase *manuk uwuk*. Nevertheless, if the speaker only said *manuk*, his sentence was completely okay though he would miss a little detail on the bird type. In other words, it can be concluded that the existence of Bahasa Indonesia phrase *burung hantu* results in sentence disruption.

The next section is the biggest number of interferences occurred in this study which is lexical interference.

Lexical Interference Given the number of sentences produced in Javanese by the children as shown in Table 1 and section Overview section, it can be seen that sentences production of the children is considered 'enough'. However, it does not imply that the children produce the perfect Javanese sentences. As the main objectives of this study, Bahasa Indonesia interference in Javanese, the sentences produced by the children also presented some interferences of Bahasa Indonesia. Such interferences are including lexical interference that occurred frequently in their speech. The lexical interference, however, is so broad that it has to be separated into two classification, namely simple words and compound words (Weinreich 1968).

Simple words Simple words interference is believed to be the most common lexical interference occurred in bilingual (Mariyana 2011; Mulyani 2014). It is quite tricky in analyzing lexical interference of Bahasa Indonesia in Javanese since both languages shared most of their lexical items interchangeably due to strong contact between those two languages. Therefore, crosschecking each vocabulary, especially the suspicious one, in Javanese dictionary (Poerwadarminta 1939; Prawiroatmodjo 1981; Purwadi 2004) is mandatory.

The following are the description of lexical interference data found in this study.

- (7) *Roni ngopeni kodok ning **toples***
(Roni kept a frog inside a **jar**)
- (8) *Raihan digodak karo **rusa***
(Raihan was chased by a **deer**)
- (9) *Mirza lankirik é nemutawon lan **pohon***
(Mirza and his dog found bees and **trees**)
- (10) *Doni ndeloki ning **lubang***
(Doni was looking inside a **hole**)

The data above show lexical interference of Bahasa Indonesia in Javanese speech of children in telling story of *Frog, Where Are You?* Data found in (7), (8), (9), and (10) are all Bahasa Indonesia lexical items where all of them are noun. The words *toples* and *rusa* are previously presented also in (2), (3), (4), and (5) where *toples* means jar and *rusa* means deer. Both words actually exist in Javanese equivalent which are *lodhong* for jar and *kidang* for deer. Data (9) and (10), however, are Bahasa Indonesia words for tree and hole consecutively. Likewise, those words in (9) and (10) are supposed to be *uwit* for tree and *bolongan* for hole in which both are Javanese equivalent. The most lexical data found in this study are noun. However, there is anomaly found in this study. In datum (11) below, the lexical item belongs to adjective.

- (11) *Mirza lan kiriké untungé **selamat***
(Mirza and his dog, luckily, were **safe**)

Sentence (11) is proof that the speaker also did an 'error' in putting Bahasa Indonesia lexical item and it is an adjective in their Javanese speech. The word *selamat* spoken by the speaker is Bahasa Indonesia word for safe. In fact, the difference between safe in Bahasa Indonesia and Javanese is only in matter of pronunciation. The Javanese equivalent for safe is *slamet*. Thus, it can be seen that if only the speaker pronounced [ə] instead of [a] in the ultima of the word as well as changing from two first syllables *se-la* into two consonants cluster /sl/+/a/ becoming /sla/, the speaker would be completely safe from interference.

Compound words and phrases

This is the section that overlaps with *Grammatical Interference* subsection above where here, it also talks about compound words where the process including affixation and other word formations. However, to distinguish this section from the morphological interference section above in this section, what is considered as compound words interference is where the words are completely Bahasa Indonesia lexemes processed in Bahasa Indonesia word formation rules only. Thus, the mixture of Javanese words with Bahasa Indonesia word formation process or vice versa will not be included in this section. Not to mention, data (3), (4), and (5) are not classified in this section. Yet, data (6) can be classified as phrase and be included in this section. The following are data presented for clearer interpretation.

- (12) *Bar ngono, David **dikejar** karo manuk burung hantu*
(After that, David **was chased** by owl)
- (13) *Sampe David **diganggu** karo rusa*
(Until David **was bothered** by a deer)

Data (12) and (13) are compound words interference found in this study. To be clear, the bold words are the main focus although there seem to be

another interference found in those data. From those data, what can be inferred is that both of lexical items are verb. The verb in (12), *dikejar* is Bahasa Indonesia for 'being chased' which actually is supposed to be *diuber* in Javanese equivalent. Meanwhile in (13), the word *diganggu* means 'being bothered or disturbed' which in Javanese equivalent is *dirusuhi* (Prawiroatmodjo 1981). Those verbs, to be précised, are in the passive form. Prefix *di-* combined with verb will create the passive form of the verb. As the rule of *di+V* passive form in Bahasa Indonesia and Javanese is quite similar, the subject in the sentences (12) and (13) who are both David stands as patient in grammatical relation. The different form of compound words found is presented in (14) below.

- (14) *David nggoléki ning hutan, ning **sekeliling** omahé, gaenek*
(David was searching in the forest, **around** his house, not found)

The word *sekeliling* in (14) is Bahasa Indonesia counterpart for adjective 'around' in English. However, *sekeliling* can be classified as noun and/or particle in Bahasa Indonesia. It is derived from noun *keliling* added with prefix 'se-' resulting *sekeliling* which commonly is preceded by preposition. Unarguably, such word is Bahasa Indonesia which actually is *sakubengé* in Javanese equivalent. This datum, along with (12) and (13), are affixed words and classified as compound words in lexical interference of Bahasa Indonesia in Javanese spoken by children in telling story. Having discussed how the compound words interference of Bahasa Indonesia in Javanese, the following is other forms of compound words and phrases found in this study.

- (15) *Mirza dikejar **burung hantu***
(Mirza was chased by **owl**)
- (16) *Ndilalah rusane **mendadak berhenti***
(Surprisingly, the deer **suddenly stopped**)
- (17) *Bar ngono, David nggoléki ning mburiné **pohon tumbang***
(After that, David was searching behind a **fallen tree**)

Those three data in (15), (16), and (17) are compound word and phrases interference of Bahasa Indonesia in Javanese spoken by children. In (15), the phrase *burunghantu* is Bahasa Indonesia for owl. It is compound word constructed by noun *burung* which means bird and noun *hantu* which actually means ghost. Those two nouns combined creating new 'word' that means owl. On the other hand, the compound word *burunghantu* is known as *manuk uwuk* or *kokobeluk* in Javanese counterpart. In contrast, (16) and (17) are phrases where *mendadak berhenti* in (16) is verb phrase constructed from adverb *mendadak* which is English equivalent of adverb 'suddenly'. *Berhenti*, however, means stop and that verb phrase can be substituted with *mandek ndadak* as Javanese equivalent to *mendadak berhenti*. Phrase in (17), by contrast, is noun phrase grammatically standing as object. Such noun phrase is constructed by noun *pohon* which means tree and verb *tumbang* which means 'fall'. The phrase *pohon tumbang* is Bahasa Indonesia equivalent to *uwit ceklék* in Javanese which means 'fallen tree'.

Semantic Interference

There is unique case in this study where words are completely Javanese, but semantically inappropriate in sentences speakers spoke themselves. Inappropriateness of these words are analyzed contextually and found to be questionable thing. In the end, the researcher found out that such thing happened as shift of meaning (Ilbek 1967). Hence, it finally fell into different

category called semantic interference taking account it is semantic relation phenomena. Data (18) and (19) showed below will assist for better understanding.

(18) *Dogi diwedeni manuk nganti mlayu*
(Dogi **was scared** by a bird to run)

(19) *David lan kiriké digodak tawon sampe David tiba*
(David and his dog **were *chased** by bees until he fell)

In sentence (18), the word *diwedeni* is definitely Javanese indicating that in this sentence, the speaker did not make any error or was interfered with Bahasa Indonesia lexical. Despite the fact that it is zero interference, the sentence is quite questionable. Word *diwedeni* is giving implication that something is feared due to respect. In fact, what the speaker was trying to convey is that Dogi was scared by a bird, an owl, or in active voice perspective, the bird was scaring Dogi. Using word *diwedeni* makes the sentence incoherent or contextually impossible. It should be *diden-deni* or reduplication of *diwedeni* into *diwedeni-wedeni* which would make the sentence coherent.

Another case as in (19), word *digodak* is also partially correct to be used in such context. In (19), it shows that the subjects, David and his dog, were chased by bees. As a matter of fact, bees definitely would 'chase' something or someone(s) by flying. However, in the sentence (19), passive verb *digodak* is commonly interpreted as be chased by something by running. It is the case where the children only have limited range of vocabulary items in Javanese for chase that varies from *diuber*, *dioyak*, *digodak*, *ditututi*, etc. (Poerwadarminta 1939) where each word have different contextual meaning.

The results presented in subsections above provide important insight into the description of each interference form of Bahasa Indonesia in Javanese spoken by the children in telling story. The next section, therefore, moves on to discuss the causes of such interferences using some different point of views as well as re-analyzing the data when it is necessary.

DISCUSSION

This study set out with the aim of describing the interference of Bahasa Indonesia in Javanese spoken by Javanese children in telling story of *Frog, where are you?* Referring to the first finding being presented in Table 1, it shows that number of sentences produced by the children are 18.625 in average. This finding broadly supports the work of other studies which also uses the frog story book created by Mayer(1969) where the children or bilingual individuals produced number of words, phrases, clauses, and sentences that are considered sufficient (Bennett-Kastor 2002; Cameron & Wang 1999; Minami 2005). In accordance with the present results, previous studies have demonstrated that female produces more utterances than male in narrative (Minami 2002) especially in mother language (Bennett-Kastor 2002). However, this still needs further investigation considering different subject numbers, method, and setting would lead to different results.

In this study, one of unanticipated finding was that the speakers made slight phonic error in their speech. Such interference was coming from both vowel and consonant. Consistent with the literature, this study found that phonic interference occurred in interlanguage between L1 and L2 where such interference accommodated both vowel and consonant interference (Hidayat & Setiawan 2015; Sukoyo 2012). However, in the case of this research, such interference occurred since the speakers obtained more Bahasa Indonesia exposure resulting in mixing L1 and L2 phonetics system. Such mixing

phenomena as defined by Clyne (in Walters 2005) as phonologically unintegrated transference of the bilingual individual.

Another important finding is in grammatical interference, the participants were mixing morphological structure between Bahasa Indonesia and Javanese. It is found that Indonesian free morphemes are combined with Javanese affixes creating imperfect words formation. Meanwhile, in syntactic interference, it is found that due to redundancy of Bahasa Indonesia phrases and Javanese word with same meaning coexist, it results in incoherent sentence. Morphological interference and syntactic interference of Bahasa Indonesia in Javanese also reported in previous studies (Mariyana 2011; Sukoyo 2012). Specifically, these findings in grammatical interference in this study also accord with previous observations, which showed that morphologically, interference tended to appear in mixing both L1 system and L2 system, and syntactically, redundancy also appeared (Sarfranz, Mansoor, & Tariq 2016).

In lexical interference, the most frequent words appeared in children speech are nouns from Bahasa Indonesia such as name of animal, plant, etc. Verbs and adjectives were also found in compound words interference. It proves that in lexical level, interference also occurred equally. The simple words interference in noun and compound words in other than noun also reported in previous studies (Mariyana 2011; Mulyani 2014; Sukoyo 2012). Moreover, semantic interferences were also found in this study as results of different vocabulary range between Bahasa Indonesia and Javanese. This wide range of Javanese vocabulary is processed imperfectly by the participants resulting in contextually incoherent sentences. Several previous studies also investigated this semantic interference issue (Luykx et al. 2007; Mahon et al. 2007). Those previous studies saw this as lexical selection of bilinguals.

Another goal of this study is to answer the causes of language interference found in this study using both sociolinguistics perspective and psycholinguistics perspective. First, most of studies on language interference in Indonesia provided that language interference occurred due to several causes and motivation namely, language contact, language attitude of the speakers, closely related language system, language habit, insufficiency of language vocabulary, emphasizing detail information and the speaker low ability in one particular language (Ardila et al. 2018; Mariyana 2011; Sukoyo 2012). Although those causes stated by previous researches are not completely wrong, there is room for broader explanation in each cause.

As mentioned in the beginning of this article that Bahasa Indonesia is constitutionally stronger making it unbeatable when it coexists with local languages. With wide range of use of Bahasa Indonesia, the speakers of local language tend to shift gradually to national language (Cohn & Ravindranath 2014) in this case, Bahasa Indonesia. In Javanese context, Bahasa Indonesia has affected in the speech level in Javanese (Poedjosoedarmo 2006) even in family context (Mardikantoro 2012; Munandar 2013). Furthermore, in the Law no.24 of 2009, it is explicitly stated that Bahasa Indonesia must be used in Education context (Republik Indonesia 2009). Meanwhile, the participants mostly spent their times at school for at least 6 to 7 hours where they were exposed by Bahasa Indonesia. During interview, 6 of 8 participants stated that they even took afterschool lesson for national examination preparation making them being exposed by Bahasa Indonesia even longer. Thus, language policy does really have big impact in the language shifting and interference.

Strong language contact between Bahasa Indonesia and Javanese eventually disrupt each language system. This phenomena will lead the Javanese community to tolerate even neglect language system interference as it becomes understandable (Mardikantoro 2012; Munandar 2013). This study has proven that the children start to forget or have lack vocabulary stocks in Javanese creating many loanwords in their speech. Lexical selection in their cognitive process is also responsible in their language interference (Mahon et al. 2007). Taking example on phonic interference, the speaker who is pure Javanese definitely has access in Javanese phonemes but what really happened is they mispronounced the words. Such situation is believed that complex visual-word recognition process is interfering even for simple words perceiving process (Hennessey, Bell & Kwortnik 2005) due to the task given to the participants. In addition, limited lexical exposure in target language also plays role in quick decision making in their mind to execute which language, level, system or unit to be expressed (Poedjosoedarmo 2006; Starreveld & Heij 1995).

CONCLUSION

In task-based method to see how Javanese children perform their Javanese skill eventually showed language interference phenomena, in this case, Bahasa Indonesia. It was found that Bahasa Indonesia infiltrate in children Javanese language in different level of interference. First, in phonic interference, Bahasa Indonesia has disrupted the children pronunciation in consonant retroflex [ɖ] and vowel [ɔ]. In grammatical level of interference, the Javanese speakers tend to combine Bahasa Indonesia and Javanese structure in possessive, definite, and verb construction as well as slight error due to redundancy of phrases in Bahasa Indonesia and Javanese. Third, in lexical level, simple words were the most occurred loanwords in this study and most of them are noun. Meanwhile, compound words and phrases appeared in verbs and adjective as well as noun phrase. Semantic interference is also found in this study due to small vocabulary range of Bahasa Indonesia which cannot accommodate Javanese vocabulary range. This study also offers a view that the constitutional strength of Bahasa Indonesia will gradually abrade the ability of Javanese in processing their own mother language. Worse, without any preservation, Javanese will eventually extinct.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, Ben. 1996. "The Languages of Indonesian Politics." *Indonesia* 1 (1): 89. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3350786>
- Ardila, Regina Rendi, Ansellyta Agustine & Rosi Rosi. 2018. "Analisis Tingkat Interferensi Bahasa Indonesia Pada Anak Usia 12 Tahun Berdasarkan Perbedaan Latar Belakang Bahasa Orang Tua." *Parole: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia* 1 (4): 651–58. <http://journal.i.kipsiliwangi.ac.id/index.php/parole/article/view/1079>
- Arua, Arua E & Keoneng Magocha. 2002. "Patterns of Language Use and Language Preference of Some Children and Their Parents in Botswana." *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 23 (6): 449-61. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01434630208666479>
- Baroroh, Kamilatun. 2020. "Possessive Expressions in Javanese." *International Journal of Cultural and Art Studies* 04 (1): 42-53
- Baykalova, Elena D, Mira K Artyna, Namdolmaa S Dorzhu, Taigana K Ochur, & Dolaana S. Mongush. 2018. "Morphological Interference in the Process of Mastering English Speech in Conditions of Interaction of Tuvan, Russian and English as a Foreign Language." *Opcion* 34 (85-2): 35-60
- Bennett-Kastor, Tina. 2002. "The Frog Story Narratives of Irish-English Bilinguals." *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition* 5 (2): 131-46. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s1366728902000238>
- Bondarko, Liya V. 2000. "Language Contact: Phonetic Aspect." *Studies in Slavic and*

General Linguistics 28: 55-65

- Caldas, Stephen J & Suzanne Caron-Caldas. 2002. "A Sociolinguistic Analysis of the Language Preferences of Adolescent Bilinguals: Shifting Allegiances and Developing Identities." *Applied Linguistics* 23 (4): 490-514+549. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/23.4.490>
- Cameron, Catherine Ann & Min Wang. 1999. "Frog, Where Are You? Children's Narrative Expression over the Telephone." *Discourse Processes* 28 (3): 217-36. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01638539909545082>
- Cohn, AC & M Ravindranath. 2014. "Local Languages in Indonesia: Language Maintenance or Language Shift?" *Linguistik Indonesia* 32 (2): 131-48
- Davies, William D & Craig A Dresser. 2005. "The Structure of Javanese and Madurese Determiner Phrases." *Austronesian Formal Linguistics Association (AFLA)* 12 (12): 57-72
- Dornyei, Zoltan. 2007. *Research Method in Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Fishman, Joshua A. 1968. "Sociolinguistic Perspective on the Study of Bilingualism." *Linguistics* 6 (39): 21-49. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ling.1968.6.39.21>
- Hennessey, Judith E, Theodore S Bell & Robert J. Kwortnik. 2005. "Lexical Interference in Semantic Processing of Simple Words: Implications for Brand Names." *Psychology and Marketing* 22 (1): 51-69. <https://doi.org/10.1002/mar.20046>
- Hidayat, Rahmat & Teguh Setiawan. 2015. "Interferensi Bahasa Jawa Ke Dalam Bahasa Indonesia Pada Keterampilan Berbicara Siswa Siswa Negeri 1 Pleret, Bantul." *LingTera* 2 (2): 156-68. <https://doi.org/10.21831/lt.v2i2.7374>
- Ilbek, Jacques. 1967. "A Case of Semantic Interference." *The French Review* 41 (3): 368-76. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/385167>
- Kartikasari, Ratna Dewi. 2019. "Penggunaan Bilingualisme pada Masyarakat Yang Berwirausaha." *Pena Literasi: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Dan Sastra Indonesia* 2 (1): 47-54. <https://doi.org/10.24853/pl.2.1.47-54>
- Kharkhurin, Anatoliy V. 2007. "The Role of Cross-Linguistic and Cross-Cultural Experiences in Bilinguals' Divergent Thinking." In Istvan Kecskes & Liliana Albertazzi (eds.) *Cognitive Aspects of Bilingualism*, 175-210. Dordrecht: Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-5935-3>
- Kundharu, Saddhono. 2006. "Bahasa Etnik Madura di Lingkungan Sosial: Kajian Sosiolinguistik di Kota Surakarta." *Kajian Linguistik dan Sastra* 18 (34). <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.23917/ks.v18i1.5124>
- Luyckx, Aurolyn, Okhee Lee, Margarette Mahoti, Benjamin Lester, Juliet Hart & Rachael Deaktor. 2007. "Cultural and Home Language Influences on Children's Responses to Science Assessments." *Teachers College Record* 109 (4): 897-926
- Mahon, Bradford Z, Albert Costa, Robin Peterson, Kimberly A. Vargas & Alfonso Caramazza. 2007. "Lexical Selection Is Not by Competition: A Reinterpretation of Semantic Interference and Facilitation Effects in the Picture-Word Interference Paradigm." *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning Memory and Cognition* 33 (3): 503-35. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0278-7393.33.3.503>
- Mardikantoro, Hari Bakti. 2012. "Pergeseran Bahasa Jawa dalam Ranah Keluarga pada Masyarakat Multibahasa di Wilayah Kabupaten Brebes." *Humaniora* 19 (1): 43-51. <https://doi.org/10.22146/jh.v19i1.890>
- Mariyana, Lisna. 2011. *Bahasa Indonesia dalam Bahasa Jawa di Cakra Semarang TV*.
- Mayer, Mercer. 1969. *Frog, Where Are You?* New York: Dial Books for Young Readers
- Minami, Masahiko. 2002. *Culture-Specific Language Styles: The Development of Oral Narrative and Literacy*. Edited by Li Wei. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004>
- Minami, Masahiko. 2005. "Bilingual Narrative Development in English and Japanese—A Form/Function Approach." *ISB4: Proceedings of the 4th International Symposium on Bilingualism*, 1618-29. <http://www.lingref.com/isb/4/128ISB4.PDF>
- Mulyani, Wahyu. 2014. "Interferensi Leksikal Bentuk Dasar Bahasa Jawa Tuban Dalam Bahasa Indonesia: Suatu Tinjauan Deskriptif." *Bastra* 1 (2): 133-0.
- Munandar, Aris. 2013. "Pemakaian Bahasa Jawa dalam Situasi Kontak Bahasa di Daerah Istimewa Yogyakarta." *Humaniora* 25 (1): 92-102. <https://jurnal.ugm.ac.id/jurnal-humaniora/article/view/1819>
- Nugroho, Miftah. 2011. "Bahasa Indonesia atau Bahasa Jawa Pilihan Orang Tua dalam Berinteraksi dengan Anak di Rumah." *International Seminar: Language Maintenance and Shift* July 2, 2011: 198-202
- Paradis, Michael. 2005. "Aspects and Implications of Bilingualism." In Judith F Kroll and Annette M. B. De Groot (eds.) *Handbook of Bilingualism: Psycholinguistic Approach*,

- 411-16. New York: Oxford University Press
- Poedjosoedarmo, Gloria. 2006. "The Effect of Bahasa Indonesia as a Lingua Franca on the Javanese System of Speech Levels and Their Functions." *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 177 (177): 111–21. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ijsl.2006.007>
- Poerwadarminta, WJS. 1939. *Baoesastra Djawa*. Batavia: JB Wolters Groningen
- Prawiroatmodjo, S. 1981. *Bausastra Jawa-Indonesia* (2nd ed). Gunung Agung
- Purwadi. 2004. *Kamus Jawa-Indonesia/Indonesia-Jawa*. S Maziyah (ed). Yogyakarta: Bina Media
- Raettig, Tim, & Sonja A. Kotz. 2008. "Auditory Processing of Different Types of Pseudo-Words: An Event-Related fMRI Study." *NeuroImage* 39 (3): 1420-28. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2007.09.030>
- Reilly, Judy, Molly Losh, Ursula Bellugi & Beverly Wulfeck. 2004. "Frog, Where Are You? Narratives in Children with Specific Language Impairment, Early Focal Brain Injury, and Williams Syndrome." *Brain and Language* 88 (2): 229–47. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0093-934X\(03\)00101-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0093-934X(03)00101-9)
- Republik Indonesia. 2009. *Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia No. 24 Tahun 2009 Tentang Bendera, Bahasa, Dan Lambang Negara, Serta Lagu Kebangsaan (Law No. 24 of 2009 on the National Flag, Language, Emblem and Anthem)*
- Sarfraz, Summaira, Zahida Mansoor & Raheela Tariq. 2016. "Analysis of Grammatical Interference and Its Social Acceptability in Pakistani Context." *Procedia: Social and Behavioral Sciences* 232 (April): 684-88. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2016.10.093>
- Schmid, Peggy M & Grace H Yeni-Komshian. 1999. "The Effects of Speaker Accent and Target Predictability on Perception of Mispronunciations." *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research* 42 (1): 56-64. <https://doi.org/10.1044/jslhr.4201.56>
- Soderberg, Craig D & Kenneth S Olson. 2008. "Indonesian." *Journal of the International Phonetic Association* 38 (2): 209-13. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0025100308003320>
- Starreveld, Peter A & Wido La Heij. 1995. "Semantic Interference, Orthographic Facilitation, and Their Interaction in Naming Tasks." *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition* 21 (3): 686-98. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0278-7393.21.3.686>
- Subroto, Edi. 2007. *Pengantar Metode Penelitian Linguistik Struktural*. Surakarta: UNS Press
- Sudaryanto. 1979. *Predikat-Objek Dalam Bahasa Indonesia Keselarasan Pola Urutan*. Yogyakarta: Djambatan
- Sukoyo, Joko. 2012. "Interferensi Bahasa Indonesia dalam Acara Berita Berbahasa Jawa Kuthane Dhewe di TV Borobudur Semarang." *Lingua* 7 (2): 95-103
- Walters, Joel. 2005. *Bilingualism: The Sociopragmatic-Psycholinguistic Interface*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Wei, Li. 2009. "Research Perspectives on Bilingualism and Multilingualism." In Li Wei & Melissa G Moyer (eds.). *The Blackwell Guide to Research Methods in Bilingualism and Multilingualism*, 3–17. Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781444301120>
- Weinreich, Uriel. 1968. *Languages in Contact: Findings and Problems*. The Hague: Mouton Publisher

ARTICLE CITATION IN *THE CHICAGO MANUAL OF STYLE 16*

In-text Citation

Wahyuniyanto (2021, 107)

..... (Wahyuniyanto 2021, 107)

Reference List Entry

Wahyuniyanto, Dian. 2021. "Frog, Where Are You?: A Study on Bahasa Indonesia Interference in Javanese Children's Speech". *Leksema: Jurnal Bahasa dan Sastra* 6 (2): 101-114. <https://doi.org/10.22515/ljbs.v6i2.3628>.
