INTEREST: Jurnal Ilmu Kesehatan
Vol. 10, No. 1, May 2021
https://doi.org/10.37341/interest.v0i0.303

Original Research

The Difference Of Javanese And Indonesian Vocabularies In Preschool Age Children

Windiarti Dwi Purnaningrum[1*], Muryanti[2]

[1,2] Department of Speech Therapy, Poltekkes Kemenkes Surakarta

ABSTRACT

Background*: Vocabulary is an important component of language aspect in children. Vocabulary mastery is a good predictor to see the language ability of children in further age. Speaking using more than one language gives children a broader experience to access language learning. This research was conducted to see the difference of vocabularies in Javanese and Indonesian languages.*

Methods: *The research was conducted using cross-sectional design. Data collection was conducted by distributing questionnaire to parents. The sample design used was total sampling. Data collection was conducted on April-September 2019.*

Results: *The result of analysis using Mann Whitney test shows that there is a difference of vocabularies between Javanese and Indonesian languages. Variance test shows that Javanese vocabularies are higher in quantity than Indonesian vocabularies.*

Conclusion: *There is a difference of vocabularies between Indonesian and Javanese. The use of dominant language in daily life putatively contributes to the findings of research. Broader exploration should be conducted to see the comparison between first and second languages.*

ARTICLE HISTORY
Received : March 17th, 2021
Accepted : July 12th, 2021

KEYWORDS
bilingual; preschool; semantic; vocabularies

CONTACT
Windiarti Dwi Purnaningrum
✉
windiartidwi@gmail.com
Department of Speech Therapy, Poltekkes Kemenkes Surakarta

Cite this as: Purnaningrum, W., & Muryanti, M. (2021). The Difference Of Javanese And Indonesian Vocabularies In Preschool Age Children. *Interest : Jurnal Ilmu Kesehatan*, 78-83. https://doi.org/10.37341/interest.v0i0.303

INTRODUCTION

Vocabulary is the basic component of language. Vocabulary mastery is an important indicator to see whether or not child passes through normal language development. Specifically, vocabulary is used in diagnosing language problem (American Psychiatric Association, 2013; Bishop et al., 2017; Paul & Norbury, 2012; Shipley & McAfee, 2021). Limited vocabulary is the primary indicator to see whether or not child has limited language ability. The prediction of language ability at advance and academic levels can be seen from the history of vocabulary mastery in early childhood (Brignell et al., 2019; Kiliç, 2019; McDaniel et al., 2018).

Vocabulary mastery gives children an opportunity to master further language ability. For example, to have sentence mastery or ability, a child should be able to use word appropriately based on the context of sentence (Rowe et al., 2012). Some factors

affect vocabulary development, either internally or externally (Pratomo et al., 2016). Parents' role is one of factors affecting the child's vocabulary achievement significantly (Bingham et al., 2017; Richels et al., 2013; Rowea et al., 2016). The administration of language stimulus and model is a process passed through in language learning for preschool students (Pratomo et al., 2018).

Parents' language use is a real model in child's language attainment. Language uttered by parents in the form of mother tongue is blueprint of language ability generally. It means that when mother uses Indonesian, child will follow her using Indonesian. Indonesia as a state with plural or multicultural populations has great language wealth. Indonesia has 737 languages used as primary and secondary languages, in addition to Indonesian. One of language types used widely is Javanese (Aji et al., 2019).

The use of more than one language has considerable advantage. A child has an opportunity of gaining more vocabularies than those using one language (Pransiska, 2017). It is reported that individuals who can use more than one language has broader language complexity. Although the use of two languages has some advantages, the exploration to see the comparison of vocabulary in two languages cannot be done. The objective of research was to see the comparison of vocabulary size in two different languages.

The difference arising will give theoretical and clinical implications particularly in speech therapy treatment. This study will focus on vocabulary in performance prediction especially when clinision treat vocabulary aspect in bilingual children. The purpose of study si to find the differences between bahasa Indonesian and Javaness Vocabulary.

MATERIALS AND METHOD

This research employed cross-sectional approach. Data collection was conducted in *Taman Kanak-kanak (Kindergarten) Sri Juwita Hanum* and *RA Al Kautsar* Mojosongo Surakarta. Research permission letter was obtained from the headmaster with letter numbers 064/SPb/ RA-AK/ VIII/ 2019 and 04/ KB-TK/ SJH/ VIII/ 2019. Data was collected on April-September 2019. The sample of research consisted of 4-6 years old students in TKA and TKB. The sample design used was total sampling. The sample size was 66. The sample is normal children that no has any communication problems.

Data collection was carried out through distributing questionnaire to parents. Parents filling in questionnaire containing list of vocabularies. List of words contains food (*makanan/ panganan*), *toy* (*mainan/ dolanan*), *di luar* outdoor (*rumah/ing njawi griyo*), animal (*binatang/ kewan*), body part (*anggota tubuh/ badan*), place (*tempat/ panggen*), activity (*kegiatan/aktifitas*), household (*rumah tangga*), personal (*pribadi*), person (*orang/ tiyang*), clothing (*pakaian/ ageman*), vehicle (*kendaraan/kendaraan*), transformer (*pengubah*), and etc (*lainya/ sanesipun*). A total of 303 words were collected. Parents marked the word by putting check on the words the child can utter spontaneously.

This study used the valid and reliable instrument. Each of word that can be uttered spontaneously is scored 1. Data analysis used descriptive statistic and bivariate statictis. To found deferences beetwen vocabulary, we used Mann Whitney Test.

RESULTS

The result of descriptive analysis indicates that majority respondents are less than 5 years old. Male dominates the distribution of respondents' sex. Data on the distribution of frequency is presented in table 1.

Table 1. Distribution of Frequency

Variable	n	%
Gender		
Girl	31	47.7
Boy	35	52.3
Age		
Above 5 years	38	56.9
Under 5 years	28	43.1
Total	**66**	**100**

The table above indicates that the ratio of male-to-female respondent is almost equal, despite a slight difference. Most respondents are less than 5 years old. It means that most respondents are still in TK A level. To see the difference of vocabularies in Javanese and Indonesian, variance test was conducted. Variance test chosen was Mann Whitney test. The result of normality test shows that the two variables have not-normal data distribution with significance value of Kolmogorov Smirnov test of 0.199 in Javanese and ≤0.001 in Indonesian vocabulary groups. The result of Mann Whitney test can be seen from Table 2.

Table 2. Result of Variance Test

Statictic	Vocabulary Score
Mann-Whitney U	1358
Wilcoxon W	3569
Z	-3.735
Aysmp. Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000

Significance value ≤0.001 indicates that there is a statistical difference of vocabularies between Javanese and Indonesian. To see the comparison of words in Javanese and Indonesia, the mean scores of two languages are compared. The comparison of words in Javanese and Indonesian is presented in Table 3.

Table 3. Vocabulary Comparison

Type of Language	N	Mean Rank
Javanese Language	66	78.92
Indonesia Language	66	54.08

The table above shows that mean score of Javanese vocabularies is higher than that of Indonesian vocabularies.

DISCUSSION

The result of data analysis shows that there is a difference of word vocabularies in Javanese and Indonesian. Significance value is less than 0.001. The result of comparison between mean scores indicates that vocabulary score of Javanese is higher

than that of Indonesian. The hypothesis that the use of Javanese language is more dominant than that of Indonesian is confirmed. The use of language in house environment is an important key to the children's language learning activity (Bingham et al., 2017).

Assumption that ethnocultural variable affects the development of children's vocabularies is confirmed. The development of cross-cultural linguistic aspect has been the material of clinical discussion in language disorder field (Connor, 2008). Domination of one language over others, particularly in mother tongue, is an early model developing more rapidly than second language (Kuo & Lai, 2006; Tager-Flusberg, 2015). Another finding proves that language activities of between parents and children is an important process in children language learning (Pratomo et al., 2016). If parents use Javanese, the process of learning vocabularies the children will receive is in Javanese.

Children will process lexical process based on the model they have received (Rescorla et al., 2013). Although the result of research successfully finds the fact concerning the difference of vocabularies in Javanese and Indonesia, this finding cannot be generalized into an assumption that one language is different from another, particularly when comparing first and second language. A broader exploration needs to be done on the difference of cross-cultural vocabularies. The dominant use of language at home cannot be used as basic indicator to see the children's language ability. Multiple factor (multifactorial) analysis is required to see broadly the aspects affecting the development of vocabularies in children (AlHammadi, 2017).

Clinical implication of research is that an analysis needs to be conducted on the assessment and the intervention based on ethnocultural study on children. Ethnocultural-based assessment and intervention are known to have more functional outcome (Shipley & McAfee, 2021). The clinical decision making not to use language choice based on clinical perception becomes important. Clinician should map detailed vocabulary including type of words and type of languages used. If the selection of targeted words is compatible to the children's contextual need, the intervention produced will be more functional (Gray & Yang, 2015).

CONCLUSION

This research successfully revealed the difference of vocabularies between Javanese and Indonesian. The result of analysis indicates that Javanese vocabularies have higher score than Indonesian ones. Javanese is putatively used more dominantly in family and social setting of children. The result of research can be used as a material of evaluation for clinicians to choose and to determine appropriately the targeted vocabularies functionally. The appropriate selection of targeted vocabularies gives an opportunity of achieving higher therapy outcome.

This research still has some limitations. The sample size needing expansion is one of recommendations for further exploration. Multivariable analysis is required to see more in-depth the variables correlating with the development of children's vocabularies. Evaluation of vocabularies in direct face-to-face form is required to see actually the vocabulary mastery the children have.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Thank to all institutions for the participation of this study.

REFERENCES

Aji, L. S., Sugiharti, S., & Salimi, M. (2019). Analysis of Javanese Language Vocabulary Skill for Elementary School Students in Kebumen District. *Social, Humanities, and Educational Studies (SHEs): Conference Series*, *1*(2), 263. https://doi.org/10.20961/shes.v1i2.26876

AlHammadi, F. S. (2017). Prediction of child language development: A review of literature in early childhood communication disorders. *Lingua*, *199*, 27–35. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2017.07.007

American Psychiatric Association. (2013). Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders : DSM-5. In *Pediatria Integral* (5th Editio, Vol. 17, Issue 7). American Psychiatric Association.

Bingham, G. E., Jeon, H. J., Kwon, K. A., & Lim, C. (2017). Parenting styles and home literacy opportunities: Associations with children's oral language skills. *Infant and Child Development*, *26*(5), 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1002/icd.2020

Bishop, D. V. M., Snowling, M. J., Thompson, P. A., Greenhalgh, T., Adams, C., Archibald, L., Baird, G., Bauer, A., Bellair, J., Boyle, C., Brownlie, E., Carter, G., Clark, B., Clegg, J., Cohen, N., Conti-Ramsden, G., Dockrell, J., Dunn, J., Ebbels, S., … Whitehouse, A. (2017). Phase 2 of CATALISE: a multinational and multidisciplinary Delphi consensus study of problems with language development: Terminology. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry and Allied Disciplines*, *58*(10), 1068–1080. https://doi.org/10.1111/jcpp.12721

Brignell, A., May, T., Morgan, A. T., & Williams, K. (2019). Predictors and growth in receptive vocabulary from 4 to 8 years in children with and without autism spectrum disorder: A population-based study. *Autism*, *23*(5), 1322–1334. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362361318801617

Connor, C. M. (2008). Language and Literacy Connections for Children Who are African American. *Perspectives on Communication Disorders and Sciences in Culturally and Linguistically Diverse (CLD) Populations*, *15*(2), 43–53. https://doi.org/10.1044/cds15.2.43

Gray, S., & Yang, H.-C. (2015). Selecting Vocabulary Words to Teach. *Perspectives on Language Learning and Education*, *22*(4), 123–130. https://doi.org/10.1044/lle22.4.123

Kiliç, M. (2019). Vocabulary knowledge as a predictor of performance in writing and speaking: A case of turkish efl learners. *Pasaa*, *57*(March), 133–164.

Kuo, M.-M., & Lai, C.-C. (2006). Linguistics across Cultures: The Impact of Culture on Second Language Learning. *Journal of Foreign Language Instruction*, *1*(1), 1–10.

McDaniel, J., Yoder, P., Woynaroski, T., & Watson, L. R. (2018). Predicting receptive–expressive vocabulary discrepancies in preschool children with autism spectrum

disorder. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, *61*(6), 1426–1439. https://doi.org/10.1044/2018_JSLHR-L-17-0101

Paul, R., & Norbury, C. F. (2012). *Language Disorders from Infancy Through Adolescence: Listening, Speaking, Reading, Writing, and Communicating* (Fourth Edi). Mosby Elsevier Inc.

Pransiska, R. (2017). Benefits of Bilingualism in Early Childhood: A Booster of Teaching English to Young Learners. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research (ASSEHR)*, *58*(November), 390–393. https://doi.org/10.2991/icece-16.2017.68

Pratomo, H. T. A., Adriani, R. B., & Akhyar, M. (2016). Association Between Parental Education, Occupation, Income, Language Activity, and Language Proficiency in Children. *Indonesian Journal of Medicine*, *01*(03), 152–159. https://doi.org/10.26911/theijmed.2016.01.03.02

Pratomo, H. T. A., Siswanto, A., & Purnaningrum, W. D. (2018). Skrining Kemampuan Bahasa Anak Pra Sekolah : A Pilot Project. *Jurnal Keterapian Fisik*, *3*(1), 25–34. https://doi.org/10.37341/jkf.v3i1.105

Rescorla, L., Cathy Lee, Y. M., Oh, K. J., & Kim, Y. A. (2013). Lexical development in Korean: Vocabulary size, lexical composition, and late talking. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, *56*(2), 735–747. https://doi.org/10.1044/1092-4388(2012/11-0329)

Richels, C. G., Johnson, K. N., Walden, T. A., & Conture, E. G. (2013). Socioeconomic status, parental education, vocabulary and language skills of children who stutter. *Journal of Communication Disorders*, *46*(4), 361–374. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcomdis.2013.07.002

Rowe, M. L., Raudenbush, S. W., & Goldin-Meadow, S. (2012). The Pace of Vocabulary Growth Helps Predict Later Vocabulary Skill. *Child Development*, *83*(2), 508–525. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2011.01710.x

Rowea, M. L., Denmark, N., Harden, B. J., & Stapleton, L. M. (2016). The Role of Parent Education and Parenting Knowledge in Children's Language and Literacy Skills among White, Black, and Latino Families. *Infant and Child Development*, *25*, 198–220. https://doi.org/10.1002/icd.1924

Shipley, K. G., & McAfee, J. G. (2021). *Assessment in speech-language pathology: a resource manual* (Sixth edit). Plural Publishing, Inc.

Tager-Flusberg, H. (2015). The Development of English as a Second Language With and Without Specific Language Impairment: Clinical Implications. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, *24*(2), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1044/2015