

THE LEARNING OF SOCIAL MULTISTATUS CHARACTER GENRE TO IMPROVE POLITENESS IN JAVANESE LANGUAGE

Sudi Esti Utami

Universitas Negeri Semarang, Indonesia.

Email: esti_sudiutami@yahoo.co.id

Endang Kurniati

Universitas Negeri Semarang, Indonesia.

Email: endangkurniawatijawa@yahoo.co.id

Maria Johana Ari Widayanti

Universitas Negeri Semarang, Indonesia.

Email: widabranta.74@gmail.com

Lispridona Diner

Universitas Negeri Semarang, Indonesia.

Email: listjoost@yahoo.com

Abstract

This research aimed to develop a learning model of social multistatus character genre in Speaking Class at Department of Study Javanese Language in Universitas Negeri Semarang. This model emphasized the performance of the use of the Java language orally. Students practiced in the form of monologue and dialogue by changing the social status of the character. Changing social status of the character offered to stimulate the application of the rules of the Java language in varied diversity. This study used the Research and Development approach. This study was conducted over 2 years. The first year activity was speaking learning model with the guided of various texts by changing the social status character. The products had been validated by several education of Java language experts. In the second year, seminars and application of these models had been conducted in the Speaking Class. The result showed the model was effective because students' spoken ability increased. Students improved their learning spirit and they participated actively during the learning process.

Keywords: genre learning, social multistatus

INTRODUCTION

The existence of Java language as a local one in Indonesia is even more alarming (Lauder in Ceylon 2014: 192), and even more difficult to be survived and closer to extinction (Ray 2010: 70). Although Javanese language is spoken by many people in many areas, the Java community still feel anxious about the existence of Java language (Nurhayati, 2013: 159). Java language will be shifted by Indonesian and foreign languages

in the industrial era 4.0, because this era is tended to be a lot of multilingual Java community. This language pattern will affect the survival of the Java language.

Preservation efforts of local languages including Java language have been done by UNESCO which set of International Mother Language Day every February 21st since 1991. The protection against local languages at the national level based on the Article 32 Paragraph 2 of the 1945 Constitution, which

states that the state shall respect and preserve local languages as national cultural treasures. In Regional level, preservation of the Java language has been protected through the Regional and Provincial Governor Regulation. The preservation of Javanese language in Central Java formal education based on Central Java Head of Education Office's leaflet number 424.13242 on 23rd July 2013, stating that the Java language learning must be implemented in primary and secondary education.

The results of the Javanese language learning are not maximized because students are still experiencing difficulties, especially in applying the rules of politeness (*unggah ungguh basa*). As stated by Kurniati (2017: 135; Utami, 2015: 25-28), there are mistakes in speaking Javanese language. Rahardi (2005: 26) states that the more choices, the speech is more polite. In Java language, politeness is not a choice but it is determined by the accuracy of selecting variety of language. The use of language diversity considering the proximity of the social, social status ranked between speaker and hearer, and the level of speech acts ratings (Yule, 2014: 104). Javanese variety or politeness (*unggah ungguh basa*) including *ngoko lugu*, *ngoko alus*, *krama lugu*, and *krama alus* (Ekowardono 1993; Hardyanto and Utami 2001). *Ngoko* used by the participants who are familiar each other and no effort to elevate / honor. It is form entirely by words and affixes *ngoko*. *Ngoko alus* is used when the participants having a close relationship that mutually giving an honor. *Ngoko alus* basically using *ngoko* words, but there are a few words using *krama inggil* to honor other speaker. *Krama inggil* words which used in *krama alus* are verb, possessive noun and pronoun to honor 3rd person. *Krama lugu* formed with words and affixes *krama*, which used the speaker and interlocutor who are not familiar with each other and do not giving an honor to each other. *Krama inggil* words

which used in a variety of *krama alus* are verbs, possessive noun and pronoun to honor 3rd person. In a conversation is possible to use two or more different languages depending on the number of social status of interlocutors. Basically, speakers (P1) speaks to the older hearer (P2) using *krama*. If P1 talks about himself or younger third person (P3) he is using *krama lugu*, but when talking about the old P2 and P3 using *krama alus*.

The language politeness errors are done by students when they do not pay attention to the social status of the person who they talked to (third person). For example: a dialogue between students: ***Bu Guru wis teka kawit mau, kok kowe lagi teka?*** 'Teacher had come earlier, why did you just come?' Politeness (*unggah ungguh basa*) on this dialogue was wrong, because it uses *ngoko lugu*, which should use *ngoko alus* in such utterance: ***Bu guru wis rawuh kawit mau, kok kowe lagi teka? Teka*** 'come' is used *ngoko* from the first person to the second person (fellow students), but when it is said to the third person who must be respected (teacher) *teka* is not appropriate, it should be ***rawuh*** 'datang'. The error becomes more complex if the person who discussed have many and varied social status.

The difficulties of using Java language for students had been overcome, but the results were not satisfying yet due to the social status of the participants in the text dialogue that have been tested in the study did not vary. Suudi dkk (2002), Supartinah (2012), Utami dkk (2015), and Kurniati dkk (2013) had tried to increase students' oral language skills in Java, Central Java by emphasizing dialogue between P1 and P2 only. Kurniati (2017) also developed teaching materials with Ecolinguistics approach to enhance the Java language vocabulary of primary school students.

Although there has been an endeavor to increase the competencies of using Java language in primary and secondary education,

students of the Javanese Language Study Program of Universitas Negeri Semarang also face the same difficulties, especially students who want to speak in *ngoko alus* or *krama alus*. They have some difficulties in communicating P3 who have varied social status. In addition, they often use *krama inggil* to honor themselves, as *maringi* (give), *ngendika* (say), *ngagem* (wear).

The problem has been handled through Speaking Class that is one subject of professional expertise. The function and urgency of Speaking Class is very important because it is to equip the student as a competence Javanese language teacher candidate. There is social multistatus genre character learning to improve the quality of the subject. This learning model aims to stimulate students in understanding the rules of politeness, increase vocabulary, and variations in the use of language in context. This course can facilitate students because they do not have to think about the message to be delivered, they just think a variety of language which appropriate with participants' social status in the dialogue. This article is one form of dissemination results of research conducted on Javanese Language Department of Semarang State University. Results of research include learning model and the results of trials conducted in even semester in 2018.

LITERATURE REVIEW

This research discussed about pragmatics in learning social multistatus character in genre analysis that is presented through speaking. Ayşegül Takkaç Tulgar in *The Role of Pragmatic Competence in Foreign Language Education*, Turkish Online Journal of English Language Teaching (TOJELT), 1(1), 10–19 said that communication is an indispensable part of any community life in which people feel the need to interact with each other for certain reasons through the concept of language that people

can communicate with a number of interlocutors in a variety of settings. She added language users are supposed to follow some conventions according to which their conversation will be not only meaningful but also appropriate and it is dealt with pragmatics. As cited from Yule (1996), she mentions that pragmatics mainly deals with what is beyond the dictionary meanings of statements. It is about what is actually meant with an utterance based on the norms and conventions of a particular society, or context, in which conversation takes place. Tulgar adds generally pragmatics underlines the connection between language use and the underlying factors like interpersonal or social dynamics that can possibly affect the usage of language. She quoted from Morris (1938) who regarded pragmatics as the analysis of how an interlocutor interprets the sign that the other interlocutor proposes. Another frequently cited definition belongs to Crystal (1985) who describes pragmatics as the study of language based on the perspectives of its users regarding their preferences, the impact of the interactional context and how utterances can influence other participants during or after the communication. Leech (1983) and Levinson (1983) also emphasize the influential nature of the context considering meaning making while proposing definitions of pragmatics.

Shokouhi, Saeedeh & Amir Rezaei (2015) in *The Importance of Teaching Pragmatics in the Classrooms (Focus on Complimenting)* add that pragmatics focuses on the use of language in particular situations; it explains the elements that influence on both literal and nonliteral meaning in peoples' communication. As they quoted from Locastro (2012) who mentioned improving the learners' pragmatic knowledge is as important as developing one's IT and technology skills. Both are important for the world of today. Teachers are on the frontlines of pragmatic development. The teachers in particular need to pursue their own ability to

think critically about language data and instances of use to prepare themselves. Their learners benefit from the explicit teaching of pragmatics by their teachers and ideally become autonomous learners, doing pragmatics to solve communication problems and pushing their competence level (p.308). As cited from Yined Tello Rueda (2006) pragmatic studies should consider to provide the students with linguistic tools and helping them to learn and understand the action in an appropriate way.

RESEARCH METHODS

This study used the approach of R and D to develop and validate educational products (Borg and Gall, 1989: 782). This study was conducted over 2 years. The first year activity was speaking learning model with the guided of various texts by changing the social status character. The products had been validated by several education of Java language experts. In the second year, seminars and application of these models had been conducted in the Speaking Class. Lesson study was done to test the effectiveness of the products that included some steps: plan, execute, and reflect (Hendayana, 2006: 10; Susilo, 2011: 32).

The subjects were lecturers and students of Java Language Education of Semarang State University. In collecting data, we used questionnaires and product validation, speaking test, interview and observation sheet. The quantitative data through the tests were analyzed by using descriptive percentage method. The qualitative data through questionnaires, interviews, and observations were analyzed with descriptively qualitative method.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results of this study included learning model and effectiveness test of the product.

Speaking Learning of Social Multistatus Character

The development of learning model referred to the learning model Firkins genre, et all (2007: 7). The model consisted of three stages, namely modeling a text, a joint construction of a text, and independent construction of text, while the activity using the technique of learning conversational skills Oradee (2012), which included discussion, role play, and problem solving. Discussion applied to joint discussion stage construction of a text. Role play activity and problem solving applied to independent construction stage of text.

Modeling a Text

At this stage, the students read the text carefully and thoroughly. The text display could be made by lecturers or utilized an existing text such as short stories, folklore, fairy tales, text dialogue, and so on. To increase the Javanese politeness, the text had specific criteria that was the charge of dialogue involving the social multistatus character. This was important because the character status differences defined a wide selection of Java language and dialogues that reflected the use of language according to the socio-cultural context.

Development of learning was done by understanding the text, exploring the cultural and social context of language use, as an example of learning with dialogue text entitled Manners 'Tata Krama' (Kridalaksana 2001: 21-22) below:

This dialogue text told that Mr. Marsudi visited Mr. Susilo's house. Mr Marsudi was offered and invited to have a lunch by Mr. Susilo. Mr. Susilo's son who named Joko Susilo Utomo also ate together.

Pak Susilo : "Pak Marsudi, mango Dhahar rumiyin."

'Mr Marsudi, let's eat first'

Pak Marsudi : "Matur nuwun. Saking griya sampun nedha kok, Mas."

"Thank you. I had eaten at my house."

Pak Susilo : "Mangga ta, ngedhapi kemawon."

"Come on, you can tasted it a little bit."

Pak Marsudi : "Inggih mangga, mangga. Nak Joko, mango lenggah ngriki. "

'Okay, then. Joko, come sit here'.

Joko Utomo : "Inggih Pak, mangga."

'Yes sir, please.'

.....

.....

In the process of understanding the text, students were guided by a number of simple questions orally, as follows.

- 1) *Sinten ingkang Rawuh dalemipun Pak Susilo?* Who is coming to Mr. Susilo's house?
- 2) *Ing ngriku, wonten Sinten kemawon?* There are anyone there?
- 3) *Mr. Marsudi kersa menapa dhahar?* 'Does Mr Marsudi want to eat?'
- 4) *Kenging menapa Mr Marsudi boten kersa tanduk?* 'Why does Mr Marsudi not want to eat more?'
- 5) *Kados pundi aturipun dhateng Bapakipun Joko Utomo?.* 'How does Joko Utomo answer to his father?'

Understanding the content of the text was very helpful when students retold and played a role. Students did not need to think about the message to be conveyed to others, they only focused on a wide selection of language in context. The text content needed to be understood by students such as reading aloud the dialogue. The goal was the students had good pronunciation both intonation or fluency.

Joint Construction of Text

At this stage, students discussed the overall structure of the text builder. Students discussed the social status of each character in the text. They analyzed the relationship between characters, whether they have the same social status/equal, higher, or lower. They also discussed the diversity of languages used types of these characters, whether using a variety of language *ngoko lugu*, *ngoko alus*, *krama lugu*, or *krama alus*. Students should look at the elements of culture that supports social objectives, among other forms of interaction such as *nuwun sewu* 'excuse me', *nyuwun pangapunten* 'sorry', *sugeng sonten* 'good afternoon', etc to be able to speak fluently. In the discussion, students guided by several questions, such as:

- 1) *Menapa Pak Marsudi kaliyan Pak Susilo ngagem unggah-ungguh basa ingkang sami?* 'Why did Mr. Marsudi and Mr. Susilo use the same kind of variety language –*unggah ungguh basa-* (politeness)?'
- 2) *Kenging menapa panjenenganipun kekalih ngagem basa krama alus?* 'Why did they use *krama alus*?'
- 3) *Kangge ngormati Mr. Susila, Tembung menapa kemawon ingkang dipun pilih Pak Marsudi?.*, what kinds of diction were used by Mr Marsudi to honor Mr. Susilo?'

After understanding the structure of the text builder, students were invited to change the social status of the character. The conversion was made in many variations. These activities made students competent in using right varied of Javanese language and applied them based on the context. Social status of character in the text *Tata Krama* (politeness) could be varied to be as follows. Mr. Mardi original characters had the same/equal social status with Mr. Susilo, transformed into Mardi equal to Joko Utomo (student) and junior high school children. Consequences of changing the social status changed application of politeness in using

Javanese language. Mr. Susilo used *krama alus* to Mr. Mardi, changed to using *ngoko alus* to Mardi (students), and a variety of *ngoko lugu* to Mardi (junior high), such as the following speech.

(1a) Pak Susilo : *Pak Mardi, mango Dhahar rumiyin!*

'Mr. Mardi, let's eat first!'

(1b) Pak Susilo : *Mas Mardi, ayo Dhahar dhisik.*

'Mardi, let's eat first!'

(1c) Pak Susilo : *Mardi, ayo mangan dhisik!*

'Mardi, let's eat first!'

Speech (1a) using a variety of *krama alus* because they were equal, they respected each other. Speech (1b) using *ngoko alus* because the social status of interlocutor was younger, but educated. Speech (1c) using social status *ngoko lugu* because interlocutor was a child.

Independent of text

At this stage the students had speaking practice by applying the appropriate varied of Javanese language based on social status of the character. The determination of social status of the character included age, education, occupation, title, etc. The training was focused on role-playing techniques. The activity started with telling the content of the text. To make discussion easy, the speaker called the persona I (P1), interlocutor called persona II (P2), others were told by so-called persona III (P3) and (P4). There were 8 models in this practice. Young P1 to P2 P3 and P4 discussed young youth.

- 1) Young P1 talked to young P2. They were talking about young P3 and P4. Variety Javanese used all participants said (P1, P2, P3, P4) is *ngoko lugu*. All vocabularies and affixes that used were *ngoko*, as in the following dialogue.

(2a) Marsudi mara *neng omahe Susilo.*

'Marsudi came to Susilo's house.'

(2b) Dheweke dijak mangan dening Susilo.

'He was invited to eat by Susilo.'

- 2) Young P1 talked to P2. They were talking about young P3 and old P4

Young P1 talked to P2 using *ngoko lugu*. When talking about young P3 and old P4 using *ngoko alus*.

Vocabularies and affixes that used were *ngoko* but there were few words to honor P4. Said *sowan* and *dalem*

(3a); *dhawuh* (3b) were used to honor P4. Even in this text using *krama inggil* words but affixes that used were *ngoko*, such as prefix *di-* in the word *didhawuhi*. It will be formed in the following dialogue.

(3a) Marsudi *sowan neng daleme Pak Susilo,*

'Marsudi came to Mr. Susilo's house.'

(3b) Dheweke *didhawuhi mangan Pak Susilo.*

'He was invited to eat by Mr. Susilo.'

- 3) Young P1 talked to young P2. They were talking about old P3 and young P4.

Young P1 talked to P2 using *ngoko lugu*, but when talking about the old P3 they used *ngoko alus*. *Krama inggil* that used to honor P3 were *rawuh* (4a); *panjenengane*, *diaturi*, and *dhahar* (4b). It will be formed in the following dialogue.

(4a) Pak Marsudi *rawuh neng omahe Susilo.*

'Mr. Marsudi came to Susilo's house.'

(4b) *Panjenengane diaturi dhahar Susilo.*

'He was invited to eat by Susilo.'

4) Young P1 talked to young P2. They were talking about old P3 and P4.

Young P1 talked to P2 using *ngoko lugu*, but when talking about (P3) and P4, (P1) using *ngoko alus*. To honor P3 and P4 they used *krama inggil rawuh* and *dalem* (5a); *panjenengane, diaturi*, and *dhahar* (5b). It will be formed in the following dialogue.

(5a) Pak Masudi rawuh ana ing daleme Pak Susilo.

'Mr. Marsudi came to Mr. Susilo's house.'

(5b) Panjenengane diaturi Dhahar Pak Susilo.

'He was invited to eat by Mr. Susilo.'

5) Young P1 talked to old P2. They were talking about young P3 and P4.

Basically, (P1) who is younger than (P2) using *krama alus* when they had a conversation, but when they were talking about (P3) and P4 without talking about P2, they used *krama lugu* such in the following dialogue.

(6a) Marsudi dugi wonten ing griyanipun Susilo.

'Marsudi came to Susilo's house.'

(6b) Piyambakipun dipunkengken Susilo nedha.

'He was invited to eat by Susilo.'

6) Young P1 talked to old P2. They were talking about young P3 and old P4.

Basically, (P1) who was younger than (P2) talked to P2 using *krama alus*. To honor P4, P1 used *krama inggil* vocabulary such as *sowan* and *dalem* (7a), *dipundhawuhi* (7b), while P3 did not need to be honored with *krama* words such as *piyambakipun* and *nedha* (7b), such as in the following dialogue.

(7a) Marsudi sowan wonten ing dalemipun Pak Susilo.

'Marsudi came to Mr Susilo's house'

(7b) Piyambakipun dipundhawuhi nedha Pak Susilo.

'He was invited to eat by Mr. Susilo.'

7) Young P1 talked to old P2. They were talking about young P3 and old P4.

Basically, (P1) who was younger than (P2) use *krama alus* to talked to P2. To honor P3, they used vocabulary from *krama inggil* such as *rawuh* (8a), *panjenenganipun, dipunaturi, dhahar* (8b), while the P4 did not need to be honored with *krama word, griyanipun* (8a) as in the following dialogue.

(8a) Pak Marsudi rawuh wonten ing griyanipun Susilo.

'Mr. Marsudi came to Mr. Susilo's house.'

(8b) Panjenenganipun dipunaturi Dhahar (Dening) Susilo.

'He was invited to eat by Pak Susilo.'

8) Young P1 talked to old P2. They were talking about old P3 and P4.

Basically, (P1) who was younger than (P2) use *krama alus* to talked to P2. To honor P3 and P4, they used vocabulary from *krama inggil* such as *rawuh dalemipun* (9a), *panjenenganipun, dipunaturi, dhahar* (9b), such as in the following dialogue.

(9a) Mr Marsudi Rawuh wonten ing dalemipun Pak Susilo.

'Mr. Marsudi came to Mr. Susilo's house.'

(9b) Panjenenganipun dipunaturi Dhahar Pak Susilo.

'He was invited to eat by Pak Susilo.'

Table 1. Differences 1-8 above speech pattern can be seen in the following speech.

<i>Marsudi mara neng omahe Susilo.</i>	'Marsudi came to Susilo's house.'
<i>Marsudi sowan neng daleme Pak Susilo.</i>	'Marsudi came to Mr. Susilo's house.'
<i>Pak Susilo Marsudi Rawuh neng omahe</i>	'Mr. Marsudi came to Susilo's house.'
<i>Mr Marsudi Rawuh ing ana daleme Pak Susilo</i>	'Mr. Marsudi came to Mr. Susilo's house.'
<i>Dugi Marsudi wonten ing griyanipun Susilo</i>	'Marsudi came to Susilo's house.'
<i>Marsudi sowan wonten ing dalemipun Pak Susilo</i>	'Marsudi came to Mr Susilo's house'
<i>Marsudi Pak Susilo Rawuh wonten ing griyanipun</i>	'Mr. Marsudi came to Mr. Susilo's house.'
<i>Mr Marsudi Rawuh wonten ing dalemipun Pak Susilo.</i>	'Mr. Marsudi came to Mr. Susilo's house.'

Product trials

Product trials conducted with lesson study in the second semester 2017/2018 at Speaking Class. Lectures Assessment carried out three times. The first assessment was a pretest, students untreated. The second appraisal carried out after students were getting treatment in learning by changing the genre of social status of the character. Lectures and assessments conducted in monologues (relating back to friends and lecturers). We found several weaknesses, such as: students tend to memorize text, lack of confidence, lack of understanding the rules of different

languages then until we found diction error. We also found wrong structure and pronunciations, often students stopped and could not continue the story. Therefore, lectures enhanced with Dialogic models (play a role). The third assessment hold after dialogues speaking class. The results indicated an increasing of student competence in speaking. It showed that the genre learning model by changing the social status character stories effectively improved the competence of students. Acquisition value of assessment of students first, second, and third as follows.

Table 2. Students Speaking Competencies

Categories/ Grade	First Rating		Second Rating		Third Rating	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
A 86-100	0	0	0	0	1	4.76
AB 81-85	0	0	0	0	7	33.34
B 71-80	0	0	10	47.62	9	42.86
BC 66-70	0	0	6	28.57	2	9.52
C 61-65	1	4.76	3	14.29	0	0
CD 56-60	3	14.29	1	4.76	2	9.52
D <55	17	80.95	1	4.76	0	0

Based on the classification ratings of Universitas Negeri Semarang, the first assessment showed that the highest grade students only in category C, and it was only achieved by one student only. Other students

occupied the CD category (3) and category D (17). After learning the genre by changing the social status character, there was a change in the acquisition of student results. At the second assessment, the highest value was

category B. There were 10 students who occupying category B, 6 students were in BC category, 3 students were in category C, and there was one student who still occupying category D. Results of study on the third assessment was better than second with the highest rating was category A, although only occupied by one student. 7 students occupied the category AB, 9 students were in category B, 2 students were in BC category, 2 students were in category CD. The failure of the 2 students was due to sport race preparation and less interest in learning Javanese language.

Learning outcomes assessment included the elements of speaking such as pronunciation, intonation, diction, structure, and fluency. Pronunciation accuracy associated with the Java language articulation. In the Javanese language, there is *swara jejeg* and *miring*. For example, U in the word *krupuk*, [kru] is *swara jejeg* and [PUK] is *swara miring*. It turned out to create problems for students. Likewise types of phonemes [d, t] and [dh, th] really needs serious training, for example, said *dados* (so) is pronounced [Dados], said *pacelathon* (dialogue) is pronounced [pacəlaton].

Intonation and pauses associated with utter precision in intonation. Most students weaknesses related to intonation and pauses do not stand alone on that element, but it happened as the effects of lack of vocabulary and structural weaknesses when speaking. It was influenced when students often lose the vocabulary and structure errors that caused inaccurate intonation and pauses.

Diction related to the choice of words and politeness. Diction as a reflection of the politeness is determined by the positions of speakers includes the first, second and third person. *Kagungan* (have), for example, should not be used in a sentence that has subject *kula* (I), but students are still frequently used it. Mistaken diction also found in words that are less acceptable in Javanese politeness, for

example, said *tangklet* (ask), *tirose* (he said), *pripun* (how), *niku* (it), etc. Said *tangklet* for instance, must be straightened and returned according to the rules of politeness. In this case the word could be distinguished at the level of words *taken*, *ndangu*, *nyuwun pirsas*, and *mundhut pirsas*.

The elements of the structure include the structure of words, phrases, clauses, sentences, and conversations. The weakness occurred by students was the word formation. Affixes both *ater-ater* (prefix) or *panambang* (suffix) were often used when speaking *ngoko*, and then they should use *krama*. For example: a sentence *panjenenganipun diaturi dhahar, daleme Pak Susilo*. (He is told to eat at Mr. Susilo's house). *Diaturi* should be *dipunaturi*. *Daleme* should be *dalemipun*. It was also found the students weaknesses at the level of the phrase. For example: a sentence *ingkang rawuh setunggal tiyang* (there is one person who already come). *Setunggal tiyang* phrase should be *tiyang setunggal*.

Fluency that meant in speaking activities is fairness of rhythm when talking. It does not stand alone; it occurs because of the effects of lack of vocabulary and structures when speaking. Students often forget / do not know the vocabulary and structure errors that make students haltingly and repeating the words.

Improved student learning outcomes is also followed by the improving learning ethos. They respond well to the stages of learning activities. During learning, the attention of students seemed interested, focused, enthusiastic, confident, and happy. Students also claimed the benefit from the life experiences of learning activities.

At the stage of changing the character status, students were challenged to try to speak. Once able to apply the correct rule created its own context, they are easier to learn the rules of politeness of Javanese language.

SUMMARY

The product of this research was a model of speaking learning. Students practiced in the form of monologue and dialogue by way of changing the social status character. Changing social status character stimulated the application of the rules of the Java language variety stages. The model consisted of three stages, namely modeling a text, a joint construction of a text, and independent construction of text, while the activities of learning conversational skills using techniques which include discussions, role playing, and problem solving. The activities applied to stage joint discussion in construction of a text. Role play and problem solving applied to independent stages in construction of text.

After having trials in Speaking class, the results showed that the model was effective. It was proved by students' knowing increasement. The highest grade in the initial assessment prior was an act of the category C (4.76%) and 80.95% of the students obtained D. The final assessment after treatment showed 4.76% of students gained grades A and no one gets D.

REFERENCES

- Borg, W.R & Gall, M.D. (1989). *Educational Research : an Introduction (Fifth Edition)*. New York : Longman.
- Crystal, D. (1985). *A dictionary of linguistics and phonetics (2nded.)*. Oxford: Backwell.
- Ekowardono, B.K. (1993). *Kaidah Penggunaan Bahasa Jawa Ragam Krama*. Semarang: Proyek Pembinaan Bahasa dan Sastra Daerah Jawa Tengah
- Firkins, A, et.al. (2007). *A Genre-Based Literacy Pedagogy: Teaching Writing to Low Proficiency EFL Students*. *English Language Teaching Journal*, fourtcoming, Oct 2007.
- Hardyanto & Utami. (2001). *Kamus Kecil Bahasa Jawa Ngoko Krama*. Semarang: Lembaga Pengembangan Sastra dan Budaya.
- Hendayana, S. et.al. (2006). *Lesson Study Suatu Strategi Untuk Meningkatkan Keprofesionalan Pendidikan (Pengalaman IMSTEP-JICA)*. Bandung: UPI Press.
- Kridalaksana, H. et.al. (2001). *Wiwara Pengantar Bahasa dan Kebudayaan Jawa*. Jakarta: PT GramediaPustaka Utama.
- Kurniati, E.(2017). "Pengembangan Cerita Anak dengan Pendekatan Ekolinguistik sebagai Pengungkap Kearifan Lokal untuk Pelestarian Bahasa Jawa dan Lingkungan di SD", *Jurnal Sekolah Dasar Kajian Teori dan Praktik Pendidikan*, Volume 26, Nomor 2, Halaman 134-143. Malang: Universitas Negeri Malang.
- Kurniati, E. & Esti Sudi Utami. 2013."Pengembangan Pembelajaran Generatif Berbasis Konteks untuk Meningkatkan Kompetensi Komunikatif Lisan Bahasa Jawa Siswa SMP" *Dalam Jurnal Lingua*, volume IX, Nomor 2. Semarang: FBS Unnes.
- Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- Levinson, S. (1983). *Pragmatics*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Morris, C. W. (1938). *Foundations of the theory of signs*. In O. Neurath, R. Carnap & C. W. Morris (Eds.), *International encyclopedia of unified science (Vol. 2, pp. 77-138)*. Chicago: University of Chicago.
- Nurhayati et.al. (2013). "Strategi Pemertahanan Bahasa Jawa di Provinsi Daerah Istimewa Yogyakarta". *Dalam Jurnal Litera* Volume 12, Nomor 12. Yogyakarta: Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta.

- Oradee, T. (2012). "Developing Speaking Skills Using Three Communicative Activities (Discussion, Problem-Solving, and Role Playing)". *International Journal of Social Science and Humanity*. Vol. 2 Nomor 6. Page. 533-535. <http://www.ijsshweb/>. Accessed on January 20th, 2019.
- Rahardi, R. K. (2005). *Pragmatik: Kesantunan Imperatif Bahasa Indonesia*. Jakarta: Erlangga.
- Shokouhi, Saeedeh & Rezaei, A. (2015). The Importance of Teaching Pragmatics in the Classrooms (Focus on Complimenting). *Journal for the Study of English Linguistics* ISSN 2329-7034 2015, Vol. 3, No. 1
doi:10.5296/jsel.v3i1.7890 URL:
<http://dx.doi.org/10.5296/jsel.v3i1.7890>
- Sailan, Z. (2014). "Pemertahanan Bahasa Muna di Kabupaten Muna Sulawesi Tenggara", in *Jurnal Litera* Volume 13, Nomor 1. Yogyakarta: Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta.
- Sinar, T.S. (2010). "Ungkapan Verbal Etnis Melayu dalam Pemeliharaan Lingkungan." Presented in dalam International Seminar Language, Literature, and Culture in Southeast Asia. Hold by Prodi Linguistik USU dan Phuket Rajabhat University Thailand, Thailand on 3-5 Juni 2010.
- Susilo, H., et al. (2011). *Lesson Study Berbasis Sekolah, Guru Konservatif Menuju Guru Inovatif*. Malang: Bayu Media Publishing
- Supartinah. (2012). "Peningkatan Keterampilan Berbicara Bahasa Jawa di Kelas V SDN Lempuyangan III Yogyakarta dengan Bercerita Gambar Seri " in *Didaktika Jurnal Ilmu Pembelajaran Ke-SD-an* Volume 3, Nomor 1. Yogyakarta: Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta.
- Suudi, et. al. (2002). "Pengembangan Materi Ajar dan Model pembelajaran Muatan Lokal bahasa Jawa Sekolah Dasar (Pendekatan Komunikatif Berbasis Lingkungan Sosial Budaya Siswa)". *Laporan Penelitian Hibah Bersaing*. Lemlit Unnes.
- Tulgar, A. T. (2016). The Role of Pragmatic Competence in Foreign Language Education. *Turkish Online Journal of English Language Teaching (TOJELT)*, 1(1), 10–19.
- Utami, E. S & Supriyanto, T. (2015). "Pengembangan Materi Ajar Keterampilan Berbahasa Jawa Reserprif Berbasis Ungkapan Tradisional sebagai Wahana Pendidikan Karakter" in *Jurnal Litera* Volume 14, Nomor 1. Halaman 75-87. Yogyakarta: Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta.
- Utami, E.S. dan Kurniati, E. (2010). "Peningkatan Kompetensi Komunikatif Siswa SMA Berbasis Konteks Sosiokultural" in *Jurnal Penelitian Tindakan Kelas* Volume 2, Nomor 2. Halaman 149-168
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Yule, G. (2014). *Pragmatik*. Diterjemahkan oleh Indah Fajar Wahyuni. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.