

**PHONOLOGICAL AND LEXICAL EXPLORATION ON
DIALECT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN KEMIREN AND
TAMPO OSING**

THESIS

BY

RETNO AJENG FRANENDYA

NIM 105110107111023



**STUDY PROGRAM OF ENGLISH
DEPARTMENT OF LANGUAGES AND LITERATURE
FACULTY OF CULTURAL STUDIES
UNIVERSITAS BRAWIJAYA**

2014

**PHONOLOGICAL AND LEXICAL EXPLORATION ON DIALECT
DIFFERENCES BETWEEN KEMIREN AND TAMPO OSING**

THESIS

**Presented to
Universitas Brawijaya
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of *Sarjana Sastra***

BY

**RETNO AJENG FRANENDYA
105110107111023**

**STUDY PROGRAM OF ENGLISH
DEPARTMENT OF LANGUAGES AND LITERATURE
FACULTY OF CULTURE STUDIES
UNIVERSITAS BRAWIJAYA**

DECLARATION OF AUTHORSHIP

Herewith I,

Name : Retno Ajeng Franendya

NIM : 105110107111023

Address : Kaliploso, Cluring, Banyuwangi

declare that

1. this *skripsi* is the sole work of mine and has not been written in collaboration with any other person, nor does it include, without due acknowledgement, the work of any other person.
2. if at a later time it is found that this *skripsi* is a product of plagiarism, I am willing to accept any legal consequences that may be imposed upon me.

Malang, 2 April 2014

Retno Ajeng Franendya
NIM 105110107111023

This is to certify that the *Sarjana* thesis of Retno Ajeng Franedya has been approved by the Board of Supervisors

Malang, 2 April 2014
Supervisor

Eni Maharsi, M.A
NIP. 19731209 20050 1 2 002

Malang, 2 April 2014
Co-supervisor

Muhammad Rozin, M.A
NIK. 851009 13 110042

This is to certify that the *Sarjana* thesis of Retno Ajeng Franedyas has been approved by the Board of Examiners as one of the requirements for the degree of *Sarjana Sastra*

Eni Maharsi, M.A, Chair
NIP. 19731209 200501 2 002

Isti Purwaningtyas, M.Pd, Member
NIP. 19790519 2005012 2 003

Muhammad Rozin, M.A, Member
NIK. 851009 13 110042

Acknowledged by,
Head of Study Program of English

Sighted by,
Head of Department of
Languages and Literature

Yusri Fajar, M.A
NIP. 19770517 200312 1 001

Ismatul Khasanah, M.Ed.,Ph.D
NIP. 1975 0518 20050 1 2001

ABSTRACT

Franendya, Retno Ajeng. 2014. **Lexical and Phonological Exploration on Dialect Differences Between Kemiren Osing and Tampo Osing**. Study Program of English, University of Brawijaya. Supervisor: Eni Maharsi; Co-supervisor: Muhammad Rozin.

Keywords: Osing language, Kemiren, Tampo, Dialect Differences

In Indonesia, there are many local languages. One of the local language is Osing language in Banyuwangi, East Java. This research aims to find out differences between Kemiren Osing dialect and Tampo Osing dialect in terms of the phonological and lexical aspects.

This research is descriptive qualitative. The data were collected using interview and *pupuan lapangan* or field research (researcher went to see the informant and had the face to face interview). Two informants were chosen from two different villages. The data were taken from 46 sentences produced by informants.

Results reveal that in terms of phonological differences, there are 7 differences, that is consonant addition, the vowel change / o / becomes / u /, the vowel addition / ə /, the vowel reduction that form / i / into / e /, the vowel addition / u /, the vowel reduction from sound / e / into / a /. In phonemic variation that is a change from phoneme / i / into / e / and the phoneme / e / into / a /. As for lexical differences, there were 21 sentences containing lexical differences. The most lexical difference was found in the predicate component

Further researchers, who conduct similar topic are suggested to complete this research, not only in terms phonological and lexical differences but also broaden to cover other linguistic aspects especially syntactical aspect.

ABSTRAK

Franendya, Retno Ajeng. 2014. **Lexical and Phonological Exploration on Dialect Differences Between Kemiren Osing and Tampo**. Program Studi Bahasa Inggris, Universitas Brawijaya. Pembimbing I: Eni Maharsi, Pembimbing II: Muhammad Rozin

Kata kunci: Bahasa Osing, Kemiren, Tampo, Perbedaan dialek

Di Indonesia terdapat banyak bahasa daerah. Salah satu contoh yaitu bahasa Osing yang ada di Banyuwangi, Jawa Timur. Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk menemukan perbedaan antara Kemiren Osing dialek dan Tampo Osing dialek dalam aspek phonologi dan leksikal.

Jenis metode penelitian ini adalah deskriptif kualitatif. Data diperoleh melalui wawancara dan *pupuan lapangan* (peneliti pergi untuk bertemu langsung dengan informan dan bertatap muka). Dari dua informan, satu orang dari masing-masing desa. Data diambil dari 46 kalimat yang diucapkan dari informant tersebut.

Dari hasil penelitian ini dapat disimpulkan bahwa dari segi perbedaan phonologi diperoleh 7 perbedaan yaitu: penambahan konsonant, perubahan vokal / o / menjadi / u /, penambahan vocal /ə/, penurunan vocal dari / i / menjadi / e /, penambahan vocal / u /, penurunan vocal / e / menjadi / a /. Dari segi variasi fonemik, yaitu perubahan phoneme / i / menjadi / e / dan fonem / e / menjadi / a /. Kemudian, terdapat 21 leksem dari 21 kalimat yang berbeda leksikal, yaitu perbedaan leksikal kebanyakan terdapat dalam komponen predikat.

Akhir kata, untuk calon peneliti yang memiliki ketertarikan topik yang sama disarankan untuk melengkapi penelitian ini, yang tidak hanya dalam aspek perbedaan fonologis dan leksikal tetapi untuk bisa lebih luas cakupannya yakni menganalisisnya dari segi lingustik yang lainnya khususnya dari segi sintaksis.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Finally, I would like to thank to Allah SWT, the Lord of universe. His mercies, blessings and helps always stand behind me so that I can finish writing this thesis although with some difficulties in this writing. All difficulties, can be solved because Allah always gives me a million power and patience. Shalawat and Salam are always blessed upon our prophet Muhammad SAW who has guided us to the right way of life.

Finishing this thesis is not easy and simple and I have spent much time. It, however, has given an invaluable experience. This thesis will never be completed without some contributions and supports from many people. Thus, my deepest gratitude is expressed to my advisor Eni Maharsi, M.A. for her patience, valuable guidance and suggestions given to me. Then, my gratitude is expressed to the co-supervisor Muhammad Rozin for the his guidance and suggestion. I would like to thank my examiner Isti Purwaningtyas, M.Pd. for the suggestions.

My gratitude is also dedicated to all of the lecturers of the study program of English department in Universitas Brawijaya, Malang, for being so kind, patient and generous in leading to the world which I never know before with the invaluable knowledge.

Additionally, I want to express my deepest thanks to my beloved family for their continual moral and material supports, especially for my parents Anwar, spd. and Mestinah Hariyani for their endless love and pray whenever and wherever. I am also thankful to my informants Sirad and Suryati who have given

me enough information and my friends : Vendy, Mia, Dewi, Verdi, Izza, Hassy
and Ella.

Hereby, this thesis would be an imperfect work without the constructive
suggestions from all readers. The researcher hopes this thesis will be useful for
everyone. Amin

Malang, 2 April 2014

Retno Ajeng Franendya



TABLE OF CONTENTS

TITLE PAGE	i
DECLARATION OF AUTHORSHIP	ii
SUPERVISORS' APPROVAL	iii
BOARD OF EXAMINERS' CERTIFICATE OF APPROVAL	iv
ABSTRACT	v
ABSTRAK	vi
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	vii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	ix
LIST OF TABLES	xi
LIST OF APPENDICES	xii
 CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION	
1.1 Background of the Study	1
1.2 Problems of the Study.	4
1.3 Objectives of the Study.	4
1.4 Definition of the Key Terms.	5
 CHAPTER II REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	
2.1 Sociolinguistics.	6
2.2 Dialect.	6
2.3 Dialect Varieties.	8
2.4 Dialect Differences.	9
2.5 The Differences of the Linguistics Features in Dialect.	10
2.6 Using Language	12
2.7 Previous Studies.	14
 CHAPTER III RESEARCH METHOD	
3.1 Research Design.	17
3.2 Data Sources.	17
3.3 Data Collection.	18
3.4 Data Analysis.	20
 CHAPTER IV FINDING AND DISCUSSION	
4.1 Data Analysis and Data Descriptions.	22
4.1.1 Phonological Differences.	22
4.1.1.1 Consonant and Vowel Change.	23
4.1.1.2 Phonemic Variations.	26
4.1.2 Lexical Differences.	27
4.2 Discussion.	38
 CHAPTER V CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION	
5.1 Conclusion.	48
5.2 Suggestion.	49

REFERENCES.

APPENDICES.

51

53



LIST OF TABLES

Table 4.1 Phonological Differences between K.O and T.O dialects.....	23
Table 4.2 Lexical Differences between K.O and T.O dialects.....	27



LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix.....	52
Appendix 1 K.O and T.O Dialect with Indonesian and English Translation.....	52
Appendix 2 List of Questions for Interview.....	58
Appendix 3 List of Answers for Interview.....	59
Appendix 4 List of Informants.....	62
Appendix 5 Berita Acara Bimbingan Skripsi.....	63



CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents background of study, problems of study, objectives of the study and definition of key terms.

1.1 Background of study

Indonesia has thirty four provinces and hundreds of ethnic groups. Maduranese, Javanese, Bataknesse are among the ethnic groups. They speak local languages or vernaculars. These languages are tools of communication among speakers of the same ethnic groups.

Local languages have differences in pronunciation, word choice or diction and sentence structure. These differences are what we call as dialect of a language. According to Mayerhoff, dialect refers to distinctive features at the level of pronunciation, vocabulary and sentence structure (2006: 27). This means every local language can have different vocabulary, phonological and syntactical patterns.

There are a lot of research on dialect differences which have been conducted previously. One of them is conducted by Ayeomoni and Omoniye (2011) which is entitled "A Lexico Syntatic Exploration of Ondo and Ikale Dialects of the Yoruba Language". In their research, Ayeomoni and Omoniye

compare Ondo and Ikale dialects of the Yoruba language based on 50 sentences from the perspective of Hallidayan Systemic Functional Grammar. The research reveals that the speakers of two dialects can have the same lexemes at both subject and predicator levels. In other words, Ayeomoni and Omoniye's research results show that dialects are mainly similar in terms of sentence structure components such as subject, predicate, complement and adjunct. For example:

Ondo dialect is *La ba un*, whereas in Ikale dialect is *La ba*. The English translation of *La ba un* is *Go and meet him*. Thus, we can see that the two imperative sentences have the same meaning but different syntactical patterns.

Dialect is one topic of sociolinguistics. It discusses how the society uses spoken language differently. Therefore, the writer is interested to analyze this topic. Dialects differ in choice of word, pronunciations and grammar or sentence structure. In Indonesia, dialect can be found in the varieties of local languages.

One of such languages, which have several different dialects is Osing.

Osing is a local language spoken exclusively in Banyuwangi, East Java. Osing is spoken in daily conversations by most of the Banyuwangese, especially those who live in an Osing language environment (Moriyama, 2010 : 244). That shows how

Osing language is important for Banyuwangi people. In one hand, Osing varieties have similarities in pronunciation, word choice or diction. On the other hand,

Osing it does not have honorifics like Javanese that has "ngoko level", "boso or kromo madhyo level" and "kromo inggil level". Therefore, differences in Osing

dialects are better be researched from perspectives of phonological and lexical aspects.

Among the Osing speakers who use different dialects are the speakers in Kemiren Village and Tampo Village. Kemiren is the village where the native speakers of standard Osing live. It means, that dialect in this area still pure than in other area. Generally, dialect of Kemiren Osing is used standardized by other Osing in Banyuwangi. It is in the northern part of Banyuwangi. In this village local custom of Osing tribes such as traditions, language and so forth are still preserved. Different from Kemiren village, Tampo village is in the southern part of Banyuwangi. Spoken language in this village is a mixture between Javanese and Osingese. In other words, people in this village do not only speak pure Osing but also use a blend of the two languages. This language phenomenon use is interesting to investigate, more particularly to seek dialect differences especially in term of choice of word. Therefore, the researcher choose Kemiren village and Tampo village as the object of study because it is surrounding phenomena in society. Thus, this research deals with dialect differences between Kemiren Osing and Tampo Osing in terms of phonological and lexical differences. The discussion of the category is limited only on phonological and lexical differences in simple sentences. The researcher considers it is sufficient to use simple sentences for analyzing lexicons in dialect differences. Further, this study is entitled "Lexical and Phonological Exploration on Dialect Differences between Kemiren Osing and Tampo Osing Of Osing Language."

Even though, research on dialect differences is not a new field in linguistic research, the researcher still expects this research to be useful for others. As the researcher, the researcher expects to be able to investigate language phenomena

especially of sociolinguistic phenomena, which occur in the real life. As for the readers, especially the students of English Study Program who are conducting the similar topic, this research is expected to give beneficial insight.

1.2 Problems of the Study

Based on the above background of the study the writer then formulates the following problems:

1. What are the phonological differences in simple sentences found between Kemiren Osing and Tampo Osing dialects in Banyuwangi?
2. What are the lexical differences in simple sentences found between Kemiren Osing and Tampo Osing dialects in Banyuwangi?
3. What are the factors which cause phonological and lexical differences between Kemiren Osing and Tampo Osing dialects in Banyuwangi?

1.3 Objectives of the Study

Based on the above problems of the study, then objectives of the study are:

1. To find out the phonological differences between Kemiren Osing and Tampo Osing dialects.
2. To find out the lexical differences between Kemiren Osing and Tampo Osing dialects.
3. To find out the factors on phonological and lexical differences between Kemiren Osing and Tampo Osing dialects.

1.4 Definition of Key Terms

The key terms in this study are as follows:

1. **Dialect:** refers to language varieties which are grammatically and perhaps lexically as well as phonologically different from other varieties (Chambers, 2004: 5).
2. **Dialect differences:** Dialect differences can be definite surely except based on the phonetic - phonological, morphological, syntactical and lexical system (Meillet cited in Zulaeha 2010 : 31).
3. **Osing Language:** Osing language is a language which is signed with the regional characteristic, heired and cherished for generations, grown together with the history of Banyuwangi society (Moriyama, 2010 : 226).
4. **Kemiren:** A home of aboriginal community of Banyuwangi known as the Osingnese, regard to have original lifestyle, language, traditions and culture of dance, farming and handcrafting, and weaving (Haryono, 2013)
5. **Tampo:** the village that is inhabited not only Osing people but also Javanese in Banyuwangi.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter presents a brief description about the theories which are used to support the data analysis. There are several important stand point to discuss in this chapter: dialect, dialect differences, Osing language and previous studies.

2.1 Sociolinguistics

According to Yule (2005: 205) sociolinguistics is used generally for the study of relationship between language and society. In other words, sociolinguistics investigates the relationship of language and society. Then, language and society can not be separated from each other.

In reality, language use in daily conversation is varied. It is part of language variation. Brown & Attardo (2009) argue that the forms of language that can be called as language variations have five forms that are commonly known.

They are dialect, register, jargon, argot, and slang. It means that there are five forms of language variation. One of the forms is dialect. This study is concerned only with dialect.

2.1.2 Dialect

According to Meyerhoff (2006: 27) dialect refers to distinctive features at the level of pronunciation, vocabulary, and sentences structure. Dialect refers to

the difference in term of sentence structure, vocabulary and pronunciation.

In addition, Chambers (2004: 5) states that dialect refers to varieties which are grammatically and perhaps lexically as well as phonologically different from other varieties of language. For example, if two speakers says “*I done it last night*” and “*I did it last night*”, we can say that they are speaking different dialects.

Labov (cited in Ayeomoni 2011: 125) says : “A dialect is a distinct form or a variety of a language; it is associated with a recognizable regional, social or ethnic group, different from other forms of the language by specific linguistic features such as pronunciation, vocabulary, grammar or any combination of these”.

From those above definitions, it can be concluded that dialect is a language variation which is distinguishable in some aspects that is phonological, grammatical, lexical and syntactical aspects. Dialect is also language variation based on the associative social group. Dialect can signify from where the speakers come. Dialect is also subpart of a language which provides a criterion for distinguishing between one language and another. For example, the local language or vernacular Malang people use the words “*mene*” whereas Banyuwangi used “*sesok*”. The word “*mene*” or “*kesok*” in Indonesian translations mean “*besok*” whereas in English translation is “*tomorrow*”. The example can give the evidences if the dialect is a variety of language.

2.1.3 Dialect Varieties

Based on Parera (1986: 32) there are two kinds of dialect: horizontal dialect or geographical dialect and vertical or social dialect. Dialect varieties can be defined by different factors such as time, places or geography, social, culture and expression (Harimurti cited in Ayatrohaedi 2003: 5). In addition, Zulaeha uses terms of geographical and social dialect (Zulaeha, 2010: 7). In other word, dialect varieties according the Parera and Zulaehas are divided into two. In contrast, Harimurti asserts that not only social and geographical difference can influence the variety of dialect but also there are other factors such as time and place. The discussion of this research focuses on two types of dialects. That is social dialect and geographical dialect.

2.1.3.1 Social dialect

Social dialect is originated from social groups and is related to a variety of factors. Among others are social class, religion and ethnicity (Wardhaugh, 2006 : 49). According to Zulaeha (2010: 29), social dialect is a language variety which is used by certain community. This dialect can distinguish speakers of that community other communities. The distinctions are seen from aspects of the job, age, activity, gender, education, ethnic and so forth.

Social dialect creates differences between the speakers from the other social groups although they stand and come from the same district. For example, the different choice of words between one and other social groups

2.1.3.2 Geographical Dialect

Geographical dialect is a term used to map the distributions of various linguistic features so as to show their geographical province (Wardhaugh, 2006 :

45). In geographical dialect, the line which separates every language phenomenon from the language variety environment based on both of the different environment systems called heteroglos (Kurat, 1972 cited in Zulaeha 2010:27).

Isogloss is an imagery line that marks the boundaries of areas where a particular form is used by speakers. One form is used on one side of the line and another form on the other (Brown and Attardo 2009: 97).

On the other hand, heteroglos is useful as the dividing line which can give the isogloss situational image in research district. From geographical dialect it can be seen the variety of linguistic features.

2.1.4 Dialect Differences

Dialect differences can be defined based on the phonetic phonological, morphological, syntactical and lexical system (Meillet cited in Zulaeha 2010: 31).

Ayatrohaedi states that “every language variety is used in a certain district and gradually formed a different linguistics features such as pronunciations, grammar, and the meaning order” (Ayatrohaedi, 2003: 3).

2.1.5 The differences of the linguistic features in dialect

According to Zulaeha (2010) there are five linguistic features in dialect differences such as phonological differences, lexical differences, syntactical

differences, morphological differences, and semantic differences. Here is the explanation concerned in term of phonological differences and lexical differences:

2.1.5.1 Phonological Differences

A phonological difference is the difference in terms of phonetic and phonology (Zulaeha, 2010: 41). There are classifications of sound correspondence in phonological difference.

Vowel and consonant correspondence

The differences of lexeme which show the same meaning, appears regularly. It includes sound reduction, replacement and sound omission (Zulaeha, 2010: 42).

A. Vowel correspondence

Vowel correspondence is vocal sound reduction in close syllable. For example, vowel correspondence / i / ~ / i / in the words / getih / /geteh / in Indonesia translation “*darah*” and English translation “*blood*”.

B. Consonant correspondence

Consonant correspondence is consonant replacement in the end of syllable. Then, there are consonant omissions in the beginning of syllable and consonant omission in a stressed syllable. The last is consonant additional in the beginning and middle of syllable. For example consonant omissions in the beginning of syllable, / wetan / become / etan / in Indonesia translation “*timur*” and English translation “*east*”.

C. Phonemic variation

The difference of lexemes which shows the same meaning only form in phonemic variation and those only occur in one or two same sound in sequence (Zulaeha, 2010: 43). The example the words “ekor” in English translation “tail” is [buntUɪ] as BJS (Bahasa Jawa Standar) and [buntut] as BJB (Bahasa Jawa Brebes).

2.1.5.2 Lexical Differences

There are lexical differences when the lexeme which is used to realize the same meaning does not come from one etymon *prabahasa* then, the lexicon will be different (Zulaeha, 2010: 46). All lexical differences is always be different. The terms "lexicon" in linguistic is meaning of vocabulary itself, which is often called a "lexeme" (Vehaar, 2012: 13). According to Chaer (2007: 290), there are three types of lexical meaning:

1. Lexical meaning is the meaning itself or without any context. In other words, it is the real meaning or the meaning of which is in accordance with the results of senses observations”.
2. Grammatical meaning is a new meaning if there is grammatical process, such as affixation, reduplication, composition
3. Contextual meaning is the meaning of a lexeme or word in the same context. Context meaning is also related with the situation that is the place, time, and the language environment.

Lexicology clearly is associated with phonology. For example in Indonesian words *lupa*: *rupa*, the difference is between / l / and / r /. Obviously, they were distinct phoneme from different lexeme "(Vehaar 2012: 13). In addition, the lexical difference occurs because of different viewpoints between one speaker to another, but it is also influenced by the social status in the choice of the lexicon (Zulaeha, 2010: 46). Yandra and Refandi (2013: 189) state "Lexical or word change will give different meaning of word in dialect, the meaning of the word should be suitable with the dictionary that is created by the people as the standard of language". For example, the using words "*gigis, kropos, griwing, krowong, krowok, krowong*" in Indonesian translation "*berlubang*" and English translation "*cavity*". There are three kinds of lexical meaning.

2.1.6 Osing Language

Osing language is a language which signed with the regional characteristic, heired and cherished for generations, grown together with the history of Banyuwangi society (Moriyama, 2010: 226). Osing language is a fragment from old Javanese language and in line with Proto-Austronesia, ancestor's language (Ningtyas 2008 cited in Marotin 2012:19). The word Osing refers to a group or ethnicity, there is Blambangan society which is they used the special language that became known as Basa or the way of Osing (Margana 2012: 322). In additions, Some people called the language" Banyuwangen" there are statement:

The term "Using", to call the language in Banyuwangi. An its speakers, I encountered initially in Lekkerkerker writing about "Sejarah Ujung Timur

Pulau Jawa in 1923". He give the description about the history of eastern part of Java island published in 1923. The describe about "those who called "orang Osing" '[*de z.g.n. 'Oesingers'*]' (from "Using", "sing" a local word actually a Balinese word "sing" for "no") (1923:1031). Lekkerkerker also note that "personality, language, and custom of Using people are very much different from those of Javanese" 1923:1031) (Moriyama 2010: 231)

Moreover, Osing has several characteristics in phonology, choice of words, pronunciation are different from other language (Dewa cited in Marotin 2010: 18).

From those statements, Osing language is indigenous of Osing tribes that are having variation of lexical, phonological and pronunciation. The words Osing is refer to Osing tribes in Banyuwangi. Osing language is used in daily conversation, but not all use Osing language or dialect Osing especially those who live in an Osing language environment.

2.1.6.1 Kemiren Village

Kemiren village is strategically positioned on the side of the main road to Ijien which is a home of aboriginal community of Banyuwangi known as the Osinganese, regard to have original lifestyle, language, traditions and culture of dance, farming and handcrafting, and weaving (Haryono, 2013). In other words, this village is purely the original place of Osing tribes.

2.1.6.2 Tampo Village

Tampo village is part of the Cluring subdistrict. It is located in the south of the Banyuwangi regions. Different from the Kemiren village, Tampo village is the village that is inhabited not only Osing people but also Javanese. Tampo Osing is dialect of Osing language.

From those statements above, Osing language has some characteristics that make it different in terms of lexical, phonological although in the same areas. In this case is occur in Kemiren village and Tampo village. People in Kemiren Osing still use standard or pure Osing language whereas people in Tampo Osing do not. Tampo dialect is part of Osing language. Then, Osing language have some characteristic in phonology. For example the is diphthong *au* for vowel *u*: every lexicon that ends with “u” is mostly pronounced “au” such as “*iku*” (that) is pronounced [*ikau*] and *gedighu* (like that) is pronounce [*gedigau*].

2.1.7 Previous Studies

There are some previous studies which analyze the same topic as this study, that is about dialect.

First, a journal entitled “A lexico syntactic exploration of Ondo and Ikale dialects of the Yoruba language” by Ayeomony and Omoniyi (2011). Their study is a comparative study of Ondo and Ikale dialects of the Yoruba Language with a view to finding the areas of convergence and divergence between the two dialects, based on 50 sentences from each of the dialects, but only 25 of the sentences were presented. They were analyzed from the perspective of Hallidayan Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG) in order to identify the prominent lexemes and syntactic structures of the sentences. Type of research design is interview. Their study used the theory from Halliday (1976), Labov (1966) and Adegubabo (1967).

The result of the study shows that the speakers of the two dialects often make use of the same nominal and verbal items in their speeches. Besides, the two dialects

share basically the same syntactic components Subjects, Predicator, Complement and Adjunct in all the sentences examined, but the Adjunct is rarely used in the dialects. Then, dialects are however, found to be mainly different in the area of auxiliary verbs usage. Most of the words or lexemes in the dialects are found in the standard Yoruba. It is thus envisaged that other dialects of Yoruba Language that are geographically close may equally share similar linguistic features and cultural norms.

Second, there is a study conducted by Yandra and Refandi (2013) “A Study of Lexical Comparison Between Labuh Sub Dialects of Minangkabau and Standard *Minangkabaunese*”. Their research problems is “What are the differences of lexical between Minangkabaunese as standard language and Labuah Sub-Dialect?”. In their study, lexical comparison of the Labuh sub dialect Minangkabau and standard *Minangkabaunese* in daily communication based on 150 words became the object. They also identified phonological aspect. In their methodology, descriptive qualitative research was used. Furthermore, the result shows that there is a phonological difference in the lexicons. The result of their research is that Labuah Sub-Dialect has its own characteristics, that is makes the same meaning words pronounced differently. It proves that Labuah Sub-Dialect is different from the standard Minangkabaunese.

These research journals on dialect differences have some similarities and differences with this study. The first journal, the similarities are the comparison of the two dialects with standard Yoruba language. Whereas, this study is also similar, it compares the dialect between Kemiren Osing and Tampo Osing. In this

case, Kemiren Osing is the standard or pure Osing language. Then, the research design is also similar with first journal. This study focuses on lexical and phonological aspects, which identified from simple sentence. The first journal used on systemic functional grammar of two dialects in standard Yoruba language based on 50 sentence, not limited on simple sentences. They used Hallidayan theory of Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG) to identify the prominent lexemes and syntactic structures of the sentences in the dialects, but this study does not use it.

Second, the similarities of this study with the previous ones are the phonological and lexical comparison. Whereas, the differences from this study is data collection which they used 150 words are listed in alphabetical order. The focus is the same lexicon but different in meaning. Different from those journals, this study focuses on phonological and lexical differences of Kemiren Osing and Tampo Osing dialects in Banyuwangi. Identified from 46 simple sentences.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHOD

This chapter presents the description of methods employed for this research which include type of research, data source, data collection, and data analysis.

3.1 Research Design

This research is qualitative in type. According to Ary et al (2002 p.425) qualitative inquiry deals with data that are in the form of words rather than numbers and statistic. This research is also called as qualitative as the goal is to gain insight and explore in depth the differences between Kemiren Osing dialect and Tampo Osing dialect in terms of phonological and lexical aspects.

3.2 Data Sources

The source of data is from the transcript of sentences produced by informants and the result of interview with the informant, one informant for each village. The criteria of informants are:

- 1) Women or man
- 2) Aged 30 to 60 years old
- 3) Born and grown up in their villages
- 4) Speak Osing as their mother tongue.

5) Never leave the village or live in other area for long time.

(Adapted from Zulaeha 2010:53)

The data of this research was taken from the recorded 46 sentences produced by Kemiren informant and Tampo informant. According to Ayatrohaedi one informant is enough to search data information in one location (2003 p.38).

Therefore, the data information is synchronized and compared with other data.

3.3 Data Collection

Ayatrohedi (2003: 24) states that there are two kinds of data collection methods used in research about dialects namely "*pupuan lapangan* and *pupuan sinurat*". This research is *pupuan lapang* (field research in study of dialect : researcher translation) in type. In *pupuan lapangan* the researcher see the informants or the researcher and the informants sit together while interview is held. *Pupuan lapang* method comprises of two kinds 1) Direct in which the research takes note while interviewing and 2) Indirect in which the data are taken through recording process. This research also uses direct and indirect method for collecting data.

Based on the Leedy and Ormord (2001 p.4) the way of doing interview in this research is as follows: First is face to face interview. By using this method, the researcher meets the informant directly to gain the information. The purpose is to enable the researcher and the informant to establish a good cooperation so that it produces a high response rate. Second is the structured interview which is

designed for the specific purpose of getting specific information from the informant. This researcher arranges the questions from various sources.

In this research, the researcher combines the two types of interview, face to face and structured interviews. The procedures of collecting data are elaborated as follows:

1. Preparing a set of questions. The questions were about the history of village, language behavior of the people living in the village, and so forth.
2. Interviewing the informants based on the questions which had been prepared. Interview was done on 30 October, 2013.
3. Asking the informants to pronounce 46 sentences in Osing language that have been prepared. The sentences were taken from some particular sources such as journal entitled “A lexico syntactic exploration of Ondo and Ikale dialects of the Yoruba language “ by Ayeomony and Omoniye (2011) 6 sentences, “ Tata Bahasa Baku Bahasa Using” by Hasan Ali (2002) 7 sentences, “Pedoman Umum Ejaan Bahasa Using” by Hasan Ali (2006) 8 sentences , “Paseh Basa Using” by Dwi Yanto (2002) 9 sentences and “Lancar Basa Using” by Maskur (2005) 16 sentences. In this step, the recording process as also done. This step was done on October 30, 2013. (view in list of appendix 1)
4. Transcribing the result of interview and 46 utterances produced by the informants.

3.4 Data Analysis

According to Ary et al (2002:465) data analysis is a process in which researchers systematically search and arrange the data in order to increase their understanding of the data to enable them to present what they learned to others.

The following are the steps in analyzing data:

1. Organizing the notes from the transcribed data
2. Identifying the phonological and lexical differences on simple sentences produced by the informants from Kemiren Osing and Tampo Osing.
3. Reducing the data. Data for analysis were 25 out of 46 utterances produced by informants. The 25 utterances were the ones considered to have more significant differences than the other data especially in both phonological and lexical aspects.
4. Classifying the data into tables. The table is arranged as follows.

NO	Lexicon		Word class	Gloss
	K.O	T.O		
1				
2				
3				
4				

Notes:

K.O : Kemiren Osing

T.O : Tampo Osing

5. Analyzing and discussing the data to find out phonological and lexical aspects of each dialect.

6. Making conclusion.



CHAPTER IV

FINDING AND DISCUSSION

In this chapter, the researcher presents the findings and analysis of data to answer problems of the study.

4.1 Data Description and Data Analysis

In this sub chapter, phonological and lexical differences found in simple sentence of Kemiren Osing and Tampo Osing are presented. There are 25 simple sentences from which phonological and lexical differences between the two dialects could be identified. The analysis was made on the basis of theory proposed by Zulaeha (2010), that is about the linguistic features of dialect differences. The difference in this research covers phonological difference and lexical difference.

4.1.1 Phonological Difference

According to Zulaeha, phonological difference is the difference in terms of phonetic and sound production (2010: 41). In this research, phonological differences which could be found were in the form of vowel differences, consonant differences and phonemic variation.

Table 4.1 Phonological differences between K.O and T.O dialects.

No	Transcriptions		Word class	Gloss
	K.O	T.O		
1	/ isu?/	/ keso?/	<i>adv</i>	<i>Tomorrow</i>
2	/ didʒa?/	/ diədʒa? /	<i>v</i>	<i>Be invited</i>
3	/ iro/	/ hiro /	<i>prn</i>	<i>You</i>
4	/ liwʏat /	/ lewʏat /	<i>adv</i>	<i>Over or through</i>
5	/ diwel /	/ diduwel /	<i>v</i>	<i>Get angry</i>
6	/ nyəbryaŋ /	/ nyabryaŋ /	<i>v</i>	<i>Cross</i>
7	/ ñyaŋ /	/ mǎñyaŋ /	<i>v</i>	<i>Going to</i>

From the table 4.1, it can be learned that there are 7 words which reflect phonological differences between K.O and T.O. They are lexemes, which have the same meaning.

4.1.1.1 Consonant and Vowel Change

In consonant change, lexicons in T.O exhibit changes from K.O. The changes are in the forms of sound reduction, sound replacement, and sound omission.

Datum 1

The first is the lexeme *isuk* in K.O. In pronouncing this lexeme, T.O speakers add consonant / k / in initial syllable. Next, the vowel change / i / into

/ e / in the initial of syllable. In other word, the lexicon undergoes a phonological process that is consonant addition and vowel change. The addition is in the initial syllable of word which changes the word [isu?] into [keso?]. Therefore, lexeme / isu? / is pronounced as / keso?/. The next change occurs in the middle of the syllable. The lexeme *isuk* undergoes process that is a vowel correspondence in which the vowel / u / changes into / o /. Therefore, if speakers of K.O pronounce the lexeme *isuk* as / isuk /, then speakers of T.O pronounce it as / keso?/.

Datum 2

The second is the lexeme *dijak*. In K.O the pronunciation of this word is [didʒa?]. This lexeme is added with sound / ə / in T.O. It means undergoes a phonological process, that is vowel addition. The addition is in the middle syllable of word which changes the word [didʒak] into [diədʒa?]. Therefore, if speakers of K.O pronounce the lexeme *dijak* as / didʒa? /, then speakers of T.O pronounce it as / diədʒa? /.

Datum 3

The third is the lexeme *iro* in K.O. The same lexeme is added with sound / h / in T.O. In other words, it undergoes a phonological process, that is consonant addition. The addition is in the beginning syllable of word which changes the word [iro] into [hiro]. As the result, when speakers of K.O pronounce the word *iro* as / iro /, then speakers of T.O pronounce it as / hiro /.

Datum 4

The fourth data is the lexeme *liwat* in K.O. The vowel sound in this lexeme is reduced, that is from [i] into [e] in T.O. In other words, it undergoes a phonological process, that is vowel reduction. The reduction is in the closed syllable of the word which changes the word [liw_yat] into [lew_yat]. Therefore, when speakers of K.O pronounce the word *liwat* as / liw_yat /, then speakers of T.O pronounce it as / lew_yat /.

Datum 5

The fifth data is the lexeme *diwel* in K.O. This lexeme is added with consonant sound / d / and vowel sound / u / in T.O. The addition is in the middle of syllable of word which changes the word [diwel] into [diduwel]. In other word, it undergoes a phonological process of sound addition. As the result, the lexeme *diwel* undergoes process that is vowel and consonant correspondence. Therefore, if speakers of K.O pronounce the lexeme *diwel* as / diwel /, then speakers of T.O pronounce it as / diduwel /.

Datum 6

The seventh data is the lexeme *nyebrang* in K.O. The first vowel in it lexeme is reduced, that is from sound / e / into / a / in T.O. In other words, it undergoes a phonological process, that is vowel reduction. The reduction is in the in closed syllable of the word which changes the word [nye_bryan] into [nyab_rryan].

This word undergoes similar process with the word *liwat*. As the result, the

lexeme *nyebrang* undergoes process that is vowel correspondence. Therefore, when speakers of K.O pronounce the lexeme *nyebrang* as / nyebrɔŋ /, then speakers of T.O pronounce it as / nyabrɔŋ /.

Datum 7

The last data is the lexeme *nyang* in K.O. This lexicon is added with consonant sound / m / and vowel sound / ə / in T.O. In other words, it undergoes a phonological process, that is consonant and vowel addition. The addition is in the beginning syllable of word which change word [ñyaŋ] into [meñyaŋ]. As the result, the lexeme *nyang* undergoes phonological process that is vowel and consonant correspondence. Therefore, when speakers of K.O pronounce the lexeme *nyang* as / ñyaŋ /, then speakers of T.O pronounce it as / meñyaŋ /.

The next change found in T.O dialect can be identified as phoneme variation.

4.1.1.2 Phonemic variations

Phonemic variation is the differences in certain sound in the same words, which have the same meaning. Phonemic variation only occurs in one or two same sound in sequence. On the other hand, the phonemic variation did not differentiate word meaning. For example, the data 4 and 6. The datum 4 is the lexeme *liwat* in K.O. The first vowel in this lexeme is reduced into / e / in T.O. It means, these words have the vowel variation, that is phoneme / i / and / e /. This variation can be identified from how the speaker of K.O pronounce the word

liwat as / liw_yat /, whereas the speakers in T.O pronounce as / lew_yat /. Another example of phoneme variation is the lexeme *nyebrang* in K.O. This lexeme shows similar process with the lexeme *liwat*. This lexeme have the vowel variation, that is a change from phoneme / e / to become / a /. Therefore, if speakers of K.O pronounce the lexeme *nyebrang* as / nyebr_yan /, then speakers of T.O pronounce it as / nyabry_yan /. From those examples, it can be concluded that the phoneme / i / → / e / and / e / → / a / are the phoneme variations in lexeme, which create or cause different pronunciation in certain words between speakers of K.O and T.O.

4.1.2 Lexical Differences

Besides vowel and consonant differences, there are also lexical differences identified in K.O and T.O dialects. Lexical differences occur when one lexeme is used to realize different words in the same meaning, it does not come from one etymon (Zulaeha, 2010: 46). In this research, there are 21 lexeme which differ from K.O and T.O dialects. The differences are presented in table 4.2

Table 4.2 Lexical differences between K.O and T.O dialects.

No	Lexicon		Word	Gloss
	K.O	T.O	class	
1	Kecaruk Isuk	Nemoni Kesok	y adv	<i>Meet</i> <i>Tomorrow</i>

Table Continued

2	Warang	Kademen	adj	Sick or ill
3	Lumure Nyiciri	Gelase Temebluk	n v	<i>Glass Fall</i>
4	Mlaku	Menyang	v	<i>Go or leave</i>
5	Mbah	Anang	n	<i>Grandfather</i>
6	Seneng	Demen	v	<i>Like</i>
7	Sokone	Caga'e	n	<i>Pillar or lamppost</i>
8	Puthuk	Gumuk	n	<i>Knoll</i>
9	Welas Sebenere	Sekaken Sakjane	adj adv	<i>Pity Actually</i>
10	Iri	Njenggi	adj	<i>Jealous</i>
11	Nunggang	Numpak	v	<i>Ride</i>
12	Terangno	Munio	v	<i>Explain or state</i>
13	Sakat	Mulai	adv	<i>Since</i>
14	Kampah	Mampiro	v	<i>Visit</i>
	Sulung	Olong	n	<i>Go ahead</i>
15	Gampang	Enak'e	adj	<i>Easy</i>
16	Kawite	Mulai	v	<i>Begin or at the first.</i>
	Bedug	Awan	adv	<i>Noon</i>
17	Gelintungan	Leyeh- leych	v	<i>Lie down</i>
18	Tasemak	Kocomoto	n	<i>Eyeglasses</i>
	Ngawe	Nganggo	v	<i>Wear</i>

Table Continued

19	Edeng-edeng	Alon-alon	adj	<i>Slowly</i>
20	Ampret-ampretan	Batek-batekan	v	<i>Pull</i>
21	Keserep	Kejungkel	v	<i>Tumble or fell</i>
	Kali	Kali kundang	n	<i>down</i> <i>Gutter</i>

4.1.2.1 Analysis on Lexical Difference

The difference in the lexemes can be identified from sentence components. It means the subject, predicate or complement or object complement in sentence which are different in forms but which similar in meaning. Analysis is done per datum.

Datum 1

K.O dialect : Isun arep kecaruk siro engko isuk
S P O adv of time

T.O dialect: Isun arep nemoni riko kesok
S P O adv of time
I will see you tomorrow

Datum 1 presents lexical difference in two sentence components, that is in the predicate and adverb. The verb predicate “meet” in K.O is realized as *kecaruk*, while in T.O it is realized as *nemoni*. Next, the difference can also be found in the adverb of time “tomorrow”. This word is realized differently in K.O and T.O dialects. In K.O, it is realized in a phrase, that is *engko isuk*. In T.O, it is realized in one word *kesok*.

Datum 2

K.O dialect: Isun warang

S

P

T.O dialect: Isun magih kademan

S

P

I am sick

Datum 2 presents lexical difference in one sentence component, that is in the adjectival predicate “sick or ill”. In K.O, lexeme “sick” is realized as *warang*, while in T.O it is realized as *kademen*. This word is realized differently in K.O and T.O dialects. In K.O it is realized in one word *warang*, while in T.O the word “sick” is realized in adjective phrase *magih kademan* “being sick”.

Datum 3

K.O dialect: Lumure nyicire sikile adine

S

P

O

T.O dialect: Gelase temebeluk kena sikile adik

S

P

O

The glass fell down on the foot of her sister

Datum 3 presents lexical difference in two sentence components, that is in the subject and predicate. The noun subject “glass” in K.O is realized as *lumur*, while in TO it is realized as *gelas*. The second difference is the verb predicate which is realized as *nyiciri* in K.O, while in T.O it is realized as *temebeluk*. This word is used differently in K.O and T.O dialects. In K.O, it is realized in a single verb, that is *nyicire* alone. In T.O, it is commonly added with preposition *kena* “fell on”.

Datum 4

K.O dialect: Sopo mlaku nyang pasar?

S

P

adv of place

T.O dialect: Sopo hang menyang nang pasar ?

S P O adv of place

Who is going to the market?

The next lexical difference can be identified from a simple interrogative sentence in datum 4. Datum 4 presents lexical difference in one sentence component, that is in the predicate. The verb predicate “go” in K.O is realized as *mlaku*, while in T.O it is realized as *menyang*. In K.O, it is realized in verb phrase *mlaku nyang*, while in T.O it is realized in *hang menyang* “be going to”. *Hang* is modal auxiliary indicating future. Furthermore, in K.O it is realized in one word *pasar*, while in T.O it is realized in noun phrase *nang pasar*.

Datum 5

K.O dialect: Mbah tuku pacul sore

S P O adv of time

T.O dialect: Sore anang tuku pacul

adv of time S P O

Grandpa bought the hoe yesterday

Datum 5 presents lexical differences in one sentence component, that is in the subject. The noun subject “grandfather” in K.O is realized as *Mbah*, while in T.O it is realized as *Anang*. This word, it is realized differently in K.O and T.O dialects. Next, the position of the adverb of time “afternoon” in K.O is in the last of sentence, while in T.O is in the beginning of sentence. In this data, it is not only lexical difference, but it shows syntactical differences.

Datum 6

K.O dialect: Riko seneng mangan poh

S P O

T.O dialect: Riko demen mangan poh

S P O

She / he likes to eat mangoes

Datum 6 presents lexical difference in one sentence components, that is in the predicate. The verb predicate “like” in KO is realized as *seneng* while in TO it is realized as *demen*. Thus, it is clear that the verb “like” is realized differently in K.O and T.O dialects.

Datum 7

K.O dialect: Sokone damar ono ring endi?

S P adv of place

T.O dialect: Caga”e damar ono ring endi?

S P adv of place

Where is the lamppost?

Datum 7 presents lexical difference in one sentence component, that is in the subject. The noun subject “pillar” in K.O is realized as *sokone*, while in T.O it is realized as *cagak*.

Datum 8

K.O dialect: Panglak kang nduwur ono ring sebelahe kidul phutuk

S P adv of place

T.O dialect: Paglak kang duwur iku ono ring sebelahe kidul gumuk

S P adv of place

The high hut is located in the south of knoll

Datum 8 presents lexical difference in one sentence component, that is in the adverb. The adverb of place “knoll” in K.O is realized as *putuk*, while in T.O it is realized as *gumuk*. In conclusion, this word is realized differently in K.O and T.O dialects.

Datum 9

K.O dialect: Welas, sebenere nyang wong kang apik

S P O

T.O dialect: Sekaken, sakjane uwong iku apik

S P O

Sorry, actually he is a kind person

Datum 9 presents lexical difference in two sentence components, that is in the subject and predicate. The adjective subject “pity” in K.O is realized as *welas*, while in T.O it is realized as *sekaken*. Next, the difference can be found in the adverb “actually”. This word is realized differently in K.O and T.O dialects. In K.O, it is realized as *sebenere*. while in T.O, it is realized in *sakjane*.

Datum 10

K.O dialect: Ana lare iri nang kancane

S P O

T.O dialect: Ana lare kang njenggi ambi kancane

S P O

There is a kid who is jealous of her

Datum 10 presents lexical difference in one sentence component, that is in the predicate. The adjective predicate “jealous” in K.O is realized as *iri* while in T.O it is realized in the lexeme of verb *njenggi*. These words, *iri* and *njenggi* are followed by different preposition “to”. In K.O “jelous” *iri* is commonly used with preposition “to” *nang*. A little difference is found in T.O which uses preposition “to” *ambi* to follow adjective *njenggi* “jealous”.

Datum 11

K.O dialect: Siro nunggang paran mrono

S P adv of place

T.O dialect: Siro numpak paran mrono

S P adv of place

What do you ride to get there?

Datum 11 presents lexical difference in one sentence component, that is in the predicate. The verb predicate “ride” in K.O is realized as *nunggang*, while in T.O it is realized as *numpak*. This word is realized differently in K.O and T.O dialects.

Datum 12

K.O dialect: Terangno aran iro kang siro goleti

P O C

T.O dialect: Munio sopo aran hiro ambi seng riko goleti

P O C

State your name and who are you looking for?

The next lexical difference can be found from an imperative sentence can be seen in datum 12. Datum 12 presents lexical difference in one sentence component, that is in the predicate. The verb predicate “explain” in K.O is realized as *terangno*, while in T.O it is realized in the word *munio*. Further, in T.O, the word “explain” is realized in verb phrase, *munio sopo* “explain who”.

Datum 13

K.O dialect: Sakat kapan siro dikongkon emak?

adv of time S P O

T.O dialect: Mulai kapan siro dikongkon emak?

adv of time S P O

Since when you are ordered by your mother

The next lexical difference can be identified from a simple interrogative sentence in datum 13. Datum 13 presents lexical difference in one sentence component, that is in the adverb of time. The adverb of time “since” in K.O is realized as *sakat*, while in T.O it is realized as *mulai*. Thus, this same word is realized differently in K.O and T.O dialects.

Datum 14

K.O dialect: Mrenio kampah sulung paman

S P O

T.O dialect: Mampiro olong Paman

S P O

Please stop here first, Uncle?

Datum 14 presents lexical difference in two sentence components, that is in the subject and predicate. The word “visit”, in K.O it is realized in verb phrase “*mrenio kampah*” please, visit first”, while in T.O it is realized in one word *mampiro*. This word is realized differently in K.O and TO dialects. Next, the difference can be found in the predicate “go ahead”. In K.O, this word is realized as *sulung*, while in T.O it is realized as *olong*.

Datum 15

K.O dialect: Siro gampang ngowo picis bain.

S P O

T.O dialect: Siro enak’e ngowo picis bain

S P O

It is easier to bring money only

Datum 15 present lexical difference in one sentence component, that is in the predicate. The adjective predicate “easy” in K.O is realized as *gampang*, while in T.O it is realized *enak’e*. This word is realized differently in K.O and T.O dialects.

Datum 16

K.O dialect: Acarane kawite jam 1 bedug

S P adv of time

T.O dialect: Acarane mulai jam 1 awan

S P adv of time

It starts at 1 pm

Datum 16 presents lexical differences in two sentence components, that is in the predicate and adverb. The verb predicate “begin or start” in K.O is realized as *kawit* suffix *-e* indicating article “the”, while in T.O it is realized as *mulai*.

Next, the difference can also be found in the adverb of time “noon”. This word is realized differently in K.O and T.O dialects. In K.O , it is realized as *bedug* while in T.O it’s realized differently as *awan*.

Datum 17

K.O dialect: Wak, *gelintungan* ring kasur

S P O

T.O dialect: Wak, *leyeh-leyeh* ring kasur

S P O

Uncle is lying down on the bed

The next lexical difference can be identified from a simple declarative sentence can be seen in datum 17. Datum 17 presents lexical differences in one sentence component, that is in the predicate. The verb predicate “lying down” in K.O is realized as *gelintungan*, while in T.O it is realized as *leyeh-leyeh*. This word is realized differently in K.O and T.O dialects.

Datum 18

K.O dialect: Bapak *maca* Koran *nggawe tasemak*

S P O C

T.O dialect: Bapak *maca* Koran *nganggo kocomoto*

S P O C

Father is reading a newspaper with the eyeglasses

Furthermore, the next lexical difference can be identified from a simple declarative sentence can be seen in datum 18. Datum 18 presents lexical differences in two sentence components, that is in the predicate and complement.

The verb phrase “wear eyeglasses”, in K.O is realized as *nggawe tasemak*, while in T.O it is realized as *nganggo kocomoto*. This phrase is realized differently in K.O and T.O dialects.

Datum 19

K.O dialect: Katone lare iku mlaku edeng-edeng liwat nang kene
 S P adv of place

T.O dialect: Katone lare iku mlaku alon-alon lewat kene
 S P adv of place

Apparently, the boy walked slowly through here

Datum 19 presents lexical differences in two sentence components, that is in the predicate and adverb. The adjective predicate “slowly” in K.O is realized as *edeng-edeng*, while in T.O it is realized as *alon-alon*. Next, the difference can also be found in adv of place “through here”. This word is realized differently in K.O and T.O dialects. In K.O, it is realized in a phrase, that is *liwat nang kene*. In T.O, it is realized in *lewat kene*.

Datum 20

K.O dialect: Lare loro ampret-ampretan sarung sampek suwe
 S P O of prep

T.O dialect: Lare loro batek batekan sampek suwek sarunge
 S P O of prep

The two kids pull the sarong one another until it was torn

Datum 20 presents lexical differences in one sentence component, that is in the predicate. The verb predicate “pull” in K.O is realized as *ampret-ampretan*, while in T.O it is realized as *batek-batekan*. This word is realized differently in K.O and T.O dialects. In this data, it is not only lexical difference, but it shows syntactical differences. That is in preposition phrase “to rips of sarong”. In K.O, it

is realized as *sarung sampek suwek*, while in T.O it is realized as *sampek suwek sarunge*

Datum 21

K.O dialect: Siro nunggang sepeda keserep ring kali

S P O adv of place

T.O dialect: Siro numpak sepeda kejungkel ning kali kundang

S P O adv of place

He rode the bike and then fell down in the gutter

Datum 21 presents lexical differences in two sentence components, that is in the predicate and adverb. The verb predicate “ride” in K.O is realized as *nunggang*, while in T.O it is realized as *numpak*. Next, the difference can also be found in adv of place “in the gutter”. This word is realized differently in K.O and T.O dialects. In K.O, it is realized in a phrase, that is *keserep ring kali*. In T.O, it is realized as *kejungkel ning kali kundang*. Next, this lexicon “gutter”, in K.O it is realized in one word *kali*, while in the T.O it is realized in noun phrase *kali kundang*.

4.2 Discussions

One of the branches of linguistics is sociolinguistics which is related to language and society. According to Yule (2005: 205) sociolinguistics is used generally for the study of relationship between language and society. In other word, sociolinguistics focuses on relationship between languages and society and the understanding of structure of language. In reality, language that is used in daily conversation is varied. It is part of language variation. One of the forms is

dialect. Dialect is a language variation, which is distinguishable in some aspects in terms of phonological, grammatical, lexical and syntactical aspects.

Dialect is also language variation based on the associative social group.

Dialect can signify from where the speakers come. Then, dialect varieties according the Parera and Zulaeha (2010) are divided into two that is geographical dialect and social dialect. Geographical dialect is the distributions of various linguistic features by geographical provenance. Whereas, social dialect is used by certain social groups, that can be distinguished from others. The distinctions can be seen from the aspects such as job, age, activity, gender, education, ethnic, religion and so forth. Therefore, social dialect creates differences between the speakers from the other social groups although they stand and come from the same district. It means that dialect is emphasized geographically. It can be concluded that dialect is variety of language in certain group based on geographical area and social structure. It can be seen on dialect differences used by the speakers.

Thus, dialect differences have different aspect in some linguistics features such as phonological, lexical, syntactical, morphological and semantic aspects.

Dialect differences can be seen between K.O and T.O of the Osing language.

Osing is local language or vernacular which is spoken by Osing tribes in Banyuwangi. Osing is also local language that is used in daily conversations. This language has several characteristics in terms of its dialect. K.O is spoken in

Kemiren village. Kemiren village is the native of Osing tribes live. Whereas,

Tampo village is one of the village, where the Osing language blend with Javanese language.

After analyzing the findings, the researcher would like to present the discussion related to the problems of the study stated in chapter one. The next is the analysis of the phonological differences and lexical differences between K.O and T.O of the Osing language.

The first analysis that the writer could identify is the phonological differences. Based on the data, there are 7 lexemes containing phonological differences found in sentences. They are consonant and vowel correspondence and phoneme variation.

The first category is consonant correspondence in term of phonological differences between K.O and T.O dialect, there are 71 exemes contains phonological difference. The forms of differences are **1)** consonant addition / k / in the initial of syllable [isu?] → [keso?] (datum1); **2)** consonant addition / h / in the beginning of syllable [iro] → [hiro] (datum 3); **3)** consonant addition / d / in the middle of syllable [diwel] → [diduwel] (datum 5) and **4)** consonant addition / m / and vowel addition / e / in the beginning of syllable [nyan] → [meñyan] (datum 7).

Next, the vowel correspondence categories, such as in **1)** vowel change / o / → / u / in the final of syllable (datum 1); **2)** vowel addition / ə / in the middle of syllable (datum 2); **3)** vowel reduction that forms / i / into / e / (datum 4); **4)** vowel addition / u / in the middle of syllable (datum 5); **5)** vowel reduction from

sound / e / into / a / in the open syllable (datum 6) and vowel addition /ə/ in the beginning of syllable (datum 7).

The last, the phoneme variation category occurs only in datum 4 and 6.

That is in lexicons in K.O *liwat* → *lewat* in T.O (datum 4) and *nyebrang* → *nyabrang* in T.O (datum 6). These lexemes occur in one or two same sound in sequence.

From the analysis on phonological difference, it can be concluded that the main vowel correspondence occur between K.O and T.O, whereas, the consonant correspondence only occurs in data 1, 3,5 and 7. Further, phoneme variation was found in the data 4 and 6.

The second part is the analysis on lexical difference. There are 21 differences on lexemes found in 21 simple sentences. This difference in these lexeme is identified from the sentence components such as subject, predicate, complement or object complement. From the finding, the sentence component which contains the lexical difference in the subject, were found from five simple sentences. The first is lexeme “glass” which is realized as *lumur* in K.O, while in T.O it used *gelas* (datum 3); 2) the lexeme “grandfather” is realized as *mbah* in K.O, while in T.O, it is *anang* (datum 5); 3) the lexeme “pillar or lamppost” is realized as *sokone* in K.O, while in T.O it is used *caga’e* (datum 7); 4) The lexeme “pity” is realized as *welas* in K.O, while in T.O it is used *sekaken* (datum 9); and 5) the lexeme “visit” it is realized as *kampah* in K.O, while in T.O. it is used *mampiro* (datum 14). A little difference from the data 3,5,7, and 9, in K.O it

is realized in verb phrase *mrinio kampah*, but in T.O it is realized in one word *mampiro*.

Furthermore, the sentence component which contains the lexical difference mostly is in the predicate. For instance, 1) lexeme “meet” is realized as *kecaruk* in K.O, while *nemoni* is used in T.O (datum 1); 2) lexeme “sick or ill” is realized as *warang* in K.O, while *kademan* is used in T.O (datum 2). Further, in T.O word “sick” is realized with the adjective phrase *magih kademan*; 3) lexeme “fell” is realized as *nyiciri* in K.O, while it is *temebluk* in T.O (datum 3). In T.O, it is commonly added with preposition *kena* “fell on”; 4) lexeme “go” is realized as *mlaku* in K.O, while it is used *menyang* in T.O (datum 4). In T.O, this word is added with the modal auxiliary *hang* in the sentence; 5) lexeme “like” is realized as *demen* in K.O, while lexicon *seneng* is used in T.O (datum 6); 6) lexeme “actually” is realized as *sebenere* in K.O, while T.O speaker used *sakjane* (datum 9); 7) lexeme “jealous” is realized as *iri* in K.O, while it is used *njenggi* in T.O (datum 10). These words are followed by different preposition “to”, that are *nang* in K.O, whereas, in T.O *kang* and *ambi* are used; 8) lexeme “ride” is realized as *nunggang* in K.O, while it *numpak* in T.O (datum 11).

In additions, 9) lexeme “explain” is realized as *terangno* in K.O, while *munio* is used in T.O (datum 12); 10) lexeme “go ahead” is realized as *sulung* in K.O, while *olong* is used in T.O (datum 14); 11) lexeme “easy” is realized as *gampang* in K.O, while *enak’e* is used in T.O (datum 15); 12) lexeme “begin or start” is realized *kawit* in K.O. In this lexeme is added with suffix -e, whereas in T.O it is used word *mulai* (datum 16); 13). lexeme “lying down” is realized as

gelintungan in K.O, while T.O speaker used *leyeh-leyeh* (datum 17); **14**) lexeme “slowly” is realized as *edeng-edeng* in K.O, while *alon-alon* is used in T.O (datum 19; **15**) lexeme “pull” is realized as *ampret-ampretan* in K.O, while *batekan* is used in T.O (datum 20); and **16**). This lexical is similar to the datum 11 (datum 21).

Next, there are five sentences which contain lexical difference in the adverb components. **1**). Lexeme “tomorrow” is realized as *isuk* in K.O, while it is word *kesok* in T.O (datum 1). In K,O it is realized with a phrase *engko isuk* : **2**). lexeme “knoll” it is realized as *puthuk* in K.O, while it is used *gumuk* in T.O (datum 8); **3**) lexeme “since” it is realized as *sakat* in K.O, while it is used *mulai* in T.O (datum 13; **4**) lexeme “noon” it is realized as *bedug* in K.O, while it is used *awan* in T.O (datum 16); **5**) lexeme “gutter” it is realized as *kali* in K.O, while it is realized in noun phrase *kali kundang* in T.O (datum 21).

Thus, there is one sentence component containing lexical difference, that is in the complement. That lexeme “wear” is realized as *nggawe* in K.O, while in T.O it is realized as *nganggo*. Next, lexeme “eyeglasses”, in K.O is realized as *tasemak*, while in T.O it is realized as *kocomoto*.

In additions, on analysis of lexical difference, not only lexical difference was found, but also there were syntactical differences found in this research. This analysis is not deeper than phonological and lexical differences analysis. Thus, the purpose of example, the data 5, 20 and 21. One of the examples is data 5. In K.O, the syntactical is S,P, O and adv of place, whereas in T.O it is adv of place, S, P, and O.

Besides the phonological and lexical differences analysis, there are some aspects influencing dialect differences. In term of language variety, the difference is based on factors such as geography, social and cultural background etc as purposed by Zulaeha (2010, p.29). Social dialect is part of the dialect variation. In this case, there are three factors that might cause phonological and lexical differences between K.O and T.O occur. The first factor is age. In Tampo, people who are around 70 years old used a little bit pure Osing but not totally pure. Then, people in other group used the mixing language Osing and Javanese. In Kemiren, all people irrespective of the age used pure Osing in this village. The second factor is ethnicity. K.O speakers are native Osing living with the pure language and custom, although there are new comers who speaks different language and have different custom, but, they must adapted with the K.O. In Tampo is different from Kemiren in which Javanese is more strongly than spoken Osing.

T.O is one of the examples of Banyuwangi language which is influenced by Javanese. The last factor is social factor. In Tampo Osing, the social factor also influences the dialect differences. For example when the children of native Tampo Osing interact with the children of Javanese in elementary school. During the interaction, there are some effects Javanese. Therefore, the language in this village is a blend between Osing and Javanese. In Kemiren Osing, the effect of interaction is as big as in Tampo Osing. It is because the local custom is stronger than new comers custom. Other, factor which creates phonological and lexical differences is because of the marriage factor between Osing people with Java people. That occurs in Tampo village. The people at this village call it

“*Pendalungan*”. It means the children who were born from parents of Osing and Java tribes. Therefore, all of the factors are related to each other which makes difference in phonological and lexical aspects.

Thus, it was different from both of previous studies that was conducted by Ayeomony and Omoniyi (2011) that was analysed from the perspective of Hallidayan Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG) in order to identify the prominent lexemes and syntactic structures of the sentences both of Ondo dialect and Ikale dialect of Yoruba language. The similarities from the first journal, that was the comparison between the two dialects. Then, the research design was also similar, that was recorded and interview based on 46 simple sentences in this study. The difference from the first journal is that this study focuses on the analysis on phonological and lexical differences as purposed by Zulaeha (2010). They study identifies the lexeme and syntactical structure purposed by Hallidayan theory.

Meanwhile, second previous study was conducted by Yandra and Refandi (2013) in their study about Lexical Comparison Between Labuh Sub Dialects of Minangkabau and Standard *Minangkabaunese*. The difference is that, their journal focuses on the same lexical comparison but it is different in meaning on dialect of Minangkabau. In this research, there is the similar analysis on lexical comparison, but it is same meaning. Their research design was interview.

The finding and the methodology of the previous study were different with this research. The previous study found that was mainly different in the area

auxiliary verbs usage. Most of the words or lexemes were found in the standard Yoruba.

The second previous study was conducted by Yandra and Refandi (2013) was found that vocabulary change or full lexicon in Labuh-Sub dialect. Then, there were five types' differences of using language between Labuh-Sub dialect and standard Minagkabau. For the example, the sound /a/ at the end of the word in standard Minagkabau changes into /oa/ in Labuh-Sub dialect.

In this research presents, there was 7 sentences that contained with phonological difference and 21 sentences contained with the lexical difference based on 46 on simple sentences. In this research, there was found that the mainly vowel correspondence occur between K.O and T.O. While, in term of lexical difference was mostly found lexical difference in the predicate component whereas, in subject and adverb components are the same rate. Then, the complement component is only one found it.

In additions, in K.O the lexical is realized in one word, but sometimes it is realized with verb phrase such as in data 1. In K.O, there was found the added with suffix-e in data 16. While, in T.O the lexical is most realized in a phrase such as (noun phrase, adjective phrase, verb phrase). Next, in T.O it is more added with preposition than in K.O. In T.O it was found the modal auxiliary in data 4. Beside, the phonological and lexical difference were found in this research, but also there are syntactical difference found in this study.

Therefore, this research tries to analyze the dialect difference, which occurs in the surrounding phenomena. Dialect can be distinguished based on the

lexical and phonological although the speaker comes from in the same district.

This study can help the reader to understand more about the dialect differences in

Using language. On the other hand, this study also can enrich some knowledge

about the phonological and lexical differences in sociolinguistics aspect.



CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

This chapter consists of conclusion and suggestions which are related to the research findings.

5.1 Conclusion

From the analysis in the previous chapter, it can be concluded that, there were 7 sentences that show phonological difference and 21 sentences which reveal the lexical difference. The first point is based on the consonant correspondence in phonological difference. The differences are the consonant addition / k / in the initial of syllable, the consonant addition / h / in the beginning of syllable and the consonant addition / d / in the middle of syllable and the consonant addition / m / in the beginning of syllable.

Next, analysis on the vowel correspondence reveals the vowel change, that is / o / becomes / u / in the final of syllable, the vowel addition / ə / in the middle of syllable, the vowel reduction that forms / i / into / e /, the vowel addition / u / in the middle of syllable, and the vowel reduction from sound / e / into / a / in the open syllable. Thus, the phonemic variation category which occurs are into phonemes of / i / → / e / and / e / → / a /. The phonemic variations caused different pronunciation in certain words between speakers of K.O and T.O.

In term of lexical difference, lexical difference which was found was mostly in the predicate component. Lexical differences in subject and adverb

components are not. Then, the complement component difference is only one. In addition, in K.O the lexical is realized in one word, but sometimes it is realized with phrase such as in data 1 in T.O. In K.O, there was lexeme which was added with suffix-e like data 16. In T.O the lexeme mostly realized in a phrase such as (noun phrase, adjective phrase, verb phrase). Next, T.O uses more preposition for the predicate than in K.O. That the modal auxiliary was also found such as in data 4. Beside the phonological and lexical difference, there are also syntactical differences found even though the differences are not discussed in this study.

The factors phonological and lexical difference on dialect differences are caused by factors such as age, ethnic background and also marriage.

5.2 Suggestion

The result of this research does not cover all about the dialect differences in some linguistics feature. Although, this is not from the completeness, but by this research, at least, we know the dialect differences between Kemiren Osing and Tampo Osing in terms of phonological differences and lexical differences.

The researcher suggests to the readers to find other aspect on dialect differences and to apply other theories, such as syntactical difference using theory of dialectology.

Further, the researcher also suggest to further researcher who conduct the same topic to research further, not only in terms phonological differences and lexical differences. For the example, the readers can analyze from morphological, semantic and other some linguistic features especially in syntactical aspect.

REFERENCES

Ary, Donald, Jacobs, Lucy Chaesar & Razavieh. Asghar (2002). *Introduction to Research in Education*. Stamford: Thomson Learning.

Ali, Hasan (2002). *Kamus Bahasa Daerah Using-Indonesia*. Banyuwangi :Pemerintah Kabupaten Banyuwangi.

Ali Hasan, (2006). *Pedoman Umum Ejaan Bahasa Using*. Banyuwangi: Pemerintah Kabupaten Banyuwangi.

Ali Hasan, (2006). *Tata Bahasa Baku Bahasa Using*. Banyuwangi : Pemerintah Kabupaten Banyuwangi.

Ayatroheidi (2003) .*Penelitian Dialektologi*. Jakarta: Pusat Bahasa Pendidikan Nasional.

Ayeomony and Omoniyi (2011). *A lexico syntactic exploration of Ondo and Ikale dialects of the Yoruba language*. Retrieved on October 07, 2013, from <http://www.academicjournals.org/JLC>

Brown and Attardo (2009). *Understanding Language Structure, Interaction, and Variation*. United States of America: The University of Michigan Press.

Chaer, Abdul (2007). *Linguistik Umum*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.

Chambers and Trudgil (2004). *Dialectology Second Editions*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.

Hariyono, Aekanu (2013). *Kemiren Kisah Barong Jakripan*. Banyuwangi : Lembaga Pendidikan Budaya dan Lingkungan

Leedy and Ormord (2001). *Practical Research: Planning and Design*. New Jersey: Pearson Merrill Prentice Hall.

Meyerhoff M, (2006). *Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. London and New York : Routledge

Marotin, Ulfa. 2012. *The shifting of address trem pronoun of riko and sro used by Osing people in Gladag Village, Banyuwangi*. Unpublished Thesis, Malang: English Study Program - Language and Literature Departement, FIB, University Brawijaya.

Margarana, Sri (2012). *Perebutan Hegemoni Blambangan*. Yogyakarta :Pustaka Ifada.

Moriyama (2010). *Geliat Bahasa Selaras Zaman*. [Pdf]. Retrieved on April 07, 2013,from <https://openaccess.leidenuniv.nl/bitstream/handle/1887/15213/Arps+2010.pdf;jsessionid=A3168908F4AAC4021654FACF7B18B565?sequence=4>

Maskur, dkk (2005).*Lancar Basa Using*. Banyuwangi: Pemerintah Kabupaten Banyuwangi.

Parera, Jos Daniel,(1987). *Study Linguistik Umum Historis Bandingan*. Jakarta: Airlangga.

Suhriyah, Aminatus, (2011).*Dialect Variations of Madurese Language (A Case of Sampang and sumenep Dialect*. Unpublished Thesis, Malang: English Study Program , Language and Literature Departement, , University Brawijaya.

Verhaar,J.W.M (2012). *Asas-Aasaz Lingustik Umum*. Yogyakarta: Gadjah Mada University Press.

Wardhaugh, R. (2006). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. New York: Basic Blackwell.

Yandra and Refandi (2013). *A Study of Lexical Comparison Between Labuh Sub Dialects of Minangkabau and Standard Minangkabaunese*". Retrieved on October 12, 2013, from https://www.google.com/url?sa=f&rct=j&url=http://ejournal.unp.ac.id/index.php/ell/article/download/2409/2021&q=&esrc=s&ei=cEh_UpK4HMaIrQfj4_YDwAg&usg=AFQjCNGb9mu3y9USrPYqxXnfsLgcEhkvxg

Yule,(2005). *The Study of Language*, fourth edition. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Yanto, Dwi (2002). *Paseh Basa Using*. Banyuwangi: Pemerintah Kabupaten Banyuwangi

Zulaeha, Ida. (2010). *Dialektologi; Dialek Geografi dan Dialek Sosial*. Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu.

Appendix 1. K.O and T.O dialects with Indonesian and English translation.

S/N	K.O Dialect	T.O Dialect	Indonesian	English Translation
1	Mrinio, madang!	Ayo, podo madang!	Ayo, kemarilah makan !	<i>Come here and eat !</i>
2	Siro teko endi sore?	Teko endi riko menyang sore?	Kemana kamu pergi kemarin?	<i>Where did you go yesterday?</i>
3	Isun arep kecaruk siro engko isuk,	Isun arep nemoni riko kesok.	Saya akan menemui kamu besok.	<i>I will see you tomorrow</i>
4	Kapan siro teko?	Kapan siro/ riko teko?	Kapan kamu datang ?	<i>When did you come?</i>
5	Sopo laki'n siro/riko?	Sopo laki'n riko/ siro?	Siapa suami kamu?	<i>Who is your husband?</i>
6	Isun warang	Isun magih loro/ kademan.	Saya sedang sakit.	<i>I'm sick.</i>
7	Klambi suwek ojo dienggo	Klambi suwek ojo dienggo	Baju sobek jangan kamu pakai !	<i>Do not wear your torn clothes!</i>
8	Riko wes mari megawe	Siro wes mari megawe	Dia sudah selesai bekerja	<i>He finished work.</i>
9	Lumure nyiciri sikile adine	Gelase temebluk kena sikile adik hiro.	Gelasnya jatuh, menjatuhkan kaki adiknya.	<i>The glass fell down on the foot of her sister</i>

Table continued

10	Sopo mlaku nyang pasar?	Sopo kang/hang menyang nang pasar?	Siapa yang pergi ke pasar?	<i>Who is going to the market?</i>
11	Sopo bain kang dijak?	Sopo bain kang diejak?	Siapa saja yang diajak.	<i>Who are invited?</i>
12	Mbah tuku pacul sore	Sore anang tuku pacul	Kakek membeli cangkul kemarin.	<i>Grandpa bought the hoe yesterday.</i>
13	Riko seneng mangan poh	Riko demen mangan poh	Dia suka makan mangga	<i>She likes to eat mangoes.</i>
14	Pondok/ paglak kang nduwur ono ring sebelahe kidul puthuk	Paglak kang duwur iku ono ring sebelahe gumuk.	Pondok yang tinggi itu berada disebelah selatan bukit	<i>The high hut is located in the south of knoll</i>
15	Sokone damar ana ring endi?	Caga'e damar ana ring endi?	Tiangnya lampu berada dimana?	<i>Where is the lamppost</i>
16	Riko madango sulung !	Siro mangano olong !	kamu makan saja dulu !	<i>You can eat first!</i>
17	Iya mari wes	Iya wes.	iya, sudah	<i>It's okay</i>
18	Welas, sebenere nyang wong kang apik	Sekaken, sak jane uwong iku apik	Kasiahlan, sebenarnya dia yang orang baik	<i>Sorry, actually he is a kind person</i>

Table continued

19	Njuwut amet garu kang cilik keliru garu kang gede.	Njukut/ njuwut garu kang cilik keliru garu kand gede.	Mengambil sisir yang kecil tertukar dengan sisir yang besar	<i>Taking a small comb which is switched with the large comb.</i>
20	Ana lare iri nang kancane	Ana lare kang njengi ambi kancane	Ada anak yang iri denagn temanya.	<i>There is a kid who is jealous of her</i>
21	Paran paedae kerja bakti iku?	Paran bain manfaatkan kerja bakti iku?	Apa saja manfaatnya kerja bakti itu ?	<i>What is the benefits of the work together?</i>
22	Apuwo siro dires Pak Guru?	Apuwo riko disetrap/ dires Pak Guru?	Kenapa kamu di hukum Pak Guru?	<i>Why did you get punished by your teacher?</i>
23	Kadung gediku teko maning minggu maning	Kadung gediku minggu ngarep teko mrono maning	Kalau begitu minggu depan saja kesana lagi	<i>Next week, we can go to there again then</i>
24	Isun kepingin weruh	Isun sak jane kepingin weruh	Saya sangat ingin mengetahui.	<i>I really want to know</i>
25	Nunggang paran mrono?	Numpak paran mrono?	Naik apa kesana?	<i>What do you ride to get there?</i>
26	Terangno aran iro kang siro goleti	Munio sopo aran hiro ambi kang hiro goleti	Sebutkan nama kamu dan yang kamu cari?	<i>State your name and who are you looking for?</i>

Table continued

27	Sakat kapan siro dikngngkon/ di perentah Emak	Mulai kapan siro dikongkon Emak	Mulai kapan kamu diperintah oleh ibu.	<i>Since when you are ordered by your mother</i>
28	Ulan kang kawitan 1764	Ulan kang kawitane 1764	Bulan yang pertama tahun 1764	<i>The first month of 1764</i>
29	Mrenio kampah sulung , Paman?	Mampiro olong , Paman?	Silahkan singgah dulu Paman?	<i>Please stop here first, Uncle?</i>
30	Soale iki weng bengi, ayo bareng muleh !	Serehne wes soren, ayo podo muleh!	Karena sudah sore, ayo kita pulang!	<i>Because it is late, lets go home!</i>
31	Siro liwat dalam (galur) ring endi?	Siro lewat dalam endi?	Kamu lewat jalan mana?	<i>Which way you will go through</i>
32	Soale isun arep diwel karo Bapak	Sebab'e isun di duwel Bapak	Sebabnya saya yang akan di marahi oleh ayah.	<i>It is because I will be scolded by my father</i>
33	Seng weruh ta siro?	Seng weruh ta siro?	Tidak tahu kah kamu?	<i>Did you know?</i>
34	Gampang ngowo picis bain.	Enak'e ngowo picis bain	Lebih mudah membawa uang saja.	<i>It is easier to bring money only</i>

Table continued

35	Acarane kawite jam 1 bedug	Acarane mulai jam 1 awan	Acaranya mulai jam 1 siang	<i>It starts at 1 pm (noon)</i>
36	Wak, gelintungan ring kasur	Wak, leyeh- leyeh ring kasur	Pakde tidur tiduran di kasur.	<i>Uncle is lying down on the bed</i>
37	Lare iku enak-enakan ring umah mulane sing duwe pengalaman	Lare iku ayem-ayeman bin ning umah makane hing duwe pengalaman	Anak itu santai- santai saja dirumah makanya tidak punya pengalaman	<i>That boy only lazed at home, so he did not have any experience</i>
38	Isun nyang Emak ambi adek tangan di gandeng kepengen nyebrang lurung	Isun ambi Emak nyekel tangane adek kanga arep nyabrang lurung.	Saya dengan Ibu memegang tangan adik yang ingin menyebrang jalan.	<i>My mother and I hold my sister's hand who wants to cross the road</i>
39	Bapak maca Koran ngagwe tasemak	Bapak maca Koran nganggo kocomoto	Bapak membaca Koran menggunakan kacamata	<i>Father is reading a newspaper with the eyeglasses</i>
40	Katone lare iku mlaku edeng-edeng liwat nang kene.	Katone lare iku mlaku alon-alon lewat kene.	Kelihatanya anak itu tadi jalan pelan- pelan lewat sini.	<i>Apparently, the boy walked slowly through here</i>
41	Lare loro ampret- ampretan sarung sampai suwek	Lare loro iku batek- batekan sampai suwek sarunge	Anak dua itu tadi tarik menarik sarung sampai sobek	<i>The two kids pull the sarong one another until it was torn</i>

Table continued

42	Lare wadon iku memengan ring THR nungang delman	Kare wadon iku memengan ning THR numapak dongkar	Anak perempuan itu bermain di THR naik delman	<i>The girl is playing in the THR ride on the wagon.</i>
43	Siro nunggang sepeda keserep ring kali .	Siro numpak sepeda kejungkel ning kali kundang	Dia naek sepeda jatuh tersungkur di parit.	<i>He rode the bike and then fell down in the gutter.</i>
44	Kucing kesereg lawang ring njero umah	Kucing isun kesereg ring njero kamar	Kucing saya terkunci di dalam kamar.	<i>My cat is locked at my room.</i>
45	Siro iku memengan bain seng pernah ana ring umah	Siro memenagan tok sing betah ring umah.	Kamu itu bermain saja tidak betah di rumah	<i>You always play around, you do not like at home.</i>
46	Uwong kang bisa memengan tetep memengan bain	Uwong hing duwek memengan agih memengan bain.	Orang yang tidak bisa bermain tetap main saja	<i>Indeed, people who can not play, still play it</i>

Appendix 2 List of Questions about historical background of Kemiren and Tampo dialects.

1. Bagaimana penggunaan bahasa Osing itu sendiri di desa ini?
2. Apakah di desa ini hanya ditempati oleh orang-orang Osing asli ataupun adakah campuran dari suku lain?
3. Apakah yang membedakan Osing di desa ini dengan yang di tempat lain ? (Tampo) mengingat ini desa adat (Kemiren)?
4. Bagaimna sejarah desa ini sehingga terbentuk sebagai desa adat/ desa Osing/ (Tampo) ini?
5. Bagaimana kehidupan orang di desa ini seperti ada upacara adat. Apakah penggunaan bahasa Osing masih sangat kental digunakan?
6. Mengingat desa Tampo ini ada banyak dari suku lain khususnya Jawa tetapi mengapa masyarakat yang asli suku Osing berlogat campuran? factor apa yang menyebabkannya?
Faktor apa yang menyebabkan desa kemiren ini masih murni dibanding dengan yang lain?
7. Apakah di desa Tampo ini masih dijalankan tradisi kebudayaan Osing seperti di desa Kemiren?
8. Apakah ada kemunduran pengunaan Bahasa Osing oleh masyarakat misal di desa ini (Kemiren dan Tampo)?

Appendix 3 List of the answer about historical background of Kemiren and Tampo dialects

The answer of Kemiren informant

1. Penggunaan bahasa Osing sendiri disini masih digunakan secara menyeluruh oleh semua kalangan masyarakat tanpa mengenal batasan usia. Meskipun ada pendatang, mereka menyesuaikan dengan masyarakat sini.
2. Ada beberapa pendatang misalnya dari Semarang (misal guru yang ditugaskan di desa ini), tetapi itu tidak banyak.
3. Bahasa Osing disini yang masih murni dibandingkan di tempat lain. Semua kamus pedoman bahasa Osing berasal dari sini.
4. Karena bahasanya yang dianggap masih murni, dan desa ini dijadikan cagar budaya untuk melestarikan budaya Osing sejak 1993. Desa ini disebut juga “desa Osing”. Disini juga masih terdapat 12 kesenian asli suku Osing dibanding di daerah lain. Sebenarnya kata Osing itu parikan. Disebut suku Osing karena pada waktu perang Puputan Bayu tahun 1771 suku Blambangan, Bali, Madura kalah dari Belanda sehingga melarikan diri ke Rowo Bayu. Dan ke -3 suku tersebut ditangkap oleh Belanda, ketika orang Bali ditanya Belanda “kamu orang Madura jawabnya osing” dan begitu sebaliknya. Kata Osing berarti tidak karena takut ditembak oleh Belanda.
5. Tentunya masih sangat digunakan baik acara adat maupun kehidupan sehari-hari.
6. Karena di desa Kemiren ini masih sangat banyak budaya Osing asli, dan penduduknya mayoritas masih suku Osing.
7. Kalau di desa Kemiren ini tentunya masih, misalnya upacara “selamatan tumpeng sewu” bulan haji tanggal 1.
8. Semua orang disini masih menggunakan bahasa Osing baik yang masih kecil sampai yang dewasa. Sekalipun ada pendatang tetapi mereka

meyesuaikan diri dan lama kelamaan mereka juga menggunakan bahasa Osing.

The answer of Tampo informant

1. Di desa Tampo ini masih menggunakan bahasa Osing ada juga yang menggunakan bahasa Jawa berlogat Osing. Tetapi, orang tua yang berumur sekitar 70 an itu masih menggunakan bahasa Osing yang murni tetapi tidak pure murni seperti di desa Kemiren dan berbeda dengan generasi berikutnya.
2. Kalau di desa ini baik suku Osing sama suku Jawa semisal dibandingkan 3:1. Tetapi Osing disini dikatakan sebagai Osing pendalungan berarti perkawinan percampuran antara suku Jawa dan Osing yang menghasilkan keturunan.” Keturunan ini dinamakan pendalungan.
3. Yang membedakanya adalah banyak logat Osing yang sudah tercampur bahasanya Jawa. Seperti contoh anak kecil yang duduk di bangku sekolah dasar, mereka berinteraksi dengan anak yang bersuku Jawa maka ada bahasa Osingnya tercampur dengan bahasa Jawa dan itu dibawa sampai pulang di rumah.
4. Sejarah desa Tampo ini ada sebelum penjajahan masa penjajahan Belanda tetapi tidak diketahui pasti tahunnya. Desa Tampo ini dulu ikut desa Benculuk tetapi karena penduduknya banyak jadi mengalami pemekaran menjadi desa Tampo. Orang Osing di desa Tampo ini sebenarnya berasal dari daerah Kabat (Banyuwangi daerah kota) yang pindah untuk mencari lahan baru.
5. Masih menggunakan tetapi tidak semurni seperti desa daerah Banyuwangi daerah kota.
6. Menurut saya, dikarenakan faktor etnik dan usia. Beda generasi karena beda penggunaan bahasa yang dipakai. Etnik karena dipengaruhi suku

Jawa yang sangat kuat di daerah sini. Seperti desa-desa tetangga yang mayoritas penduduknya Jawa.

7. Untuk upacara atau tradisi sudah tidak ada di desa ini.

8. Kemunduran dari segi budaya Osing memang sangat terlihat, tetapi kalau bahasa tetap digunakan untuk mayoritas orang di desa ini.



Appendix 4 List of Informants

Kemiren Informant

1. Name : SIRAD
2. Age : 69
3. Occupation : Farmer
4. Address : RT/ 03 RW/03, Kemiren, Glagah. Banyuwangi

Tampo Informant

1. Name : Suryati
2. Age : 53
3. Occupation : PNS
5. Address : RT/ 03 RW/03, Tampo , Cluring . Banyuwangi