

## **CHAPTER II**

### **REVIEW of RELATED LITERATURE**

This chapter talks about some related theories that support the study, i.e.: the field of sociolinguistics, language definition, speech community, language variation, some varieties of language (by gender, age, role-relationship, social dialect, semantic), and the last about attitude towards swearword.

#### **2.1 The Field of Sociolinguistics**

Holmes (1992: 1) says,

Sociolinguistics studies the relationship between language and society. The focus is the way we speak differently in different social contexts, and that concerning with identifying the social functions of language and its way in conveying social meaning (See Janet Holmes, 1992: 1)

In the statement above, Holmes claims that sociolinguistics studies the relationship between language and society. He prefers to use the term "variation" as primary subject matter of sociolinguistics, specifically variation in language, which is conditioned by social differences.

Wiśniewski says,

Sociolinguistics investigates the way in which language changes depending on the region of country it is used in. To describe a variety of language that differs in grammar, lexis and pronunciation from others a term dialect is used. Moreover, each member of community has a unique way of speaking due to the life experience, education, age, and aspiration (See, Wiśniewski in <http://www.tlumaczenia-angielski.info/linguistics/sociolinguistics.htm>)

In comprehending sociolinguistics, Hymens and Whorf in Holmes (1989: 182) state,

Social pattern consideration is an inevitable subject, since it has been relevant for particular varieties used. The use of language varies and is determined and influenced by the social structure of the community in question. This may be considered a Whorfian notion in its mirror image, as has been articulated by Hymens. While Whorf said that the structure of language may influence social structure, interaction, and thinking, Hymens suggested that the social structure might influence attitudes toward particular kinds of language. In other words, the social differences are there to begin with, and we can then use concomitant linguistic differences to symbolize them. At that point, we may use language to discriminate and to control, because we may use it to categorize people, to put or keep them in their place.

## **2.2 Language Definition**

Pei in Brown (1980: 4) states,

Language is a system of communication by sound, operating through the organs of speech and hearing, among members of a given community, and using vocal symbols possessing arbitrary conventional meaning.

Furthermore, Finocchiaro in Brown (1980: 4) states,

Language is a system of arbitrary, vocal symbols which permit all people in a given culture or other people who have learned the system of that culture, to communicate or to interact.”

Then, Wardhaugh in Brown (1980: 5) states that language is a system of arbitrary vocal symbols used for human communication.

Kerff (1984: 16) states, “Language is a means of communication between society members, in the sound’s symbol which is produced by the organs of speech of human beings”.

A language is an arbitrary system of articulated sounds made use of by a group of humans as a means of carrying on the affairs of their society (Francis in Prof. DR. Soekemi 1958: 13)

Thus, language definition according to the above statements is a system of arbitrary communication by sound, operating through the organs of speech and hearing, vocal symbols which permit all people in a given culture or other people who have learned the system of that culture and in the sound’s symbol which is produced by the organs of speech of human beings.

Dorais and Bourhis in Taylor state,

Language is a symbol of cultural identity. In addition, language is a resource that can be used to entrench the power of one group over another. For example, if one language is always used at important meetings, that language gains prestige and status over other available languages. For these reasons, the study of language is not merely important for what it reveals about language attitudes per se. It can be vital in terms of policy implications for accommodation process generally and specifically their impact on participation in major institutions, including education, employment, media and government (Taylor in <http://www.brandonu.ca/Library/CJNS/9.1/taylor.pdf>.)

As written in [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sapir-Whorf\\_hypothesis](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sapir-Whorf_hypothesis) Sapir-Whorf state,

Human beings do not live in the objective world alone, nor alone in the world of social activity as ordinarily understood, but are very much at the mercy of the particular language which has become the medium of expression for their society. It is quite an illusion to imagine that one adjusts to reality essentially without the use of language and that language is merely an incidental means of solving specific problems of communication or reflection. The fact of the matter is that the 'real world' is largely unconsciously built upon the language habits of the group. No two languages are ever sufficiently similar to be considered as representing the same social reality. The worlds in which different societies live are distinct worlds, not merely the same world with different labels attached... We see and hear and otherwise experience very largely as we do because the language habits of our community predispose certain choices of interpretation.

### 2.3 Speech Communities

Patrick in <http://privatewww.essex.ac.uk/~patrickp/papers/SpeechCommunity.pdf> states,

The speech community is a core concept in empirical linguistics, is at the intersection of many principal problems in sociolinguistic theory and method. Every branch of linguistics that is concerned with representative samples of a population. It takes individual speakers or experimental subjects as typical members of a group, that studies language as attributable to a socially coherent body (whether or not it professes interest in the social nature of that body); or that takes as primitive such notions as 'native speaker', 'competence/ performance', 'acceptability', etc., which manifestly refer to collective behavior, rests partially on a concept equivalent to the speech community. Linguistic systems are exercised by speakers, in social space: there they are acquired, change, are manipulated for expressive or communicative purposes, undergo attrition, etc.

In another opinion, Labov in Malcolm Coulthard (1985: 37) states,

“The speech community is not defined by any marked agreement in the use of language elements so much as by participation in a set of shared norms; these norms may be observed in overt types of evaluative behavior and by the uniformity of abstract patterns of variation which are invariant in respect to particular levels of usage”.

And here some definitions and observations on the speech community as quoted by Patrick in <http://courses.essex.ac.uk/lg/lg232/SpeechComDefs.html> from some sociolinguists are:

Bloomfield (1926: 153- 154) states,

1. Definition An act of speech is an utterance. 2. Assumption. Within certain communities successive utterances are alike or partly alike... 3. Definition any such community is a speech community

Then, Prague School approach explains,

*Neustupny coined the term Sprechbund ('speech area'); it involves "shared ways of speaking which go beyond language boundaries" (Romaine 1994:23). This is parallel to the older Sprachbund ('language area'), which involves "relatedness at the level of linguistic form"*

Furthermore, Gumperz (1962/ 71: 101) says,

'linguistic community' is "a social group which may be either mono-lingual or multilingual, held together by frequency of social interaction patterns and set off from the surrounding areas by weaknesses in the lines of communication." LC's "may consist of small groups bound together by face-to-face contact or may cover large regions, depending on the level of abstraction we wish to achieve." *A purely social concept*

Thus, from three statements above, it is concluded that speech community is a certain social group which has a typical language boundary in the social interaction.

## **2.4. Language Variation**

Seville *et al.* and Gumperz (1989: 49) explain,

A variety of language codes and ways of speaking is available to its members, which is its *communicative repertoire*. This includes 'all varieties, dialects, or styles used in a particular socially-defined population, and the constraints which govern the choice among them'. Therefore, any speakers also have a variety of codes and styles from which to choose according to their members. The means of communication used in a community include different languages, and different channels of communication. The nature and extent of this diversity is related to social organization of the group, which

likely to include differences in relationship between speakers, their goals of interaction, and the settings in which communication takes place.

As written in [http://www.csulb.edu/~linguag/W\\_is\\_ling.html](http://www.csulb.edu/~linguag/W_is_ling.html) says,

Language Variation" describes the relationship between the use of linguistic forms and factors such as geography, social class, ethnic group, age, sex, occupation, function, or style. The combination of these various factors results in an individual's "idiolect," that is, their particular and idiosyncratic manner of speech. When a group of speakers shares a variety of language, it is known as a "dialect," A dialect, whether standard or non-standard, includes the full range of elements used to produce speech: pronunciation, grammar, and interactive features

Edward (1997: 284) explains in learning language and using language, people are susceptible to social influences in their environment. Therefore, within a given society the social conventions relating to language may be many and varied. In addition, he states that the variation deals with many aspects such as: sex, ages, and social status.

## **2.4.1 Some Varieties of Language**

### **2.4.1.1 By Gender**

The rise of research into language and gender has meant that widespread folk linguistic beliefs concerning the language use of males and females have been subject to various kinds of empirical tests. One such belief is that men swear more than women (Coates in Kidman, <http://www.gusworld.com.au/nrc/thesis/intro.htm>).

Various studies Bailey-Timm *et al.* have confirmed, showing men to use swearing more, to be perceived as using it more and to be more comfortable with its use. However, while men often show a statistical tendency to swear more it is not true (as is also often assumed) that swearing is a largely male prerogative. The differences between male and female swearing in several studies were very small. Women appear aware of a social expectation that they will swear less, but this is not always an expectation, which they meet. Indeed, some women examined showed a positive enjoyment of swearing. (See, Bailey-Timm *et al.* in Kidman,

<http://www.gusworld.com.au/nrc/thesis/intro.htm>)

In another statement Seville *et al.* (1989, 192) state,

As the language becomes less and less *alus* 'gentle' as we move eastward from Solo, so are the people. Generally speaking, a Javanese from Surabaya (the capital of the East Java province) is less *alus* than one from Solo or Jogjakarta, in that the former tends to talk faster and louder as well as to be more frank and straightforward than the later

In another context of meaning, such studies are relevant because they demonstrate that the usage of swearwords is in fact, constant across males and females. We need not assume that swearwords have different meanings for men and women, the fact that women can swear as much as men and abuse the opposite gender with equal facility. (Kidman in <http://www.gusworld.com.au/nrc/thesis/intro.htm>)

#### **2.4.1.2 By Age**

In most speech communities, age is a major dimension for social categorization (Seville *et al.* 1989: 98). In short, age influences use of language variation in communication in the society.

In research, speaker age is considered the primary correlate of language change (Chambers 2002), and as such is generally included as independent variable in studies of language change. However, in contrast with other social variables (e.g., sex, socio-economic class), in sociolinguistics, age has not typically been of interest in and of itself: "there has been little, if some researches that has had age differences in language use as its primary focus" (Cheshire 1987: 766). Indeed, most prior mainstream sociolinguistic research has focused on morph-phonological variation, while syntactic, lexical, and pragmatic variation has remained under-investigated (Cheshire 2005). In sum, we know relatively little about how speakers from different age groups might differ in their linguistic choices, particularly at the lexicon-grammatical level. Syntactic, lexical, and pragmatic variation however cannot be tackled the

same way as phonological variation, where a linguistic variable is identified by circumscribing relevant variants. Rather, we need approaches taking into account the fact that the social embedding of these forms may involve forms drawn from other linguistic levels beside themselves (Cheshire 2005). (See Chambers and Cheshire in Barbieri, [http://www.ling.upenn.edu/nwav/abstracts/nwav36\\_barbieri.pdf](http://www.ling.upenn.edu/nwav/abstracts/nwav36_barbieri.pdf)).

In additional opinion, Holmes (1992: 183) states,

There are other features of people's speech, which vary at different age too. Not only pitch, but vocabulary, pronunciation, and grammar can differentiate age groups. There are patterns which are appropriate for 10 year-olds or teenagers which disappear as they grow older. These are age-graded patterns. The extensive swearword vocabulary that some teenagers use is likely to change over time, for instance, as example 12 year-olds suggests. Though continue to know these terms, the frequency with which they use them diminishes, especially as they begin to have children and socialize with others with young families. It seems possible that adult men restrict swearing largely to all-male settings, whereas women reduce their swearing in all setting as they move into adulthood

Thus, the use of swearwords in communication in the society are also affected by social categorization, especially, here is age.

#### **2.4.1.3 By role-Relationship**

Seville *et al.* (1989: 91) state,

Role-relationship may also be marked by the order in which participants speak eye contact or avoidance, and body position, in a cyclic or interaction even with several people in sequence, such as greetings, introductions, or thanks, the order of address may mark relative deference or closeness. The cycle of Iranian families exchanging traditional New Year Greeting visits always begins with an early call of the youngest on the eldest relative or friend, and then acquaintances, with the ordering considered an important sign of relative love and respect for each

Havilland in Seville *et al.* (1989: 93) state,

In some speech communities, particular role-relationships require that clearly distinct variety of language used, often-involving avoidance, or taboo in some respect (Seville *et al.*, 1989: 93)

#### 2.4.1.4 By Social Dialect

Dialect diversities are separated from each other geographically and socially. The changes in language spoken do not necessarily spread to another but among the group itself (Alwasilah, 1988:133). Furthermore Hartmann & Stork (1972: 65) state,

A dialect may be classified by social criteria also, A regional, temporal or social variety of a language, differing in pronunciation, grammar and vocabulary from the standard, which is in itself a socially favored dialect. If the variant of differs only in pronunciation it is often called accent

Seville *et al.* (1989: 87) add,

In rigidly stratified communities, social class members of the lower strata have little opportunity to acquire "higher" language forms (dialects). In more communities that are democratic individuals have a wider range of roles potentially open to them, and generally command a wider range of socially speech

Thus, social dialect according to above statements is classified by social criteria, a regional, temporal or social variety of a language, differing in pronunciation, grammar and vocabulary from the standard and social class members of the lower strata have little opportunity to acquire higher language forms (dialect).

The term dialect is as a neutral term to refer to the systematic usage of a group of speakers. Those in a particular region or social class, for instance that the term has within linguistics none of the negative connotations, which it sometimes has in everyday usage (for instance, meaning "nonstandard" or "substandard" speech, or the speech of people from other regions besides one's own). Everyone speaks a dialect at least one. (Rickford in [http://www.stanford.edu/~rickford/papers/173\\_reading\\_1.doc](http://www.stanford.edu/~rickford/papers/173_reading_1.doc))

In another view, Jay (1992:1) claims cursing is the more basic notion in the relevant area and one that is more commonly used. In addition, a cultural difference is indicated even between speakers of the "same language". The existence of such a difference indicates the inherent risks of assuming swearing to be an invariant category. (*See*, Jay in Kidman,

<http://www.gusworld.com.au/nrc/thesis/intro.htm>)

#### **2.4.1.5 By Semantic**

Frequently, people discuss semantic variation in different meaning some words or phrases that are used for the same thing or in different context. It is like the swearword used by youth of Mojokerto in communication. They tend to express some swearwords ambiguity, according to the context while express them

As written in <http://www.csulb.edu/~linguag/W is ling.html> says,

Semantics" is the study of meaning in language. The goal of semantic study is to explain how sequences of language are matched with their proper meanings and placed in certain environments by speakers of the language

Bezuidenhout states,

“Expression meaning can come apart from speaker meaning. Another way is; when a speaker engages in some form of implicit communication, conveying a meaning other than the meaning of the words or sentences she utters. Such implicit meaning can be intended either in addition to or instead of the explicit meaning. Some regard utterance meaning as a species of speaker meaning others regard it as a distinct level of meaning. According to the speech-act centered conception of meaning, speaker meaning has priority over expression meaning. In contrast, the expression-centered conception regards semantic properties as intrinsic to expressions. This latter view is disputed by those who (like Grice) wish to reduce expression meaning to speaker meaning or who (like Searle) regard expression meaning as depending on a Background of human practices (See, Bezuidenhout in [http://www.cas.sc.edu/ling/faculty/bezuidenhout/ELL2\\_ms1168.pdf](http://www.cas.sc.edu/ling/faculty/bezuidenhout/ELL2_ms1168.pdf).)

#### **2.5 Attitude towards Swearword**

Commonly, youth bad attitude is triggered by some sources of problem, and one of them is caused by wrong social interaction in group of society, that influence any against attitudes with norms in a society i.e.: religion norm, politeness norm, and other norms. Any kinds of youth delinquency action are consuming drugs, fighting, or swearing, and others.

Lawang in Sosiologi SMU 1 states, “deviation is all actions which digressing from norms in a social system... “(See, Sosiologi of SMU, 1994: 87)

According to above statement, we could take a conclusion that everything attitudes, which deviate with norms in a society, are considered wrong, in this matter like the swearwords used by youth of Mojokerto in communication. Swearword is an expression of words or phrases that are considered wrong, and it is not good to say it in a communication. On the contrary, sometimes swearword expression is accepted depend on the context of interaction.

Wang states, swearword involves a rather extreme employment of language, and its representative ness for a given culture is hence limited. It would be foolish, therefore, to characterize a culture's attitude toward incest based solely on an analysis of swear words. It is reasonable to suggest, however, that the small special differences one can observe on the surfaces of a pair of languages. (Wang in [http://www.indiana.edu/~easc/resources/working\\_paper/noframe\\_9a\\_oedip.htm](http://www.indiana.edu/~easc/resources/working_paper/noframe_9a_oedip.htm))

In another statement, Seville *et al.* (1989: 182) state,

Attitudes are acquired as a factor of a group membership, as part of enculturation in particular speech community, and thus basic to its characterization

From above opinion, attitudes toward communicative performance are generally determined culturally, which they are so strongly influenced by the social structure of the community in question. Depends on Holmes (1991: 1) in sociolinguistic comprehension, which the language variation especially usage of swearwords in relationship is affected by social interaction in a society.

In additional view, Kristiansen in Holmes (1992: 291) states,

Language attitudes are complex psychological entities, which involve knowledge and feeling as well as behavior and feeling as well as behavior, and are sensitive to

situational factors (e.g. the formality of the situation, or the salience of language in situation)

The Kristiansen's view above describes that children, or persons, may use language according to their educational background (knowledge), and emotion to utter it in communication.

Andersson & Trudgill define swearing as (a) refer to something taboo in a given culture, (b) to be interpreted non-literally and (c) used to express strong emotions and attitudes. The main fault with this definition is that it fails to account for the intuition of many speakers that a word such as *cunt* is a swearword whether it is being used literally or not (Taylor). Although its use is more sanctioned under some circumstances than others, the general attitude to swearing is that it is a socially unacceptable behavior. (See, Andersson & Trudgill and Taylor in Kidman, <http://www.gusworld.com.au/nrc/thesis/intro.htm>).

Attitudes to language are important to sociolinguistic for reasons language variation. Some social dialectologists as quoted Holmes (1992: 356) have claimed that shared attitudes to speech or shared speech norms is crucial criterion in defining members of the same community.

Therefore, from statements above, we can take a conclusion that the use of swearwords in relationship, depend on social interaction, educational background, and emotion that are very crucial to form varieties of language.