

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

In this section, the writer summarizes several theories which are related to the objective of the study. The writer realizes that the theories are needed for analysis in field of sociolinguistics study. The main theory of the language is based on Holmes theory.

2. 1. Theoretical Framework

2.1.1. Sociolinguistics

Language is very important for interact each others for us in society. As human being, we use language anytime and anywhere. According to Holmes (1992: 1), stated that sociolinguistics is the study of the relationship between language and society.

“Sociolinguistics is that part of linguistics which is concerned with language as a social and cultural phenomenon. It investigates the field of language and society & has close connections with the social sciences, especially social psychology, anthropology, human geography and sociology (Trudgill, 1974:32).”

The aim of sociolinguistics is to expose the orderly heterogeneity of the normal speech community or society. Society is a group of people as the user of language. The role of sociolinguistics is to manage a language as its functions in society. The role of language in each community is very crucial.

In other word, sociolinguistics deals with a language as means of communication.

2.1.2 Speech Community

Society is conscious that everybody need interaction each other to keep strong friendship and relationship. Based on Yule, (2006: 1) states that a group of citizen who share a set of norms and expectations regarding the use of language is called speech community. Other explanation comes from Bernard Spolsky. According to Spolsky (1998: 25), states that the speech community is a complex interlocking network of communities whose numbers share knowledge about and attitudes towards the language use patterns of others as well as themselves. Both of explanation above, there is appropriate that environment is a part of speech community. Speech communities as bounded and localized groups of people who live together and come to share the same linguistic norms because they belong to the same local community.

A speech community comes to share a specific set of norms for language use through living and interacting together in the society (Yule, 2006: 2). In the world, speech communities may therefore emerge among all groups that interact and connect frequently, then share certain norms and ideologies. Some examples on speech community can be shown on villages, countries, political or professional communities, communities with shared interests, hobbies, and lifestyles or even just groups of friends.

Speech community has different characteristics each other. It is related with the concept of speech community. Sociolinguists use the concept of speech community to delimit the social locus of their account of language use (Eckert, 2000: 30). In addition, Clark (1998: 267) stated that the concept of speech community is basic to understand of regional and social variation in language. Based on explanations by Eckert and Clark, each speech community has typical concept according where place of origin, dialects and their specific speech community.

2.1.3 Language Choice

Human being has own language in their tribe or society. According to Brace (2001: 11), language is a tool of communication between speakers and listener. Then, language choice is society phenomena. The choice of language refers to selecting language for different purpose in different social contexts. Social context is one of the causes of language choice. A person switches their language into other languages. They will use some languages in different contexts. Although they are not fluent in the language. They try to speak the language which can encourage them to speak in other communities. According to Muhammad's study (2012: 8 cited in Holmes 2008) stated the way of people choose the language depending on the setting, participant, and topic. They use different languages based on those three components.

2.1.4 Diglossia and Bilingualism

According to Chaer (2004: 92), states the word “diglossia” is derived from French. It is called “diglossie” which has been used by Marçais. He is a linguist from French. Diglossia is the ability to use two languages in the society. Moreover an explanation from Holmes (1992:36), proposed the diglossia is a characteristic of speech communities rather than individuals. Individuals may be bilingual. Societies or communities are diglossic. In other words, the term diglossia describes societal or institution bilingualism. Where two varieties are required to cover all the community’s domains but there are diglossic communities where there is very limited individual bilingualism.

According to Pride (1979: 74), that bilingualism is the practice of alternatively using two languages. Bilingualism is different with monolinguals; it is the ability to use a single code. Another explanation stated that bilingualism is for a group of people to have a sense of identity more characteristic of a nationality than an ethnic group (Fasold, 2006: 392). Bilingual derives from the contact between people with different nationalities whereas this contact can be forced under certain circumstances or chosen by the people themselves. On the other hand, the geographical proximity between two communities is the reason for the development of bilingual communities and speakers.

Diglossia is different from bilingualism. In sociolinguistics, there are relationship between bilingualism and diglossia. Fishman (1988: 185) stated

both of diglossia and bilingualism are continuous variables, matters of degree rather than an all-or-none phenomenon, even when compartmentalized obtains. See table:

		Diglossia			
		+		-	
Bilingualism	+	1. Both Diglossia and Bilingualism.		2. Bilingualism without Diglossia.	
	-	3. Diglossia without Bilingualism.		4. Neither Diglossia nor Bilingualism.	

“The first instance, both of diglossia and bilingualism occurs where individual bilingualism is not only widespread but also institutionally buttressed. Fishman believes is imperative for language maintenance. The second case is diglossia without bilingualism. It is referring to different monolingual entities being bought together under one political-territorial rubric (Fishman, 1988: 186).”

2.1.5 Polyglossia and Multilingualism

Polyglossia is the ability to use more than two languages in the society. The term polyglossia has been used for situations like a community regularly uses more than two languages (Holmes, 1992: 38). On society, if there are people involved in polyglossia community is called diglossic situations that involve two constructing varieties are high (H) and low (L).

Polyglossia is a useful term for describing situations where more two distinct code or varieties are uses for clearly distinct purposes or in clearly

distinguishable situation (Holmes, 2001: 32). For example, the community of Maori people in New Zealand. They have one variety of language which consider as “L” variety or called low variety. Then, two varieties which are considered as “H” variety or called high variety. Colloquial or daily language of Maori was the “L” variety which they used to talk to friends, family, and in many shop.

Multilingualism is the act of use; promote the use of multiple languages, either by an individual speaker or by a community of speakers. Multilingual speakers out-number monolingual speakers in the world's population. Multilingualism is becoming a social phenomenon governed by the needs of globalization and cultural openness. Multilingualism allows people to grow up with access to two or more languages resulting in them being able to exercise a choice in using languages for different purposes in the different contexts.

2.1.6 Code Switching and Code Mixing

According to Coulmas (2006: 113), said that code switching happens spontaneously. There are some definitions about code switching. According to Holmes (1992: 50) stated that code switching occur when the speaker shifted their language from one language to another. Then, code switching is occurs when a bilingual person is speaking in one language and then switches to other language (Attariba and Heredia, 2008: 86). Moreover, when bilingual speakers converse, they frequently integrate linguistic material from both of

their languages within the same discourse segment. This process called code switching (Bonvillain, 2011: 332). Code switching is different with borrowed word. When words are borrowed, host languages adapt sounds and intonation patterns to suit their native rules. In code switching, alternation do not occur.

In code switching, there are a number of possible reasons for the switching from one language into another language. First of these is the notion that a speaker may not be able to express him or herself in one language so switches to the other compensate for the deficiency. Second, switching commonly occurs when an individual wishes to express solidarity with a particular social group. The last is the alteration that occurs when the speakers wishes to convey his or her attitude to the listener.

Kinds of code switching are two. There are situational and metaphorical. Situational code switching occurs when the language used change according to the situations. For examples are formal, informal, intimate, etc. Thus, metaphorical code switching occurs when a change of topic requires a change in the language used (Wardhaugh, 2006: 104).

Mix of one word or one phrase of a language with another language called code mixing. According to Bonvillain (2011: 336), stated that code mixing is a linguistics process that incorporates material from a second language into a base of language, adding morphological markers of the base to introduced elements. There are some factors caused code switching and code mixing. They are asserting power (pride and status), decelerating solidarity,

expressing ethnic identity, being more competent, conveying the speaker's attitude to the listener, expressing self emotion, and being more informative (message-oriented).

2.1.7 Domain

The domain concept originally suggested by Schmidt-Rohr (Haberland, 1930: 1). Domain is one factor that can affect by people in choosing language they use. According to Holmes, domain is a number of such typical interactions have been identified as relevant in describing pattern of code choice in many speech communities (2001: 24). There are seven domains are family, friendship, neighborhood, transaction, government, education and employment (Muhammad cited in Fasold, 1992: 9).

Domain of language use:

Domain	Addressee	Setting	Topic	Variety/code

Source: Based on Fishman 1972:22 (cited in Hoffman, 1992:244).

2.1.8 Social Factors

According to Holmes, there are four factors which influence the language choice (1992: 29). Those are known as social factors. The influence of the social factors is reflecting in the language they choose to use. These social factors are:

- a. The participants: who is speaking and whom they are speaking with.
- b. The setting or social context of the interaction: where they are speaking.
- c. The topic: what is being talking about.
- d. The function: why they are speaking.

These are the basic factors to know the purpose why people talk differently.

2.1.9 Social Dimensions

According to Holmes (2001: 25), stated when both of participants share more than on variety, then two other factor will contribute to the appropriate choice. According to him also (1992: 12), states that social dimensions are related also to social factors. However, it is implicit meaning to know about the relationship between participant and the function of speech. These include four scales which are:

- a. A social distance scale
- b. A status scale
- c. A formality scale

d. Two functional scale

A social distance scale concerns with participant relationship. This scale relates to high solidarity or low solidarity. Such as, solidarity is determined by a condition whether a participant knows the other participant well or not.

A status scale concerns with participant relationship. It describes the status of participants and it influences the participant relationship. How they choose their language depends on whether the participants has higher status or lower status.

A formality scale relates to the setting or type of interactions. According to some conditions that formal or informal interaction usually relates to educational place. The students will use different languages when they interact with their teacher or friends. A formality scale is to assess the influence of social setting or type of interaction on language choice (Holmes, 1992:12).

Two functional scales relates to the purposes or topics of interaction. The last scale is two functional scales. Those are referential and affective. Referential is more informative than affective. Holmes (1992: 12) said that in general the more referentially oriented an interaction is, the less it tends to express the feelings of the speaker. Therefore, based on those two scales, the speech reflects the functions of interaction or what the language is being used for.

2.2 Previous Studies

There are some studies supporting this research that have relation to language choice theory:

First is a study about *a Comparison between Language Choice Used by the Male Torajanese Students of Petra Christian University in Their Domains and Those Used by the Female Students*, by Tjandra, Eka (2006). In her research, she investigated the similarities and differences between the code used by the male and female Torajanese students. The research is descriptive quantitative with 20 male and 20 female participants. The theory used is the domain of language use, theories gender, social dimensions, social network and polyglossia. In her study, she found that the codes use are influenced by the formality scale, status scale, social distance, the topic of interaction and their social network.

The second study is *Code Choice Made by Chinese-Samarindanese Students of Petra Christian University*, by Sugianto, Syeli (2009). She chooses the topic for find her study since Samarinda has no native language, so it will be interesting to find out several code choices they used in daily life. In her study, the writer used the theory about code choice and social distance proposed by Janet Holmes. She found that there were four additional codes aside from Indonesian code that Chinese-Samarindanese used in daily life, such as Samarindanese hedges, Banjarese code, Mandarin code, and English code. Mandarin code was dominantly used between the respondents toward their mother in mentioning pronoun, determiner, main verb,

preposition, interjection, adverb, and noun. Samarindanese hedges were used dominantly by the respondents to their older siblings. In addition toward friend, they tended to use Banjarese code especially in mentioning certain pronoun, main verbs, adverbs, and nouns to show solidarity among them. Then, English code was used in mentioning certain nouns and main verbs which have been understood by many people.

The third study is *Language Choice among Students of Al-Khoziny Islamic Boarding School Buduran-Sidoarjo*, by Muhammad (2012). He was student at Airlangga University. He focused the dominant factors which contribute to the student's language choice's participant or addressee. Participant becomes the dominant factor in Al-Khoziny because there is level or status between addressee and addressee, such as ustadz, student, and kyai.

All students have high solidarity when they interact with different addressees, such as; they speak different languages depending on the addressee and the purpose which is to respect the addressee by using the same languages as the addressee. Therefore, in his research all students always see the addressee when they choose the languages but it is no out of the setting, the topic, and the purpose.

The fourth study is *Language Choice of Non-Javanese Immigrants in Sepanjang-Taman, Sidoarjo*, by Amalia (2007). He was student at Airlangga University. In Amalia's study, there are some social factors which are estimated to influence those Javanese immigrants language converse to Javanese language. The first primary factor is motivation and positive attitude Javanese language culture and

people. Second factor is a social need to be fully accepted and functioned in the new community. The last is improving the effectiveness of communication between those non Javanese immigrants and their interlocutor since Javanese is the wider regional language of community in Sepanjang.

Although there have been done many researches on language choice, there is no doubt on study language choice and still an interesting topic to be discussed. Therefore, based on four related studies above, there are some differences on objects between these researches. First, this research use a movie, it is “Lost in Love” as the object of the study. It is different with some of studies above that are focused on societies. Secondly, the writer focuses on language choice used by the main character in “Lost in Love”. The writer takes “Lost in Love” because the movie consists of four languages. There are Indonesian, French, and English. Moreover, the writer also wants know what is language used and the social factors by the main characters. Thus, the study is same on subject but it is different on object.