

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

II. 1. Language and Sex

Actually, the essential differences between the males and females are physically reflected from the differences in anatomy and physiology. The sex differences above, however, does not merely include the observable features such as physical appearance, but also influences the determination for one's body to regard his/herself as male and female, such as the awareness toward the ways of behaving and the sex identity. For that reason, it seems that there always exists the social expectation of male or female to react depending on his/her sexual identity.

Montgomery, Reid and Thomas (1994: 28) state that "The more significant differences are socially constructed". In this case, the distinctive treatment toward language use based on sex differences can be categorized as the result of different social attitude toward the behavior of men and women.

Due to the correlation between language and the aspect of sex role and identity, there arises the assumption that the language treatment between male and female is different. Trudgill (1974: 94) suggests that:

Language simply reflects this social fact. Men and women's speech is not only different: women's speech is also (socially) 'better' than men's speech. This is a reflection of the fact that, generally speaking, more 'correct' social behavior is expected of women.

The women's speech is always considered to be 'better' than that of men. It seems that women and men automatically use and interpret language in different way within daily communication. Sometimes men and women speak a particular kind of language that tends to be appropriate to their sex. In addition, the use of inappropriate linguistic features will reinforce social pressures, particularly on the women.

Although there are obvious distinctions between men and women's speech, it does not mean that men and women totally speak different language because the differences usually lie on vocabulary items they use. Accordingly, Trudgill (1974: 86) also points out that:

... although there were clear differences between men and women's speech, only a relatively small number of vocabulary items involved. The men and women, that is, did not speak different language. Rather, they spoke different varieties of the same language – the differences were lexical only.

The tendency of women to speak 'better' and 'correct' speech forms indicates that women's utterances are often closely related with the extensive use of standard speech forms of a language.

According to research findings (See. Trudgill, 1974; Holmes, 1992), generally speaking, across all social groups, women use more standard forms than men. Therefore, the women's speech is presumably less innovative and seems to be conservative than that of men. This characterization also signals the existence of feminine values, which are usually adopted by the women. In line with this, Holmes (1992: 170) points out that:

In many speech communities, when women use more of a linguistic form than men, it is generally the standard form – the overtly prestigious form – that women favor. When men use a form more often than women, it is usually a vernacular form, one which is not admired overtly by the society as a whole, which is not cited as the ‘correct’ form.

However, the preferential linguistic behavior of women to produce standard forms more often than men illustrates one stereotype, as a feminist linguist, Robin Lakoff, has previously characterized the features of women’s language, which contains general specification of language commonly spoken by the women. According to Lakoff in Holmes (1992: 314), “One of the characteristics of women’s language is ‘hypercorrect’ grammar, e.g. consistent use of standard forms. Additionally, Poynton (1980: 67) also assumes that “Men use slang more than women.”

II. 1. 1. Reasons for the Women to Choose Standard Forms

What are actually the reasons that stimulate women to choose standard forms? There are at least four different suggested explanations, which are supposed to be able to answer the important question above. In the opinion of Holmes (1992: 171), they are “appeals to social class and its related status for an explanation”, “women’s role in society”, “women’s status as a subordinate group”, and “the function of speech in expressing masculinity”.

Firstly, the tendency of women to use standard forms more often mainly corresponds to their social-status-consciousness. In society, it is often claimed that one’s status is predictable depending on one’s daily behavior including one’s use of language because there appears the awareness of the fact that the way one

speaking signals one's social class background or social status in the community. The higher one's class status, the better for him/her to treat language better, especially in speaking more standard speech forms. The women often tend to adopt this assumption as a way of increasing the status.

In the sense of women's role in society, the women are supposed to have 'better' behavior than men. Therefore, misbehavior of women will be intolerable and must be quickly corrected. Thus, the attitude of women is supposed to be related with the matters of correctness, including the correctness in using language, the decision to use standard forms more often.

The third explanation refers to the subordinate position of women. This position requires the women to be more 'polite' and avoid offending others, particularly the men. It also influences the women's daily behavior, for instance, they are supposed to use language carefully and politely. Moreover, the correct daily behavior of women links to the fulfillment of their needs for positive impressions of society. That is why; the subordinate position affects the women to use standard linguistic forms more often.

Function of speech in expressing masculinity seems to correlate with the phenomenon of vernacular language usually spoken by men. They tend to speak in vernacular forms because the forms usually contain meanings that connote masculinity and toughness. Furthermore, those values are often used to draw men's personality. Thus, mostly women tend to avoid using vernacular forms and communicate standard linguistic forms as much as possible.

II. 1. 2. Related Studies

1. Sampesule (1999) focused her research on the comparison of language use between male and female, particularly in expressing their anger. Her respondents were Surabaya young people aged 22 to 30 years old, who were college graduates. She found that male used swear words, proposing question, rhetorical question more than female. On the contrary, the last result revealed that the female used more tags question than the male.
2. Puspitorini (2004) studied the politeness strategies used by male and female students of Tourism Department, Airlangga University, particularly in making request. The classification of these strategies was negative politeness (41, 18%), positive politeness (36, 68%), Bald on Record (15, 71%), Off Record (6, 73%). However, the differentiation between them lied on the tendency of males to use negative politeness and Bald on Record more frequently. On the contrary, females tended to use positive politeness and off Record more often.

II. 2. Language and the Situation

Most activities of a speech community need conversation in daily communication. During conversations, a language speaker can interact with others. Meanwhile, daily conversation indirectly affects the language itself to be

more flexible used in certain ways, and more representatives in expressing thoughts according to the speakers' expectations.

Additionally, Wallwork (1978: 73) also figures out that "We may well have learnt that language, even the same language, has to cross not only generation gaps, but political, cultural, and class gaps so that we have to 'mind our language' fairly carefully in many situations..." The quotation above suggests that the situation becomes one of the most important factors within a conversation. Its presence enables language speakers to utter statements or opinions well depending on the audience's demand.

For that reason, each speaker must relatively have ability to switch and modify language based on the situation where the conversation occurs, if they still commit that misunderstanding and unfriendly reactions have to be avoided. Generally, Wallwork (1978:73) also emphasizes, "...how language is used is determined by the situation in which it is used".

II. 2. 1. The Features of 'Situation'

Actually, there are some essentials features, which may constitute a speaker's consideration before conducting a conversation. Related to such features, still Wallwork (1978:73-74) points out that:

It seems useful to think of 'situation' as occurring at two levels at least. Firstly, one can think of the physical, relatively easily identifiable level related to such factors as whom the speakers and listeners are... what the relationship between the... where the language happens... The time at which language happens too as a bearing... Secondly, 'situation' has to be considered in rather more abstract terms... the effect the speaker wishes to

make on the audience...related to social and cultural context...also to the psychological context of the speaker.

In terms of physical feature, the 'situation' of language indicates the main identifiable factors that usually exist within conversation. First factor concerns, the speaker, the listener and the relationship between them, for instance, the relationship between parent and child, employers and employee, strangers to each other in public transportation etc.

Secondly, the location of where the language exists also indicates the form of situation, such as the way of preaching in a church is different from the way of talking among friends in a school break time.

The 'time' where the language occurs, furthermore, corresponds to the chronological time, such as this year, last year etc and 'time' in the sense of occasion, such as party, an official ceremony, a funeral etc.

Meanwhile, the abstract feature refers to the complimentary factors, which indirectly affect the 'situation' of language. What the speaker expects from the audience, such as informing, flattering, impressing etc, is supposed to be associated with social, cultural, and psychological context.

Due to the situation of language, it is often found that language speakers talk differently in different situations or settings. Most of them, however, may not realize that they are able to speak in two or more different ways of talking, even in their own language. These differentiations are specifically mentioned in terms of 'style'. As stated by Fromkin and Rodman (1988:275-276)"...but you may not be aware that you speak two or more 'dialects' of your own language...These

'situation dialects' are called styles. Nearly everybody has at least an informal and a formal style".

The formal style is used in formal situations or settings, like the situation in the court and job interview. There are also many informal situations or settings in everyday life where informal style is allowed even preferred, including when talking to friends while shopping and hanging out, and talking with close family members. Generally speaking, one of the main points which determine whether the styles (formal or informal) are suitable is the degree of situational formality when a language speaker is using the language.

II. 2. 2. Related Studies

1. As quoted from Tannen (1993:294), the list below is the studies, which discussed about the situational formality and the amount of talk, related with gender.

Table 2. 1. Studies Examining Formally Structured, but Not Formally Task-Oriented Interaction

Studies	Researchers
Studies, which Found men to talk more overall	Bernard 1972; Karp&Yoels 1976; Latour 1987; Parker 1973; Swacker 1976; Woods 1989
Studies, which found men to talk more in some circumstances, but no difference in other circumstances	Boersma, Gay, Jones, Morrison&Remick 1981; Brooks 1982; Cornelius&Gray 1988; Cornelius, Gray&Constantinople 1990; Craig&Pitts 1990; Sternglanz&Lyberger-Ficek 1977
Studies, which found men to talk more in one respect, but women to talk more in	Kajander 1976

another	
Studies which found no difference between the genders in amount of talk	Crouch&Dubois 1977; Leffler, Gillespie&Conaty 1982; Robertson 1978

Then, the outcomes of those contribute to the recent findings that a great majority of males tended to talk more than women, particularly within formal tasks.

2. The studies, which examined the amount of talk in informal task contexts and non-task oriented contexts between genders, generally showed the results almost similar with the previous ones. Associated with the above statement, Tannen (1993:297) also provided a complete list of them, as follows:

Table 2. 2. Studies involving informal task and Non-task-oriented activities

Studies	Researchers
Studies which found men to talk more overall	Argyle, Lallje&Cook 1968; Aries 1976; Doherty 1974; Eubanks 1975; Sayers 1987
Studies which found men to talk more in some circumstances, and no difference in others	Soskin&John 1963
Studies which found men to talk more in some circumstances, and women to talk more in another	Dovidio, Brown, Heltmen, Ellyson&Keating 1988
Studies which found women to talk more overall	Askinas 1971
Studies which found no difference between the genders in amount of talk	Case 1988; Duncan&Fiske 1977; Frances 1979; Hirschman 1973; Hirschman 1974; Manber 1976; Markel, Long&Saine 1976; Martin&Craig 1983

The list indicates that nearly all of the studies found that males seem relatively to talk more than females, even in informal situation. However, the list also suggests that, in informal situation, the females have chances to speak up more. The amount of the talk may equal or exceed that of men.

3. Hamid (1994) observed the language use of Arabic descendent traders in Kelurahan Ampel, Surabaya. In this case, she merely focused on the language used when the process of trading occurred. Based on the result of the observation, she concluded that Arabic descendent traders usually used and mixed more than two languages. Those were Indonesian, Javanese, Arabic, and Madurese.

II. 3. Slang as One Mark of Informality

One characteristic of informal style is the occurrence of slang. Generally, its existence is often assumed to define certain informal usages or is often signaled by certain vocabularies found in most of speech communities. In line with the statement, O'Grady, Dobrovolsky, and Aronoff (1989: 341) refer to slang as "Special vocabulary used by any set of persons of a low or disreputable character." Due to its special characteristic, most language speakers describe the appearance of slang as the result of a language process to create certain

vocabularies for nonstandard usages, which merely focuses its application on informal situations.

Additionally, Warfel (1987: 194) also indicates that “Slang words are words that are widely used in informal speech and writing but are not accepted for formal use...People often object to slang because they believe it is impolite, is connected with low-class society...”

Based on both quotations, the use of slang, previously, seems to have been avoided, particularly in formal situation because it could cause negative impression toward slang speaker themselves from others. Therefore, they were usually judged to have lack of politeness.

II. 3. 1. The Function of Slang

Basically, slang functions as one of the chief markers of one special group’s identity. For the language of that social group, the existence of slang occupies an important role as a means of communication in order to keep secrets between themselves only from being known by outsiders.

Slang words mostly have not reached total acceptability yet in speech community even though it is sometimes difficult to differentiate words and expressions that belong to ‘slangy’ words from those that are regular ones.

More startling facts, there are some words, which were considered to be slang for years ago, that can be fully accepted by the whole society today and join the regular forms into standard usages such as ‘phone’ and ‘bus’, which originally

derive from the words ‘telephone’ and ‘omnibus’. It can, therefore, indirectly enrich the vocabularies of formal language.

II. 3. 2. Slang as an Aspect of the Language of Adolescents

Based on its main function, slang is often classified into as aspect of the language of adolescents because adolescents are considered to be the majority of slang’s active speakers. More obviously, O’Grady, Dobrovolsky, Aronoff (1989: 341) state that, “It [slang] is often applied to aspects of the language of adolescents.”

It seems that the use of slang is important among them, especially to exclude themselves from their family and elderly people, such as parents and teachers. Moreover, this separation automatically insists the establishment of adolescents and teenagers as a distinct social group, who speak slang well as their in-group identity.

II. 3. 3. The Word Formation Processes of Slang

Linguistically, slang consists of words and expressions that sometimes sound so peculiar although it is usually invented in the same way formal language is. More specifically, Warfel (1987: 194) also has offered a complete explanation, which contains several processes of slang production.

They may be new words or old ones with a new meaning...some slang words imitate the sound made by something, as *bam*, *click*...Other words come from longer expressions or from words with similar sounds, as when the name of something is unknown or forgotten and it is called a *whatsit*, *whozis*...Abbreviations often become slang terms, as *D.A.* (District Attorney), *M.C.* (Master of Ceremony)...Shortened or clipped words are slang, as *biz* (business), *natch* (naturally)...Learned words may be imitated in slang, as *discombobulate*, *rambunctious*...Two words may be telescoped into one, as in *slanguage* (slang and language), *brunch* (breakfast and lunch)...Foreign languages are a source of slang, as in *boocoo* or *boocoop* (from the French *beaucoup*, "much"), *toot sweet* (from the French *tout de suite*, "at once")...

Some words that enter the vocabulary as slang can immediately come and go. It means that slang words can pass into a more standardized usage and endure for decades or become old fashioned and left unused by its speakers.

II. 3. 4. Related Studies

1. In the article titled "Sex Roles: A Journal Research", Grossman and Tucker (1997) concluded several studies concerning differences and sexism in the knowledge and use of slang. Generally, they assumed that most slang was created and used by males. In other words, the use of slang was more appropriate for males than females. Many types of slang words closely related to male endeavor and interest. So, it may lead to the greater prevalence of slang among males.

2. Setyowati (1999) has observed slang words of prisoners in prison house of Kalisosok, Surabaya. Generally, there were several processes of making slang:

- (i) Affixation and infixation of certain syllable, for example: *ebes* (bapak=father), *lingsima* (maling=a thief), *homer* (homo=homosexual), *sakauw* (kecanduan obat=drug addiction)
- (ii) Process of metathesis, for example: *libom* (mobil=car), *nakam* (makan=eat), *oges* (sego=nasi=rice), *ojob* (bojo=wife)
- (iii) Acronym, for example: *BD* (Bandar Gede), *PB* (Pembebasan Bersyarat), *CMB* (Cuti Menjelang Bebas), *CMK* (Cuti Mengunjungi Keluarga).
- (iv) The process of changing a word with another, which has similar sound at the beginning, for example: *limosin* (lima=five), *mande* (mana=which one?), *matahari* (mata-mata=spy), *lupus* (lupa=forget)

3. Aliyah (2000) focused on the use of slang words spoken by prostitutes in Bangunsari prostitution area, Surabaya. There were several processes of creating slang. They were:

- (i) Affixation, for example: *sukmêr* (masuk=in), *mutêr* (tamu=guess), *emes* (emak=mother), *cloken* (celana=trousers, underwear)

- (ii) Process of metathesis, for example: *nolab* (balon=prostitute), *kaceb* (becak=pedicab), *rudit* (tidur=sleep), *wanpra* (perawan=virgin), *pabra* (berapa=how much?)
- (iii) Acronym, for example: *ABG* (Atas Bawah Gede, Anak Buah Germo), *BR* (Bangun Rejo), *CD* (Celana Dalam)
- (iv) Borrowing from foreign language, for example: *Habibi* (Arabic, aku cinta kamu=I love you), *ciak* (Chinese, makan=eat), *short time* (English, jangka pendek, sebentar)
- (v) Borrowing from dialects, for example: *nyenyek ho* (Madurese, tidak laku=disliked by customers), *dramus* (Javanese, rakus=greedy), *sukim* (Madurese, pisau=knife)

CHAPTER III
PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS
OF THE DATA