2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Guth (1970:XVI) says, ”Language is man’s greatest invention and most precious possession. Without the present of a language, trade, government, family life, friendship, religion, and arts would be either impossible or radically different. How we use language, and how well, has much to do with what kind of people we are.” So according to the statements of Guth that we may believe that language is very important for human beings. It also may mean that no human can live without the present of a language.

Perrin (1980:243) says,” Linguistics has been defined as the scientific study of language.” So it means that when someone wants to discuss the aspects of language he or she may not escaped from using linguistics as the science.

Although the lives and views of ordinary group members are clearly of the greatest important in understanding their language, identity and social relationships, we do not have much formal information here. For example, that ‘the only aspect of bilingual education that has been even less researched than student attitudes and interests is that of parental attitude and interests’. Nevertheless, the informal record is useful. In the United States, we have noted the gradual lessening of the influence of specifically ethnic institution: and societies as group need for them decreased. As regards ethnic language itself, there has not been much legal or official pressure on ethnic-group speakers to abandon the mother- tongue; the important factor here has typically been the perceived advantage of life in the mainstream. The few moves to suppress immigrant languages in the last century were unpopular and soon revoked. This is
not to say that minorities would not have preferred a Utopian society with mainstream accessibility and complete cultural and linguistic retention. Choices had to be made. These were not always easy or welcomed in themselves but it is clear that communicative language, at any rate, was a dispensable commodity for most groups. However regrettable this may be, we must remember that, in areas generally untouched by legal compulsion, immigrants of Americans of their own volition, to the extent desired or made necessary by attractive options. Providing we acknowledge the public—private and communicative-symbolic distinctions, we can see that American groups have been largely assimilations in their attitudes.

So far as indigenous minorities are concerned, perceptions of ordinary group members confirm what is mentioned above. It is true that group languages have suffered persecution (but or, at least, ignorance. But even here we should not neglect the elements of choice and volition. Languages may, through force of circumstance, come to play a very reduced communicative role or only a symbolic one, and only group members themselves can save but, we observe that ordinary group members are not, typically, language activists. They are not generally swayed by abstract or romantic appeals which cannot compete with more immediate exigencies; the attitudinal stance is clear. Most minority groups are, above all, pragmatic and this usually implied a considerable assimilation sentiment. Many of the interviewees had regrets connected with emigration and not all of them preferred to describe themselves as American—although many, even in this first generation, did so—but the pragmatic desire to make the act of emigration worthwhile is clear.
A language is a human phenomenon, which will differ from something what even from person to person; it will differ far more from one place to another and from one time to another. These variations in persons, times, and places give rise to such studies as dialectology, linguistic geography, historical and corn preoperative linguistics; and, collaborating even more with other disciplines, lexicography, the making of dictionaries, orthography, the study of spelling, and paleography, the study of ancient text.

In the last few decades linguists have developed a rigorous technique for the analysis of languages, in part in reaction against previous methods of study, particularly philology, which was concerned chiefly with the Indo-European languages and based largely on the study of literature, especially of written literature. A basic principle of linguistics is that language is primarily speech; the methods of analyzing speech (such as establishing categories by comparing “minimal pairs,” two locutions alike in all but one linguistic feature—cat, rat) have become relatively standardized and have been applied to other aspects of language. Perhaps the most difficult aspect of linguistics has been the separating (for the purposes of analysis) of linguistic activities from the current of life in which they appear. The words structure and structural, often applied to linguistic study (sometimes almost with a mystical or magical overtone), emphasize this separation. Structural linguistics isolates the linguistic activity and stresses that despite the variety in a language there is a system or a series of patterns which can be discovered and described by linguistic methods and which alone are the proper subject of linguistics.
Because of the tremendous importance of language in life, there have been numerous pressures for practical applications of the methods and findings of the new science. To date, the notable successes have been in recording and analyzing languages not previously written, recording many that were on the point of extinction, and in teaching the spoken form of a second language through more detailed and accurate analysis.

Considerable progress has been made in describing English in newer and more precise terms. Features like word order and intonation patterns have been more systematically explored. Real advances have been made in abandoning or at least minimizing some categories inherited from Latin grammar but not significant for English, such as forms for case in nouns and mood in verbs; in defining various categories more objectively, such as the parts of speech (or form classes)—defining them by reference to form and function rather than to meaning; in giving more definite recognition to the phrase patterns basic to syntax; and in providing a syntax grounded in observation of speech.

The description of English should be as accurate as possible, and gradually linguistics is furnishing a more complete and consistent description. Even now there are gains in using some of the terms and categories of linguistics: a few topics such as sentence boundaries and restrictive punctuation can be more accurately presented than formerly, even though the precise definitions of the terminals.

The language part of a context and situation beyond a few pretty elementary topic is certainly in the area of meta-linguistics, involving social habits
and attitudes. Most of the questions are of the order of “Shall I say or write this in this situation?” Linguistic generalizations, whether in traditional or more scientific form, can help in presenting general patterns, in summarizing general practices, but they do not go far in guiding choices between similar expressions when both are in the range of Standard English. To make these decisions students need not only the paradigms but a wide knowledge of the varieties of current usage, what educated people say and write. Since this knowledge by itself will not answer the questions, principles are also needed, especially principles of appropriateness. These involve value judgments, the cultivation of taste and some sensitivity to styles.

While we are talking about code-mixing and code-switching there will be many things or linguistic aspects to be discussed on. So in order to make the writing has a rail to be followed by, the writer wants to limit her analysis deal with the code-mixing and code-switching which are taken around the parkof the Faculty of Culture Study used by the students of the English D-3 program who are having no class.