CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

2.1 Sociolinguistics

Sociolinguistics is a branch of linguistics that takes language as an object of study, in a way that is usually distinguished from how syntax, semantics, morphology, and phonology handle it. It is a field that analyzed language as part of social property. The study explores the function and the varieties of language, the contacts between different languages, attitudes of people towards language use and users, changes of language, as well as plan on language. In the early definition of the study, some linguists used the term sociology of language, while others named it sociolinguistics. The difference between the names was agreed by some, though today most scholars in the field see it as an insignificant issue. In reference to the difference, the term sociolinguistics was used more to refer to the study of language in relation to society, whereas, sociology of language is used mainly to refer to the study of society in relation to language. Thus, in sociology of language, the emphasized object of study is societies, whereas in sociolinguistics, the focus of study is language. Although the different emphasis seems to make a sense, in practice the discussions inevitably overlap.

The term sociolinguistics has gained much more popularity both in the studies and in the literatures discussing the subject. The following definitions on the subject used sociolinguistics as the names of the fields:

Wardaugh, (2010:12) said that sociolinguistics is concerned with investigating the relationships between language and society with the goal being a better understanding of the structure of language and of how languages function in communication. The equivalent goal in the sociology of language is trying to discover how social structure can be better understood through the study of language.

Spolsky, (1998: 3) said that sociolinguistics is the field that studies the relation between language and society, between the uses of language and the social structures in which the users of language live. It is a field of study that assumes that human society is made up of many related patterns and behaviours, some of which are linguistics.

Chambers (2009:10) said that Sociolinguistics are sometimes accused of giving more space to their methods than to their results.

Hudson (1980:4-5) defined sociolinguistics as the study of language in relation to society, implying (intentionally) that sociolinguistics is part of the study of language.

Hymes (1974: vii) said that sociolinguistics could be taken to refer to use of linguistic data and analyses in other disciplines, concerned with social life, and conversely, to use of social data and analyses in linguistics. The word could also be taken to refer to correlations between languages and societies, and between particular linguistic and social phenomena.

The existence of patterned variation in language makes it possible to identify ourselves and others as belonging to certain groups. The social prestige or stigma associate with these variations makes language a source of social and political power. Only by including both linguistic and social factors in our analysis can this complex but rule-governed behavior be account for. To do this is chosen goal of the sociolinguist.

2.2 Speech Community

The term speech community is widely used by sociolinguists to refer to a community based on language, but linguistics community is also used with the same meaning. If speech communities can be delimited, then they can be studied, and it may be possible to find interesting differences between communities which correlate with differences in their language.

For general linguistics in Spolsky's Book (1998:25) the speech community is a complex interlocking network of communication whose members share knowledge about and attitudes towards the language use patterns of others as well as themselves. There is no theoretical limitation on the location and size of a speech community, which is in practice defined by its sharing a set of language varieties (its repertoire) and a set of norms for using them.

Hymes, (1974:47) says, "Speech community is a necessary, primary concept in that, if taken seriously, it postulates the unit of description as a social, rather than linguistic, entity. one starts with a social group and considers the entire organization of linguistic means within it, rather than start with some one partial, named organization of linguistic means, called a language".

Hymes also said that speech community is necessary, primary concept in that, if taken seriously, it postulates the unit of description as a social, rather than linguistic, entity. One starts with a social group and considers the entire organization of linguistics means within it, rather than start with someone partial, named organization of linguistic means, called "language". This is vital because the notion of "a language" can carry with it a confussion of several notions and attributes that in fact have to be sorted out.

The idea that the members of a speech community share norms about the selection of varieties is important. Though they might not all know and use each of the varieties, they recognize the condition under which other members of the community believe that it is appropriate to use each of them.

According to Spolsky (1998), the speech community is, therefore, the abstract 'space' studied in sociolinguistics, the location in which the patterned variations in selection from the available repertoire takes place.

Wardhaugh (1986:120) defined that a speech community is defined as much by what it is not as what it is. The group must manifest regular relationships between language use and social structure, and there must be norms.

To participate in speech community, is not quite the same as to be a member of it. Here we encounter the limitation of any conception of speech community in terms of knowledge alone, even knowledge of patterns of speaking as well as of grammar, and of course of any definition in terms of interaction alone. Just the matter of accent may erect a barrier between participation and membership in one case, although be ignore in another.

A speech community is defined, then tautologically but radically, as a community sharing knowledge of rules for the conduct and interpretation of speech. Such sharing comprises knowledge of at least one form of speech, and knowledge also of it's patterns of use. Both condition are necessary. Since both kinds of knowledge may be shared apart from common membership in a community, an adequate theory of language requires additional notion, such as language field, speech field, and speech network, and requires the contribution of social science in characterizing the notions of community.

In every group of people there is a need for communicative, such as a process of socialization or group solidarity. These needs will never be met, if not shared linguistic norms are adhered together in order to maintain and develop the society as a whole. Language that makes a society becomes centripetal, meaning that the language tends to absorb people into a single unit. Unity of society because they adhere to the norms of the same linguistic community we name the language.

2.3 Code-Mixing

Talk about code-switching, usually followed by a discussion of code-mixing. Code-mixing occurs when a language speakers, for example, Indonesian incorporate elements into the regional language Indonesian conversation. In other words, someone who speaks with the main code Indonesian who has it autonomy function, while the local language code that is involved in a major code fragments without function or autonomy as a code.

Code-mixing refers to the mixing of two or more languages or languages varieties in speech. Some scholars use the terms "code-mixing" interchangeable, especially in studies of syntax, morphology, and other formal aspects of language. Others assume more specific definitions of code-mixing, but these specific definitions may be different in different subfields of linguistics, education theory, communications, etc.

Code-mixing is similar to the use or creation of pidgins, but while a pidgin is created across groups that do not share a common language, code-mixing may occur within a multilingual setting where speakers share more than one language.

Some linguists use the terms code-mixing more or less interchangeably. Especially in formal studies of syntax, morphology, etc. Both terms are used to refer to utterances that draw from elements of two or more grammatical systems. These studies are often interested in alignment of elements from distinct systems, or on constraints that limit switching.

While linguists have worked to describe the difference between code-switching and borrowing of words or phrases, the term code-mixing may be used to encompass both types of language behavior.

Hudson (1996:53-55) said that, in code-switching the point at which the languages change corresponds to a point where the situation changes, either on its own or precisely because the languages changes. There are other cases, however, where a fluent bilingual talking to another fluent bilingual changes language without any change at all in the situation. This kind of alternation is called code-mixing (or conversational code-switching, a rather unhelpful name).

The purpose of code-mixing seems to be to symbolize a somewhat ambiguous situation for which neither language on its own would be quite right. To get the right effect the speakers balance the two language against each other as kind of linguistics cocktail, a few words of one language, then a few words of the other, then back to the first for a few more words and soon. The changes generally take place more or less randomly as far as subject-matter is concerned, but they seem to be limited by the sentence-structure.

An important question about code-mixing is what syntactic constrains apply to it, and attempts to answer this question have constituted one of the main points of contact over the last few years between sociolinguistics and non-social linguistics. There is no doubt that there are syntactic constraints, people to belong code-mixing communities can judge whether particular constructed code-mixed examples are permitted or not, and these judgments are on the whole born out by studies of text.

The reason why code-mixing has interested non-social linguists is that these restrictions call for an explanation. Are they peculiarities of each languages pair involved in mixing, or are there more general patterns that apply to all code-mixing, and if there are, what are they and who do they exist? the research is still in its infancy and the results are quite inconclusive, but it hard to avoid the conclusion that constraints vary from community to community in spite of the enthusiastic attempts to provide universal explanation.

Made Irawan (2010:79) said that if its involved changing into a foreign clause or a sentence, it should be defined as a code-switching, but if it involves uses of foreign phrases or group of words, it is code-mixing. Another view considers the formality of the situation, in which mixing is said to be found in the less formal situation while switching is possibly done in a formal one. Another way is by considering the bilinguals level of fluency in the languages (codes). To this perspective of bilinguals can perform mixing while the less skilled ones may only do switching.

The concept of code-mixing is used to refer to a more general form of language contact that may include cases of code-switching and the other form of contacts which emphasizes the lexical items.

2.3.1 Kinds of Code Mixing

Hudson (1980:53-54) Says that in code switching at which the languages change corresponds to a point where the situation changes. There are other cases, however where a fluent bilingual talking to another fluent bilingual changes language without any change at all in the situation. The kind of alternation is called code mixing (or conversational code-switching, a rather unhelpful name). The purpose of code-mixing seems to be symbolize a somewhat ambiguous situation for which neither language on its own would be quiet right.

To get the right effect the speakers balance the two languages against each other as kind of linguistic cocktail. A few words of one language, then a few words of the other, then back to the first for a few more words and so on. The changes generally take place more or less randomly as far as subject-matter is concerned, but they seem to be limited by the sentence structure, as we shall see.

An important question about code-mixing is what syntactic constraints apply to it, an attemps to answer this question has constituted one of the main points of contact over the last few years between sociolinguistics and non-sociolinguistics. There are no doubt that there are syntactic constraints. People who belong to code-mixing communities can judge whether particular constructed code-mixed examples are permitted or not, and these judgment are on the whole born out by studies of texts.

Wardaugh (2006:98) says, "code-mixing (also called code mixing) can occur in conversation between speakers' turn or within a single speaker's turn". In the latter case it can occur in conversation between sentences (inter-sententially) or within a single sentence (intra-sententially).

2.3.2 Factors that influence code-mixing

Hymes (1974:53-62), said that the setting and scene are places, occasions, or natural situations that can influence the people in choosing the code. People may consider choosing a more formal variety of a language when talking in an office than when talking in a picnic place. A more moderate attitude in speaking is also found in a ritual or ceremonial occasion than in a street or supermarket. There

are some factors that influence code-mixing we usually short it becomes **SPEAKING**, namely:

1. **Setting and Scenes**

Setting refers to the time and place of a speech act and in general to the physical circumstances. Scene, which is distinct from setting, designates the psychological setting, or the cultural definition of an occasion as a certain type of scene. Within a paly on the same stage with the same stage set the dramatic time may shift ten years later. In daily life the same persons in the same setting may redefine their interaction as the changed type of scene, say from formal to informal, serious to festive, or the like. Setting and scene may be linked as components of act situation. Since scene implies always an analysis of cultural definition, setting probably is to be preferred as the informal, unmarked term for the two.

2. **Participants**

The participants are the people involved in the communication foun in the setting. Participants can be used to refer to at least two parties to speak. The first party is the first or the speakers, and the second is the partner speech. In time and certain situations can also happen that the number of participants is more than two, namely the presence of a third party. election code associated with speech component will involve two dimensions of human social, solidarity, concerning the relationship with the partner speakers' speech that had been built previously and power, the issues related to the age, rank and social status of the participants' speech.

3. Ends

The ends are the goalss or the purposes that a speaker wishes to reach. If a political party delivers a speech in a campaign, he/she wishes to persuade the crowd before him/her in order to receive support for the election. However if the moher speaks to her son before he leaves for school, she might want her son to behave himself in the school. Thus, for different ends, speakers a language often choose different code.

4. Act of Sequence

The act sequence refers to the order of a speech, a narrative, a conversation, or a talking. A formal speech for example, is set carefully with an opening expression, followed with an introduction, a story, before entering the main topic. The sequence in speaking is the considered to be also an important factor to consider.

5. Key

Key is introduced to provide for the tone, manner, or spirit in which an act is done. It correspond is roughly to modality among grammatical categories. Acts otherwise the same as regards setting, participants, message form, and the like may differ in key.

Key is often conventionally ascribe to an instance of some other component as its attribute, seriousness, for example, may be the expected concomitant of a scene, participant, act, code, or genre. Yet there is always the possibility that there is a conventionally understood way of substituting an

alternative key. In this respect, ritual remains always informative. Knowing what should happen next, one still can attend to the way in which it happens.

The significance of key is underline by the fact that, when it is in conflict with the overt content of an act, it often overrides the latter. The signaling of key may be nonverbal, as with a wink, gesture, posture, style of dress, musical accompaniment but it also commonly involves conventional units of speech too often disregarded in ordinary linguistic analysis, such as English aspiration and vowel length to signal emphasis. Such features are often termed expressive, but are better dubbed stylistic since they need not at all depend on the mood of their user.

6. Instrumentalities

The instrumentalities are referred to the register and forms of the speech. The forms that might be under consideration are whether it will be delivered in a more formal way or a casual friendly one.

7. Norms of Interaction and Interpretation

All rules governing speaking, of course, have a normative character. What is intended here are the specific behavior and proprieties that attach, that one must not interrupt, for example, or that one may freely do so, the normal voice should not be used, except when scheduled in a church service, that turns in speaking are to be allocated in a certain way. Norms of interaction obviously implicate analysis of social structure and social relationships generally in a community.

An account of norms of interaction may still open leave open the interpretation to be placed upon them, especially when members of different communities are in communication. The problem of norms of interpretation is familiar from the assessment of communications from other governments and national leaders. One often looks for friendliness in lessened degree of overt hostility. Relations between groups within a country are often affected by misunderstanding on this score.

8. Genres

By genres are meant categories such as poem, myth, tale, proverb, riddle, curse, prayer, oration, lecture, commercial, form letter, editorial, etc. From one standpoint the analysis of speech into instances of genres.

The common notion of casual, or unmarked speech, however, points up the fact that there is a great range in the ease with such markers have been identified. It remains that unmarked casual speech can be recognize as such in a context where it is not expected or where it is being exploited for particular effect. It's lesser visibility may be a function of our own orientations and use of it. It's profile may be as sharp as any other, once we succeed. in seeing it as strange.

Genres often coincide with speech events, but must be treated as analytically independent of them. They may be occur in different events. The sermon as genre is typically identical with a certain place in church service, but it's properties may be invoked, for serious or humorous effect, in other situations. To make the set of component mnemonically convenient, at least in English, the letters of the terms SPEAKING can be used. The component can be grouped

together in relation to the eight letter without great difficulty. Clearly, the use of speaking as a mnemonic code word has nothing to do with the form of an eventual model and theory.

2.4 Interference

As loanword, loan blend, and loan shift, interference is also a form of language contact. The term is originally used to refer to the deviation from the norm of using a language that occurs in the speech of bilinguals as an effect of their familiarity with another language. The deviation includes cases of using a single word, phrase, clause that belong to a language in another language, as well as the sound of language which is influenced by the sound found in another language, or the spelling system usually used in a language which is then used in another language. With such a scope, the concept of interference must be overlapping with code-switching, code-mixing, and word-borrowing.

Chaer And Agustina (1995:163) says, "Penggunaan serpihan kata, frasa, dan klausa dari bahasa lain yang terdapat didalam kalimat dapat juga dianggap sebagai interferensi pada tngkat kalimat". It means that, the use of fragment of words, phrases, and clauses from other languages contained in the sentence can also be considered as interference at the sentence level).

Example:

- Sebenarnya, saya tidak begitu mengerti tentang *gadget*, tapi saya suka foto, foto *selfie* dan Instagram.

- Di awal karier, ternyata Ellie tidak pernah menyangka kalau album pertamanya Lights, yang dirilis empat tahun yang lalu akan secepat itu *booming*.

- Ketika ditanya oleh temannya, dia hanya menjawab kalau dia sedang *apik-apik wae.*

- etc.

From the example above, (Chaer and Agustin, 1995:164) give the conclusion about the difference between code-mixing and interference. They says, "*Campur kode mengacu pada tingkat digunakannya serpihan-serpihan bahasa lain dalam menggunakan suatu bahasa tertentu, sedangkan interferensi mengacu pada adanya penyimpangan dalam menggunakan suatu bahasa dengan memasukkan suatu sistem bahasa lain, yang bagi golongan puris dianggap sebagai suatu kesalahan*".

It means that code-mixing refers to the levels of use of other languages flakes in using a particular language, whereas interference refers to the existence of irregularities in the use of language by incorporating another language system, which for the purist faction regarded as an error).

Interference occurs as an automatic transfer because of the learner's habit or because the two languages that are learned are not well separated. As English is learned by speakers of various languages across the world, interferences of other languages in English are pretty common. What has been described before as forms of the non-native English varieties or the sub-standard ones may all be included as interferences.

In addition to this, sociolinguists usually suggest applying a functional-syllabus that emphasizes developing communication needs. The success in mastering a target language, however, is not only a matter of adopting correct methods or approaches. Lots of people believed that an achievement may also be gained by considering how the students, the teachers, as well as the people around the learners. Perceive and judge the language, the culture, and the speakers of the language being learned.

Thus the notion of interference include the use of elements belonging to a language when speaking in another language and application of two language systems simultaneously on a language element, and consequently a deviation from the norm every language that occurs in bilingual speech.