**CHAPTER II**

**REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE**

This chapter tries to explain about the continuous between the research with the theory. The contain of this chapter is trying to explain about language and society, bilingualism and multilingualism, code switching, speech community and diglossia.

1. **Language and Society**

Dealing with the social aspects language we need also to consider tie basic thought and study result of both sociology and linguistics. Some linguist come to sociolinguistics from the field sociology and named their study asSociology of Language.

Sociolinguistics are usually conducted with one or more of the following goals in mind; a description of the existing language situation and its social correlates, measurement of the direction and magnitude of sociolinguistics change within the territory under study, estimation of linguistic consequences of government policies such as those pertaining to education or the mass media and or broad societal changes such as urbanization, industrialization, and internal migration, etc (Liberson, 1982: 263). Pride and Helmes define sociolinguistics as the study of language as part of culture and society. Hudson (1975) on the other hand, states that Sociolinguistics is the study of language in relation to society (Susanto, 2007: 1).

The relationship between language and society or of the various functions of language in society, should begin with some attempt to define each of these terms. A society is any group of people who are drawn together for a certain purpose or purposes. By such as definition, society becomes a variety comprehensive concept, but we will soon see how useful such a comprehensive view is because of the very different kinds of societies we must consider in the course of the discussion that follow. We may attempt an equally comprehensive definition of language: a language is what the members of a particular society speak. However, as we will see, speech in almost any society can take many very different forms, and just what forms we should choose to discuss when we attempt to describe the language of a society may prove to be a contentious matter. Sometimes too a society may be plurilingual that is many speakers may use more than one language, however we define language. We should also note that our definition of language and society are not independent: the definition of language includes in it a reference of society (Wardhaugh, 1998: 1).

There are several possible relationship between language and society. One is that social structure may influence or determine linguistic structure and behavior. Certain evidence may be educed to support this view: the age grading phenomenon whereby young children speak differently from older children and, in turn, children speak differently from mature adults; studies which show that the varieties of language that speakers use reflect such matters as their regional, social, or ethnic origin and possibly even their sex or gender and other studies which show that particular ways of speaking, choices of words and even roles for conversing are in fact highly determined by certain social requirements.

A second relationship is directly opposed to the first: language structure and behavior may either influence or determine social structure. This is the view that is behind the Whorfian hypothesis, the climes of Bernstein, and many of those who argues that language rather then speakers of these languages can be exists.

A third possible relationship is that the influence is be-directional: language and society may influence each other. One variant of this approach is that this influence is dialectical in nature, a Marxist view put forward by Ditmar who argues that speech behavior and social behavior are in state constant interaction and that material living conditions are important factor in the relationship.

A fourth possibility is to assume that there is no relationship at all between linguistic structure and social structure and that each is independent of the other. A variant of this possibility would be to say that, although there might be some such relationship, present attempts to characterize it are essentially premature, given what we know about both language and society (Wardhaugh, 1998: 11).

Many common kinds of human interaction involving language, in fact, require an individual to switch readily and repeatedly from one of these roles to the other (Lockwood, 1972: 1). Having in set social interaction, it it necessary for the people to recognize the role relationship between them. Fisman purposes, any of two interlocutors within a given speech community or more narrowly, within a given speech network within a speech community must recognize the relationship that exists between them any particular time.

Implicitly when member of speech community are linked in social interaction, they are subconsciously tied up with norms obligation and value system sharpen in the community where they are interaction. As the consequence of the social equipment, it is created role relationship between the people who participate in the social interaction. Linguistically, this aspect, role relationship, facilitates people to establish their behavior toward the use of language. By knowing the relationship between them, the speaker can consider how he should behave toward their companions between the speaker will implications to the different behavior of the speakers toward their companions. Linguistically, this behavior is shown by their use of languages of variants of language. For example, it is found that in transactional interaction, the member of speech community in, for example, a market create role relationship as sellers and buyers, then, it gives implication that members who play a role as sellers have to propose different behavior when they are set up in transactional with buyers from when they face other members of their own group. It is explained, then that recognition of the role relationship is part of the communality of norms and behavior upon which existence of speech community depends (Susanto,2007: 6). Language need be seen as connecting to objects and elements, therefore, only on its periphery (Lockwood: 5).

The statement above, in its daily use, language is a tool employed by human being to achieve communication. People advantage language as vitally means of their communication. As social living culture, human needs to use language to communicate their ideas, feelings, and interest to say what it is in mind and heart, to others. Furthermore, it just by using language human can learn, study, analyze, so he could advance their skill, competence, also performance that living in worthiness. Briefly, language and human life are endless inseparable.

All those information empirezed that the link between language and society as it users presented, the unquestionable or obvious characteristic of sociolinguistics, hence, many sociolinguistics associated that the link between those two are undoubted. Wardhaugh stated that the link between language and society is inseparable, where the existence of one would be the requirement of other’s existence. Therefore study on language phenomena should not ignore its social aspects.

Hudson purposed dealing with the importance to consider with the aspects of social context in language study. First, a form of language is meaningful, because its society defined its meaning and used it. It means mankind who has created language. Second, the aspect of speech or using utterance, which is employed by the speaker, has such social function, it is either as interaction device or as an instrument used to identify particular social group. Both language and its society are undoubtedly included in sociolinguistics (Rahmadani, 2006: 16).

The above description give some aspects which are necessary to discuss in correlation between language and society. One, that in social interaction language is merely not useful as a means of a communication, moreover it is also means of establishing relationship among the speakers and showing the identification of speakers, giving information about speakers, either the social background of the speakers or parts of places the speakers come from. Next, Trudgill adds that in social interaction, the first speakers, probably and subconsciously, tends to recognize certain thing that the second, for example what job he does what social status he has in order to be sure exactly how he should behave toward him. This recognition can be done via the use of languages, variants of languages, style of language utilized by the second, inside making intelligent guesses about his companion from the short of clothes he is wearing and other visual clues.

The next aspect that in interaction, it is necessary for the people to recognize the role relationship between them. It gives the consequence that the use of language must naturally be linked to the norms, the use of language must be closely be tied up with social structure, value system applied in the society (Susanto, 2007: 5).

From the statements above, language and society have a closely relationship. It gives a reason why people choose a certain language in his or her communication in a society. Exactly, the Bawean community in Tulungagung where the members of their community switch into Javanese to Javanese interlocutors.

1. **Bilingualism and Multilingualism**

A bilingual is one who can use two languages alternately ( Bloomfield in Wardhaugh, 1998: 88). A bilingual speaker uses two languages that differ in speech sounds, vocabulary, and syntax, and a multilingual speaker, or polyglot use more than two. The term bilingual will be used for multilingual as well, except when the two have to be specially distinguished (Taylor, 1990: 327). Bilingualism may also involved dialect and a standard language or a high language for formal communication and a low language for inimate communication.

Bilingualism and multilingualism is the rule rather than the exception in our ”global village”. When two or more language are used in nation, sometimes they are used in harmony but sometimes in tension. Problem associated with bilingualism are many and varied: economic, social, and political (Taylor, 1990: 329).

We will look specifically at the phenomenon of code switching in bilingual and multilingual situations (Wardhaugh,1998: 86). However, in many part of the word an ability to speak more than one language is not at all remarkable. In fact, a monolingual would be regarded as a misfit, lacking an important skill in society, the skill of being able to interact freely with the speakers of the languages with whom regular contract is made in ordinary business of living. In many parts of the world it is just a normal requirement of daily living that people speak several languages: perhaps one or more at home, another in the village, still another for purpose of trade, and yet another for contact with the outside world of wider social or political organization. These various language are usually acquired naturally and unselfconsciously, and she shifts from one to another are made without hesitation.

People who are bilingual and multilingual do not necessarily have exactly the same abilities in the languages or varieties; in fact. That kind of parity may be exceptional as Sridhar says, multilingualism involving balanced, native like command of all the languages in the repertoire is rather uncommon. Typically multilingual have varying degrees of command of the different repertoires. The differences in competence in the various language might range from command of few lexical items, formula expression such as greetings, and rudimentary conversational skills all the way to excellent command of the grammar and vocabulary and specialist register and styles. Shidhar adds: multilingual develop competence in each of the codes to the extent that they need it and for the contexts in which of the languages is used. Context determines language choice. In a society in which more than one language or variety is used must find out who uses what, when, and for what purpose if you are to be social competent (Wardhaugh, 1995: 95).

An interesting example of multilingualism exists among the Bawean community in Tulungagung. However, everyone in the community is interested in language learning so most people can speak most of languages. Multilingualism is taken for granted, and moving from one language to another in the course of a single conversation is very common Wardhaugh, 1995: 96. In fact, multilingual is so usual that Bawean community are hardly conscious that they do speak different languages as they shift easily from one to another. The multilingual speaker can not readily tell an outsider how many language they speak and to describe how well they speak each one.

Bilingualism is actually sometimes regarded as a problem in that many bilingual individuals tend to occupy rather low position in society and knowledge of another language becomes associated with inferiority. Bilingualism is sometimes seen as a personal and social problem, not something that has strong positive connotations (Wardhaugh,1998: 98).

In this case, bilingualism and multilingualism are available in a using of code switching to the language he or she wants to speak. For example, such as Bawean community in Tulungagung may employ their bilingualism and multilingualism in a switching certain code to their interlocutors.

1. **Code Switching**

In linguistics, code-switching is the concurrent use of more than one language, or language variety, in conversation. Multilingual are people who speak more than one language sometimes use elements of multiple languages in conversing with each other. Thus, code-switching is the use of more than one linguistic variety in a manner consistent with the syntax and phonology of each variety. Code-switching refers to changes over phrases or sentences (intersentential). It involves the alternate use of two languages or linguistic varieties when the same utterance or during the some conversation (Susanto, 2007: 20).

There are three main factors: environment, words and psychological factor would cause code-switching happen. When two distinct cultures meet, sometimes they would compromise each other and blend the other side’s elements into their own, for example a Bawean event hold in Java, such as Marriage celebration, would have hosts who speak both Baweanese and Javanese. In this particular situation, it is very understandable to switch between two languages. Another factor is the words they are using. People like to use word to describe certain thing in a particular language when they cannot replace this word in a different language, or hard to explain in another language. For example, people use French cuisine’s name in a conversation simply because they could not find a better word in English to substitute. Code switching can also be found between dialect and language. People’s psychological factor determines how much they like to switch between dialect and common language. For instant, if there is someone who is from outside the region and could not understand this region’s dialect, others would have high possibility to speak common language with him if they want to show the closeness and intimacy. However, if they want to show the different between them and this outsider, they prefer to add some dialect or replace some words with dialect in order to isolate this person. In now days, many bilingual speakers are very weak at their second language compare to their native language. They can only barely communicate with foreigners with their second language. Therefore, bilingual speaks have their own weakness that has to be seriously considered.

Most speakers command several varieties of any language they speak, and bilingualism, even multilingualism, it is the norm for many people throughout the world rather than unlingualism. People usually required to select a particular code whenever they choose to speak, and they may also decide to switch from one code to another or to mix codes even within sometimes very short utterance and thereby create a new code. Furthermore, code switching is a conversational strategy used to establish, cross or destroy group boundaries to create, evoke or change interpersonal relations with their rights and obligation (Gal in Wardhaugh, 1998: 100).

Local language like Javanese tend to be used only with imitates when fine shades of respect or distance were necessary, particularly when in the presence of important older people. Tanner’s finding conform to an earlier prediction made by Gretz, Indonesian appeals to those whose sense of political nationality as Indonesian rather that as Javanese is most developed, to those who are interested in the cultural products of the Indonesian’s mass media and those who wish to take relationship position in government and business. Javanese will continue to be used ‘in certain special contexts and for certain special purpose’ (Wardhaugh, 1998: 101).

Equating in this instance code with language, we can describe two kinds of code switching: situational and metaphorical. Situational code-switching occurs when the languages used according to the situations in which the conversant find them selves: they speak one language in one situation and another in a different one. No topic change is involved. When a change of topic requires a change in the language used we have Metaphorical code-switching*.*

Situational code-switching occurs when the language change accompanies a change of topics or participant, or anytime the communicative situation is redefined. For example: with in a single conversation, a teachers who are from Java usually speak Indonesian to one another when discussing matters related to school, but may switch to Javanese to discuss their families or another community activities (Susanto, 2007: 20).

Instances of situational code-switching are usually fairly easy to classify for what they are. What we observe is that one variety is used in certain set of situation and another in an entirely different set. However, the changeover from one to the other may be instantaneous. Sometimes the situation are so socially prescribed that they can even be taught, e.g., those associated with ceremonial or religious function. Others may be more subtly determined but speakers readily observe the norms. This kind of code-switching differ from diglossia. In diglossic communities the situation controls the choice of variety but the choice is much more rigidly defined by particular activity that is involved and by the relationship between the participants. Diglossia reinforces differences, whereas code-switching tend to reduce them. In diglossia too people are quite aware that they have switched from H to L or L to H. Code-switching, on the other hand, is often quite subconscious: people may not be aware that they have switched or be able to report, following a conversation, which code they used for a particular topic.

Metaphorical code-switching occurs with in a single situation, but adds meaning to such components as the role relationship which are being expressed. As the term itself suggests, metaphorical code-switching has an effective dimension to it: we change the code as define the situation formal to informal, official to personal, serious to humorous, and politeness to solidarity (Wardhaugh, 1998: 103).

Grumpez’s analysis of code-switching in the community reveal that the situation is quite complex because of the member of possibilities are available, with the ‘right’ choice highly dependent of the social context and intent of speaker.

Code-switching is not a uniform phenomenon; e.g., the norms vary from group to group, even within what might be regarded as a single community. Grumpez adds that each communicating subgroup tends to establish its own convention with respect to both borrowing and code-switching, and that factors such as region of origin, local residence, social class, and occupational niche are involved in defining the norms. Moreover, bilinguals in such communities are aware not only of the norms that apply within their own sub-groups but also of some of the norms that other bilinguals observe (Wardhaugh, 1998: 106).

A speaker may for a variety of reason, e.g. to define interaction as appropriate to different social arena, or to avoid, through continual code-switching, defining the interaction in terms of any social arena. The later function of avoidance is an important one because it recognizes that code-switching often serves as a strategy of neutrality or as a means to explore which code is most appropriate and acceptable in a particular situation. Code-switching as a function of changes in setting, topic, etc (Romaine, 200: 60).

From the definition above, it is available that code switching is a language alternation for people who are able apply more than one language.

1. **Speech Communities**

Language is both an individual possession and social possession. We would except, therefore, that certain individuals would behave linguistically like other individuals: they might be said to speak the same language or the same dialect or the same variety, e.g., to employ the same code, and in that respect to be members of the same speech community (Wardhaugh, 1998: 116).

However, such a speech community cannot be our concern, it is a theoretical construct employed for a narrow purpose. Our speech communities, whatever they are, exist in real world. Consequently, we must try to find some alternative view of speech community, one helpful to investigation of language in society rather than necessitated by more abstract linguistic theorizing. A real speech community: all the people who use a given language or dialect. However, that really shifts the issue to making the definition of language or of a dialect also the definition of a speech community (Lyon in Wardhaugh, 1998: 117). The speech community is not defined by any marked agreement in the use of language element, so much as by participation in a set of shared norms; these norms may be observed in overt types of evaluate behavior, and by the uniformity of abstract pattern of variation which are in variant in respect in particular levels of usage. In this sense, speech community is very abstract concept, one likely to create not e few problems, because the particular norms that a community uses or may or may not be exclusively linguistic in nature, and even the linguistic norms themselves may vary considerable among small sub-group.

The single-language, or single-variety, criterion is also a vary dubious one. Grumperz points out that there are no a priori grounds which force us to define speech communities so that all members speak the same language. Many societies have existed and still exist which bilingualism and multilingualism are normal (Wardhaugh, 1998: 118).

In this definition, communities are defined partially through their relationship with other communities. Internally, a community must have a certain social cohesiveness, externally its member must find themselves cut off from other communities in certain way. The factor that bring about cohesion and differentiation will vary considerably from occasion to occasion. Individual will therefore shift their sense of community as different factors come into play. Bloomfield defined that speech community is a group of people who interact by means of speech.

Grumperz offers another definition of speech community: any human aggregate characterized by regular and frequent interaction by means of a shared body of verbal signs and set off from similar aggregates by significant differences in language usage. Most group of any permanence, be they small bands bounded by face to face contact, modern nation divisible into smaller sub regions, or even occupational association or neighborhood gangs, may be treated as speech communities (Wardhaugh, 1998: 119). Hymes in Wardhaugh (1988: 121) defined that speech community is a local unit, characterized for its members by common locality and primary interaction.

Meanwhile according to Rommaine (2000: 23) a speech community is any group of people who do not necessarily share the same language, but share a set of norms and rules for the use of language. The boundaries between speech communities are essentially social rather than linguistic.

1. **Diglossia**

A diglossic situation exist in a society when it has two distinct codes which show clear functional separation that is one employed in one sett of circumstances and the other in an entirely different set. Frugson defines that diglossia is a relative stable language situation in which, in addition to the primary dialects of the language which may include a standard or regional standards, there is a very different, highly codified often grammatically more complex, superpose variety, the vehicle of a large and respected body of written literature, either of an earlier period or in another speech community which is learned largely by formal education and is used for most written and formal spoken purposes but is not used by any sector of the community for ordinary conversation (Wardhaugh, 1998: 87).

Diglossia is situation in which two or more language or varieties of the same language in a speech community are allocated to different social function and contexts. The term diglossia was firstly coined by Charles who use in initially to refer only the use of two or more varieties of the some language by speakers under different condition (Susanto, 2007: 19).

A key defining characteristic of diglossia is the two varieties are kept quite a part in the function. One is used in one set of circumstances and the other in an entirely diffarent set. For example, the H varieties may be used for delivering sermons and formal lectures, especially in a parliament or legislative body, for giving political speech, for broadcasting the news on the radio and televisio and for writing poetry, fine literature and editorials in newspaper. In contras, the L varieties may be used in giving instructions to workers in low prestige occupation or to household servants, in conversation with familiars in soap operas and popular programs on the radio in captions on political cartoons in newspapers and in folk literature. On occasion, a person may lecture in an H variety but answer question about its contents or explain part of it in an L variety so as to ensure understanding (Wardhaugh, 1998: 88).

Often in each language or variety in multilingual community serve a specialized function and is used for particular purposes. This situation is known as ‘diglossia’ (Rommaine, 2000: 46).