

2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

In this chapter, the writer explains the theories and earlier studies related to her topic. The writer uses the main theories from Nababan (1991), Holmes (2001), Brown and Attardo (2001), and Chaer (2006). In addition, the writer presents some previous studies. These theories would be useful in analyzing and answering the writer's research questions.

2.1. Review of Related Theories

This section would present the theories that would be used to help the writer to analyze the data. The main theories used are the speech styles by Nababan (1991), social status by Holmes (2001) and Brown and Attardo (2001), and the lexical and grammatical characteristics for standard Indonesian by Chaer (2006).

2.1.1. Speech Style

Many scholars have defined the term "speech style". Bell (2001, pp. 141-148 as cited in Coupland, 2007, p. 60) defines speech style as "what an individual speaker does with a language in relation to other people". He also says that "speech style focuses on the person. It is essentially a social thing. It marks inter-personal and inter-group relations".

Marjohan (1988, p. 34) states speech style refers to a variation in speech or writing from more formal to more casual. Some markers for the formal style would be the use of *may* instead of *might* and *can* and also constructions, such as "For whom did you get it?" instead of "Who did you get that for?" in more casual speech.

Meanwhile, Holmes (2001, p. 223) considers speech style as the form of language variation that is related more with the situations than with the speakers themselves. This can be seen that when people want to talk about speech style, it means that people talk about the same speakers who talk in different ways on

different situations rather than the different speakers who talk in different ways from each other.

Speech style is often analyzed according to the degree of formality which is influenced by the situational factors and the social factors (p. 246). Participant, setting or social context, task or topic, and function are kinds of situational factors. Social factors include the social distance between participants, their status, the functional scale, and the formality of the context.

According to the degree of formality, Nababan (1991, pp. 22-23) proposes five types of speech styles. They are (1) *gaya* or *ragam beku* (frozen style), (2) *gaya* or *ragam resmi* (formal style), (3) *gaya* or *ragam usaha* (consultative style), (4) *gaya* or *ragam santai* (casual style), and (5) *gaya* or *ragam akrab* (intimate style). Each of these five speech styles is explained below.

2.1.1.1. *Gaya* or *Ragam Beku* (Frozen Style)

This style is the most formal style, which is used in very formal situations and ceremonies. This style is characterized by the use of long sentences, correct grammar pattern, and standard or formal vocabularies. In written forms, this style can be found in ratification, historical documents, constitution, and other necessary state documents. It is called “frozen” because the pattern has been set up firmly and can never be changed (p. 22).

In Indonesian language, a sentence which is started with the relative words, such as *bahwa* (that), *hatta* (then), *maka* (so), and *karena* (because) are considered as *ragam beku* (frozen style). The examples are:

- The first paragraph in the preamble of 1945 constitution: “*Bahwa sesungguhnya kemerdekaan itu ialah hak segala bangsa, dan oleh sebab itu maka penjajahan di atas dunia harus dihapuskan karena tidak sesuai dengan prike-manusiaan dan prikeadilan*” (“That actually independence is the right of every nation and because of that the colonization on earth has to be abolished, because it does not conform to humanity and justice”) (p. 23).
- The result of the Indonesian language congress II in 1954: “*Bahwa asal bahasa Indonesia ialah bahasa Melayu. Dasar bahasa Indonesia ialah bahasa Melayu yang disesuaikan dengan pertumbuhannya dalam masyarakat Indonesia...*”

(“That the origin of the Indonesian language is Malay language. The center of the Indonesian language is Malay language which is adjusted with its development in the Indonesian society...”) (Ohoiwutun, 2007, p. 58).

2.1.1.2. *Gaya* or *Ragam Resmi* (Formal Style)

Ragam resmi (formal style) is the same as *bahasa baku* or standard language, which is always used in formal situation, such as in the ceremony of engagement, when students talk with their teacher, sermons, speeches, et cetera (Nababan, 1991, p. 22). It is designed sometimes to show deference.

The standard language is the language that has certain norms that are not influenced by vernacular, regional, and foreign language (Tampubolon, 1978, p. 23). The sentence structures used in this style are more complete, complex, and varied than *ragam usaha* (consultative style) (Chaer and Agustina, 2004, p. 70-71). The standard language has some affixes namely prefixes and suffixes (Alwi, et al. 2003, p. 107).

The examples of *ragam resmi* (formal style) are:

- “*Bapak Suparman menerangkan makna dari peristiwa itu*” (“Mr. Suparman explains the meaning of that event”) (Nababan, 1991, p. 23).
- “*Inspektur upacara meninggalkan lapangan upacara*” (“The ceremony inspector leaves the ceremony field”) (Kushartanti, Yuwono, and Lauder, 2007, p. 51).

2.1.1.3. *Gaya* or *Ragam Usaha* (Consultative Style)

Ragam usaha (consultative style) is a style usually used in semi-formal or ordinary conversations in schools or companies, in a meeting or conversation that leads to result and production. In other words, this style is the most operational one (Nababan, 1991, p. 22).

The patterns of clause connection are generally simple. The sentence has subject and/or predicate. The word *and* and the preposition *on* are used very heavily. Connectors of greater range, such as *nevertheless*, *moreover*, *alternatively* are practically unused by many people, including those who would write these

frequently and who would employ them regularly in more formal speech (Gleason, 1973, p. 354).

In addition, *ragam usaha* (consultative style) makes use of certain characteristic items of vocabulary that are used in the transaction or information changer. For instance, when the teacher explained or discussed with the students; or when the buyer bargained with the seller (Kushartanti, Yuwono, and Lauder, 2007, p. 50). Standard and/or non-standard vocabularies or words also belong to this style (p. 50).

The examples for this *ragam usaha* (consultative style) are:

- “*Pak Parman terangkan arti kejadian itu*” (“Mr. Parman explains the meaning of that event”) (Nababan, 1991, p. 23).
- “*Saudara boleh mengambil barang ini yang Saudara sukai*” (“You may take this thing that you want”) (Chaer and Agustina, 2004, p. 71).

2.1.1.4. *Gaya* or *Ragam Santai* (Casual Style)

Ragam santai (casual style) is used in the informal situation. It is commonly used among friends, strangers, and others who have equal social statuses for chatting, gossiping, recreation, exercising, et cetera. The topics of the discussion are casual, such as about weather, place, hobby, sport, et cetera (Ohoiwutun, 2007, p. 56).

The form of the sentences in this style is usually short and uses the non-standard form (Kushartanti, Yuwono, and Lauder, 2007, p. 50). Ellipsis or the omission of subject and/or predicate and the unstressed words particularly at the beginning sentence which involves the article, pronouns, auxiliaries, and copula also occurs (Peng, 1987, p. 272).

The vocabulary used is mostly influenced by the dialect or slang words (Nababan, 1991, p. 22). In Indonesian language, there are some examples of the non-standard words that belong to this style, such as *gue* (I), *loe* (you), and *bête* (very bored) (Kushartanti, Yuwono, and Lauder, 2007, p. 50). Kridalaksana (2007, p. 5) also mentions some examples of the non-standard words, namely *kenapa* (why), *situ* (there), *deh* (please - for emphasizing the end of the sentence), *bilang* (say), *dong* (please - for emphasizing the end of the utterance; a soften

command), *nggak* (no), *kasih* (give), *mikirin* (think), *timbang* (than), *gini* (this), *ini hari* (this day), *kok* (why - for indicating wonder or surprise), *cuma* (just; only), *sama* (with), *emang* (sure), *sich* (guess - for indicating annoyance and doubt), *pada* (to), and *kalo* (if) that belong to this style.

Some examples of *ragam santai* (casual style) are:

- “*Aku tak ngerti maksudmu*” (“I do not understand what you mean”) (Nababan, 1991, p. 23).
- “*Ambillah yang kamu sukai*” (“Take what you want”) (Chaer and Agustina, 2004, p. 71).

2.1.1.5. *Gaya* or *Ragam Akrab* (Intimate Style)

This style is a completely private language developed within families or among very close friends. Since it is not used in public, it is of little concern to the schools (Nababan, 1991, p. 23). By using this style, people do not need to use the varied, complex, and complete sentences. They, for example, do not need subject and predicate. They just simply use short words and incomplete or very short utterances because both the addressor and the addressee have had background information about the topic discussed. Many jargons and slangs or dialect words which are usually restricted to and understood only by certain people belong to this *ragam akrab* (intimate style) (Chaer and Agustina, 2004, p. 71).

Below are the examples of *ragam akrab* (intimate style):

- “*Nggak ngerti*” (“Do not understand”) (Nababan, 1991, p. 23).
- “*Kalo mau ambil aja*” (“If you want, just take it”) (Chaer and Agustina, 2004, p. 71).

The information presented in section 2.1.1, particularly the types of speech style proposed by Nababan (1991) would be used to analyze the utterances produced by Gusti, the subject of this research when he talked to his interlocutors, namely Taka, Hendra, and Sayuti in the sitcom *Office Boy*. Next, in section 2.1.2., the writer would discuss the theory of the social status scale proposed by Holmes (2001) and Brown and Attardo (2001). This theory is important to be reviewed

since the social status scale could affect someone's choice of speech style (Holmes, 1992, p. 224).

2.1.2. Social Status Scale

According to Brown and Attardo (2001, p. 366) social status is “a system of social stratification defined in terms of occupation, income, position, and education”. The social status can influence the way people talk. People from different social status class do not speak in the same way. For example, bank managers do not talk as same as office cleaners, lawyers do not talk in the same way as the criminals they defend in court.

People often call the person of the higher status by TLN (Title, Last Name) and FN (First Name) to the person of lower class status. For instance, in an office, someone addresses the person with the higher occupational status (a boss) by TLN (Title, Last Name) and addresses the person with the lower occupational status (employees) by FN (First Name) (pp. 76-77).

People also use considerably more standard forms to those they do not know well or their superiors and more casual form to their friends or subordinates. For instance, the use of *Sir* by a student to his school principal signals that the school principal has higher status than the student's (Holmes, 1992, p. 224). Other examples are:

- (a). Excuse me, could I have a look at your photos too, Mrs. Hall?
- (b). C'mon Tony, gizzalook, gizzalook (p. 246).

The first utterance was addressed by a teenage boy to his friend's mother when she was showing the photos of their skiing the holiday to an adult friend. The second utterance was addressed to his friends when he brought round his own photos of the holiday.

The information presented in section 2.1.2., which is related to the social status scale would be used by the present writer to analyze that the social status scale could affect Gusti's choice of speech style when he talked to his interlocutors, namely Taka, Hendra, and Sayuti in the sitcom *Office Boy*. Next, since the data is in Indonesian language, in section 2.1.3., the writer will discuss

the lexical and grammatical characteristics of standard Indonesian proposed by Chaer (2006) which later would be used to identify which speech styles are formal and informal.

2.1.3. Lexical and Grammatical Characteristics of Standard Indonesian

According to Chaer (2006, pp. 5-8) the characteristics of standard Indonesian are commonly used to help determine which speech styles can be considered as formal and informal style. The standard form is considered as formal style consisting of frozen and formal style that is used in the formal situation. The non-standard form is considered as informal style consisting of consultative, casual, and intimate style that is used in the informal situation.

The distinction between standard and non-standard Indonesian can be seen through three features namely the use of the normative form of language explicitly and consistently, the use of standard words, and the use of sentences effectively. Each feature is described below.

2.1.3.1. The use of the normative form of language explicitly and consistently

This can be accomplished by:

- A. The uses of conjunction, such as, *karena* (because) to connect the dependent clause with the main thought in order to show cause; and *bahwa* (that) to connect a subordinate clause to a preceding verb in order to explain something consistently and explicitly (p. 5, 141, 152). Some examples are:

Standard Indonesian	Non-Standard Indonesian
<i>Ibu guru marah kepada Sudin <u>karena</u> ia sering bolos</i> (The teacher is angry at Sudin because he is often absent) (p. 5).	<i>Ibu guru marah kepada Sudin, ia sering bolos</i> (The teacher is angry at Sudin, he is often absent) (p. 5).

<i>Dia tidak masuk sekolah <u>karena</u> hari hujan</i> (He does not go to school because it is raining) (2002, p. 53).	<i>Ia tidak masuk sekolah hari hujan</i> (He does not go to school it is raining) (2002, p. 53).
<i>Ia tidak tahu <u>bahwa</u> anaknya sering bolos</i> (She does not know that her child is often absent) (2006, p. 5).	<i>Ia tidak tahu anaknya sering bolos</i> (She does not know her child is often absent) (2006, p. 5).
<i>Ia tahu <u>bahwa</u> anaknya tidak lulus</i> (She knows that her child does not pass) (2002, p. 53).	<i>Ia tahu anaknya tidak lulus</i> (She knows her child does not pass) (2002, p. 53).

B. The use of the prefix *me-* and *ber-* consistently and explicitly

- The use of the prefix *me-* to form active verbs (2006, p. 5, 225).

Some examples are:

Standard Indonesian	Non-Standard Indonesian
<i>Gubernur <u>meninjau</u> daerah kebakaran</i> (The governor observes the fire region) (p. 5).	<i>Gubernur <u>tinjau</u> daerah kebakaran</i> (The governor observes the fire region) (p. 5).
<i>Israel <u>menyerang</u> kubu-kubu PLO</i> (Israel attacks the fortification of PLO) (2002, p. 53).	<i>Israel <u>serang</u> kubu-kubu PLO</i> (Israel attacks the fortification of PLO) (2002, p. 53).

- The use of the prefix *ber-* to form intransitive verbs (2006, p. 210)

Below are some examples of the use of the prefix *ber-*:

Standard Indonesian	Non-Standard Indonesian
<i>Anaknya <u>bersekolah</u> di Bandung</i> (Her child goes to school in Bandung) (p. 210).	<i>Anaknya <u>sekolah</u> di Bandung</i> (Her child goes to school in Bandung) (p. 210).

<i>Kami <u>berjalan</u> kaki ke sekolah</i> (We go to school on foot). (2002, p. 53).	<i>Kami <u>jalan</u> kaki ke sekolah</i> (We go to school on foot) (2002, p. 53).
---	---

C. The use of the pattern of verb phrase explicitly

The verb phrase pattern here is written as [aspect+agent/doer+V] (2006, p. 5). Some examples are:

Standard Indonesian	Non-Standard Indonesian
<i>Surat Anda <u>sudah</u> <u>saya</u> terima</i> (Your letter has already been received) (p. 5).	<i>Surat Anda <u>saya</u> <u>sudah</u> terima</i> (Your letter has already been received) (p. 5).
<i>Rencana itu <u>sedang</u> <u>kami</u> garap</i> (The plan is being worked on) (p. 5).	<i>Rencana itu <u>kami</u> <u>sedang</u> garap</i> (The plan is being worked on) (p. 5).

D. The use of syntactical construction

The use of syntactical construction here means a construction that has no bound forms among its immediate constituents (p. 6). Below are some examples of the use of syntactical construction:

Standard Indonesian	Non-Standard Indonesian
<i>Anak<u>nya</u></i> (His child) (p. 6).	<i><u>Dia punya</u> anak</i> (He has a child) (p. 6).
<i>Memberitahukan</i> (To inform about) (2002, p. 53).	<i>Kasih tahu</i> (To inform) (2002, p. 53).

E. The avoidance of the use of the grammatical regional dialect (2006, p. 6)

The use of the grammatical regional dialect must be avoided in order to limit the overuse of the regional dialect which is not considered as the rule of Indonesian standard language (Pateda, 1987, p. 72). Some examples are:

Standard Indonesian	Non-Standard Indonesian
<i>Mobil paman saya baru</i> (My uncle's car is new) (p. 6).	<i>Paman saya mobilnya baru</i> (My uncle, his car is new) (p. 6).
<i>Dia mengontrak rumah di Kebayoran Lama</i> (He leased a house by contract at Kebayoran Lama) (Chaer, 2006, p. 6).	<i>Dia ngontrak rumah di Kebayoran Lama</i> (He leased a house by contract at Kebayoran Lama) (Chaer, 2006, p. 6).

2.1.3.2. The use of standard words

The use of standard words here means the use of the common words or the words whose frequency of use is high and not pertaining to a certain region (p. 6). Below are some examples of the use of standard words:

Standard Indonesian	Non-Standard Indonesian
<i>Bagaimana kabarnya</i> (How are you?) (p. 6).	<i>Gimana kabarnya</i> (How are you?) (p. 6).
<i>Cantik sekali</i> (Very beautiful) (2002, p. 54).	<i>Cantik banget</i> (Very beautiful) (2002, p. 54).

2.1.3.3. The use of sentences effectively

The use of sentences effectively here means the sentences used can convey the message of the speakers to the listeners properly (p.7). This can be accomplished by:

A. The arrangement of sentences based on the standard rule of language pattern. It means that the dialect of a language is accepted by the speakers as the most proper and socially desirable form of the social context (Pei, 1966, p. 258 as cited in Pateda, 1987, p. 66).

Below are some examples:

Standard Indonesian	Non-Standard Indonesian
<i>Pulau Buton banyak menghasilkan aspal</i> (Buton island produces many asphalts) (Chaer, 2006, p. 7).	<i>Di Pulau Buton banyak menghasilkan aspal</i> (In Buton island produces many asphalts) (Chaer, 2006, p. 7).
<i>Tindakan-tindakan kekerasan itu menyebabkan penduduk dan keluarganya merasa tidak aman</i> (The violent actions cause the inhabitants and their families feel insecure) (p. 7).	<i>Tindakan-tindakan kekerasan itu menyebabkan penduduk merasa tidak aman dan keluarganya</i> (The violent actions cause the inhabitants feel insecure and their families) (p. 7).

B. The unitary of reason and logic connection in a sentence (p. 8)

Some examples are:

Standard Indonesian	Non-Standard Indonesian
<i>Dia datang ketika kami sedang makan</i> (He came when we were eating) (Chaer, 2006, p. 8).	<i>Ketika kami sedang makan dan dia datang</i> (When we were eating and he came) (Chaer, 2006, p. 8).
<i>Loket belum dibuka walaupun hari sudah siang</i> (The locket has not opened yet although the day is breaking) (p. 8).	<i>Loket belum dibuka walaupun hari tidak hujan</i> (The locket has not opened yet although it is not a rainy day) (p. 8).

C. The use of word exactly and efficiently (p.8)

The use of word exactly and efficiently means the use of the words which is appropriate to the standard Indonesian language (Sugono, 1994, p. 8). Below are some examples of the use of word exactly and efficiently:

Standard Indonesian	Non-Standard Indonesian
<i>Korban kecelakaan lalu lintas bulan ini <u>bertambah</u></i> (The number of victims of traffic accidents this month increases) (Chaer, 2006, p.8).	<i>Korban kecelakaan lalu lintas bulan ini <u>naik</u></i> (The number of victims of traffic accidents this month raises) (Chaer, 2006, p.8).
<i>Panen yang gagal <u>memaksa</u> kita mengimpor beras</i> (The unproductive harvest forces us to import the bulled rice) (p.8).	<i>Panen yang gagal <u>memungkinkan</u> kita mengimpor beras</i> (The unproductive harvest enables us to import the bulled rice) (p.8).

From the theories presented in section 2.1.1. and 2.1.2., it can be concluded that a person's speech style in speaking with his/her interlocutors is influenced by the social status scale. Meanwhile, the theory presented in section 2.1.3. presents the information about the lexical and grammatical characteristics of standard Indonesian. All of theories presented in section 2.1. are important to analyze Gusti's utterances when he talked to his interlocutors, namely Taka, Hendra, and Sayuti in the sitcom *Office Boy*. Next, in section 2.2., the present writer will present some previous studies that are used as her related studies.

2.2. Review of Related Studies

As her related studies, the writer used two studies from the previous researches in the same field as this study. The previous studies were conducted by Herlina (2003) and Oktavia (2007).

2.2.1. The Speech Styles Used in *Selamat Datang Pagi* Dialog Program on *RCTI* (Herlina, 2003)

In her research, Herlina aimed to find out the answers of three research questions: (1) the types of speech styles are used by male and female hosts in the *Selamat Datang Pagi* dialog program, (2) the speech styles occurs the most in this program, and (3) the differences of the speech styles toward male and female

hosts. In order to answer her research questions, she used the theory of speech styles proposed by Nababan (1991).

As her research instrument, Herlina recorded the program broadcasted in March 10th up to 15th, 2003 on *RCTI*. Then, she chose two dialogs which discussed people's social life. There were two hosts (Ferdinand as the male host and Beki as the female host) and three guests (Rohana and Shanti who were the actresses and Dr. Okky who was the professional). In dialog one, Herlina found thirty six utterances and in dialog two, she found thirty two utterances expressed by the hosts.

The findings of Herlina's study revealed that there were four types of speech styles, namely formal style, consultative style, casual style, and intimate style that are used by male and female hosts. Among these four types of speech styles, the casual styles had the highest occurrence or percentage.

There were four utterances of casual styles (14%) used by the male host to the female guest who had equal status with the male host's, five utterances (17%) the male guest who had the same status as the male host's, and ten utterances (34.5%) to the male guest who had higher status than the host's. In addition, there were ten utterances of casual styles (23%) used by the female host to the female guest who had equal status with the female host's, nine utterances (20%) to the male guest who had the same status as the female host's, and eight utterances (18.2%) to the male guest who had higher status than the female host's.

Moreover, Herlina found that there were six utterances of formal styles (20.7%) used by the male host to the male guest who had higher status than the male host's and one utterance of formal style (2.27%) used by the female host to the male guest who has higher status than the female host's.

In addition, there were two utterances of intimate styles (6.9%) used by the male host to the female guest who had the same status as the male host's, one utterance of intimate style (2.3%) used by the female host to the female guest who had equal status with the female host's, and three utterances of intimate styles (6.8%) used by the female host to the male guest who had the same status as the female host's.

The similarity between Herlina's thesis and the present writer's is on the use of Nababan's speech styles theories (1991). However, there are some differences between Herlina's study and the present writer's study. The first is in the present writer's study, she analyzed the speech styles used in the sitcom *Office Boy*, and however, Herlina analyzed the speech styles used in *Selamat Datang Pagi* program. The second is that the present writer analyzed the speech styles used by a male administrative staff to his three interlocutors who had three different social statuses, while Herlina analyzed the speech styles used by male and female hosts in the *Selamat Datang Pagi* program. Herlina's study was also different from the present writer's study since the present writer did not analyze the differences of the speech styles used. She only focused her attention to find out the types of speech styles and the speech styles which are mostly used.

Herlina's study gives an insight for the writer's present study. After reading Herlina's study, the present writer realized that the context of the situation and the social background of the addressees may influence the choice of someone's speech style while communicate with other people. Therefore, in this present study, the writer would like to observe more about the speech styles used by Gusti in the sitcom *Office Boy* when he talked to three different people whose social status are also different.

2.2.2. The Speech Style Used by the Host and the Guests in *Dorce Show* (Oktavia, 2007)

In her research, Oktavia aimed to find out the answers of three research questions: (1) the types of speech styles occurs the most in *Dorce Show*, (2) the kinds of speech styles are mostly used by the host in *Dorce Show*, and (3) the speech styles are more dominantly used by the two different professional groups (the artists and the professionals). In order to answer her research questions, she used the theory of speech styles proposed by Joos's (1976) and Chaer and Agustina's (2004).

As her research instrument, she recorded *Dorce Show* program which was broadcasted by *TransTv* in September, 2006 at 9.30 a.m. until 10.30 a.m. The topic of this talk show was "Gossiping in the Fasting Month." There were a host

(Dorce Gamalama) and six guests (Anya Dwinov, Mona Ratuliu, Fenny Rose, and Nova Eliza as the artists; Effendi Gazalli as the communication expert; and Zuhairi Mizrawi as the young professional).

In her study, Oktavia only found three types of speech styles among the five types of speech styles proposed by Joos's (1976) and Chaer and Agustina's (2004). The speech styles found were 292 utterances of casual style (69.86%), 103 utterances of consultative style (24.64%), and twenty three utterances of formal style (5.50%). Thus, Oktavia concluded that the casual style occurred the most in *Dorce Show* since the setting of talk show program was informal. Oktavia also assumed that this style is occurred the most because the host and the guests tried to make their audience, who come from different social background, understand more about the topic discussed.

The similarity between Oktavia's thesis and the present writer's is that both studies dealt with speech styles. However, there are some differences between these two studies. The first is in this study, the present writer analyzed the speech styles used by Gusti in the sitcom *Office Boy*; while, Oktavia analyzed the speech styles used by the host and the guests in *Dorce Show*. The second is that the present writer analyzed the speech styles used by a male administrative staff to his three interlocutors who had three different social statuses; while Oktavia analyzed the differences of idiolects (the language or speech of one individual at a particular period in life) used between two different groups of speakers (artists and professionals).

Oktavia's study gives an insight for the writer's present study. After reading Oktavia's study, the present writer learnt that the setting or the situation where the conversation takes place and the social background of the addressees may influence the choice of someone's speech style. Therefore, in this present study, the writer would like to observe more about the speech styles used by Gusti in the sitcom *Office Boy* when he talked to three different people who had different social status.