

## 2. REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

In this chapter, the writer wants to explain in details the theories that support the analysis. As the writer has stated, in this study she is going to discuss the speech styles used in “*Selamat Datang Pagi* “ dialog program by the hosts, based on Joos’ five degrees of formality (1976), Abdul Chaer’s and Leony Agustina’s theory in “*Bahasa Indonesia*”, Harimurti Kridalaksana (1984) and “*Tata Bahasa Baku Bahasa Indonesia*”(1992).

In this respect, the writer thinks that the concept of “speech styles” is central in measuring the appropriateness of conversation in the dialog.

### 2.1. Style

According to Joos (1976), speech style means the form of language that the speaker uses and it is characterized by a degree of formality. He identified the styles in five classes: frozen style, formal style, consultative style, casual style, and intimate style. Based on Joos’ theory, the following are the examples of such degree of formality about “the time of day”:

- a. I should be glad to be informed of the correct time.
- b. I should like to know the time please?
- c. Do you have the time on you please?
- d. What’s the time?
- e. Time?

Gleason (1965:357), in the treatment of keys, follows Joos’ theory, *The five clocks*, (1976). He has, however, made three terminological changes, two with Joos’ concurrence. He has substituted keys for Joos’ styles; they are oratorical for frozen, deliberative for formal. Although Gleason (1965) substituted the terminologies to differentiate speech from writing, the meanings are the same and the function in a specifiable set of social situations; the keys are oratorical key, deliberative key, consultative key, casual key, and intimate key.

Peng (1986) looks at style as a structural notion, a term that indicates the existence of variation in the linguistic code which can be classified into a scale of gradation comprising five steps, they are; elaborative, deliberative, consultative,

casual and intimate. Although these classifications are not identical with Joos' classification, the meaning is actually similar. Thereby, it is hoped that it will minimize misunderstanding. Indeed, the writer believes that Joos' category provides a convenient framework for her thesis since the work of Joos is also concerned with grammatical-syntactical level of speech analysis.

## **2.2. Types of Speech Style**

The writer divided the types of speech style first in English language based on Joos' theory (1976) and second, in Indonesian Language based on Abdul Chaers' and Leony Agustina's theory (1995).

### **2.2.1. English Language Theory:**

Based on Martin Joos' theory, the classification in English Language is as follows:

#### **2.2.1.1. Frozen Style**

Frozen style is the one that is used in very formal situation such as in Japan, the ceremony held at the imperial place, for instance on New Year's day or some other occasion. This style involves a fairly large group whose members cannot meet face to face, so they are unknown to one other. Consequently, if they meet, they only remain social strangers. Nevertheless, the reader or hearer is not permitted to cross question the speaker. Therefore, background information of conversation may be given but is not required. Based on the characteristic above, this style requires high skill and almost used exclusively by specialist, professional orators, lawyers and preachers.

#### **2.2.1.2. Formal Style**

Formal style is generally used in formal situation, where there is the least amount of shared background and the communication in this style is largely one way with little or no feedback from the audiences, for example, in a graduation ceremony which is typically used in speaking to medium or large groups.

However, it may also be used in speaking to a single hearer, for example, between strangers.

In fact, formal style is designed to inform and the background information is woven into the text in complex sentences. Indeed, the sentence structures are more complex and varied than consultative. That is why the speaker must ahead and frame whole sentences before they are delivered. Furthermore, the leading code-label of this style is “may”. For example, “May I present Mr. Smith?”(Ibid268).

#### 2.2.1.3. Consultative Style

Consultative style is a style used in semi formal communication situation. It must be confessed that consultative is the central point in the system because it is chiefly involved in speech styles. It is one type of language, which is required from every speaker. Besides, it is the usual form of speech in small groups, chance acquaintances and strangers. It is also used orally to conduct every business.

This style is defined into two features. First, the speaker supplies background information and she/he does not assume that he will be understood without it. In addition, consultative style deals with public information. Yet, if there is no public information, a consultative conversation will not happen. Second, the addressee participates continuously. Most often they talk alternately, although one may talk for a very long period. While one is speaking at intervals, the other gives short responses or standard signals such as yes; no; uhuh; mmm; that’s right; I think so; oh; yes, I know; I see; and so on. *Well* is also used to reserve the role between listener and speaker. The conjunction *and* and the preposition *on* are mostly used. For example, He cuts himself on a knife (Gleason 1965:357).

#### 2.2.1.4. Casual Style

Casual style is a style used among friends and co-workers when an informal atmosphere is appropriate and desired such as outside the classroom where students have a chat. There are two devices of casual style, first is the

ellipsis (omission). It makes most of differences between casual grammars, which require a shorter form. For example:

“I believe that I can find one” (consultative).

“I believe I can find one” (casual).

“Believe I can find one” (casual).

Casual speech is the omission of unstressed words particularly at the beginning sentence. It involves the article, pronouns, auxiliaries, and capula. For example, Car broke down? Got a match? Need help? (Peng 1987:272).

Second is slang, which is a prime indication of in-group relationship. For example, a jazz musician will feel more familiar and natural if he says “guys, I ain’t a groovy cat, y’know, but I dig all kind of jazz”, to the other musicians, rather than using a formal style as “ friend, I’m sure you all know that I’m nor very good musician, although I understand all kinds of jazz” (Widarso, 1989:64). The purpose of using ellipsis and slang is the same in a way that only the addressee as an insider will understood what outsider would not be able to comprehend.

Casual style is the style we use to integrate an audience into social group (Joos 1967). The listener is made an insider, by being treated as an insider. This style is spoken, or acted out, rarely written. For example, when someone abuses us in an affectionate manner, and calls us a greenie, we know they are using casual style. The speaker is not being rude, in fact, the listener is being payed a compliment. The speaker is assuming that the listener already knows what a greenie is, and that explanations are entirely redundant. If a friend warns us, in casual style, "Watch out for that greenie ozone hole!", it is assumed that we already know what to do with sun-block cream.

#### 2.2.1.5. Intimate Style

Intimate style is a style that is completely private language used within family and very closed friends. Normally the intimate group is a pair. In this style, the speaker extracts a minimum pattern from casual style for example, ready, enough, cold. Intimate style is that the role of public information is positively abolished.

Holmes (1992), used the term style to refer to language variation, which reflects changes in situational factors, such as addressee, setting task or topic. According to Holmes (1992), language varies according to its uses as well as its users, according to where it is used and to whom, as well as according to who is using it. The addressees and the context affect the people's choice of code or variety, whether language, dialect or style. Moreover, the influence of the addressee on the speaker's language, exemplifying from less formal contexts where the solidarity between participants is an important influence on speech style, and the features of speech style in a range of contexts which vary in formality, looking at the interaction of the formality and status dimensions.

Example 1:

(a) Excuse me. Could I have a look at your photos too, Mrs Hall?

(b) C'mon Tony, gizzalook, gizzalook. (Holmes 1992:246)

The first utterance in this example was addressee by a teenage boy to his friend's mother when he was showing the photos of their skiing holiday to an adult friend. The second utterance was addressed to his friend when he brought round his own photos of the holiday. From this happening, the better we know someone, the more casual and relaxed the speech styles we will use to them. People use considerably more standard forms to those they do not know well, and more casual form to their friends.

Javanese is another example, which illustrates the complexity of stylistic variation, which can be found in languages. The social group membership and the social context affect a speaker's linguistic choices. In addition there is also the possibility of raising any utterance an additional 'half-level' by various linguistic means. Each level involves different pronunciations, different grammatical forms, and different items of vocabulary. The example according to Holmes (1992:272-273), is as follows:

<i>Menapa</i>	<i>nandalem</i>	<i>mudhut</i>	<i>sekul</i>	<i>semanten?</i>	3a HIGH
<i>Menapa</i>	<i>panjenengan</i>	<i>mendhet</i>	<i>sekul</i>	<i>semanten?</i>	3
<i>Napa</i>	<i>sampean</i>	<i>medhet</i>	<i>sekul</i>	<i>semonten?</i>	2
<i>Napa</i>	<i>sampean</i>	<i>nyupuk</i>	<i>sega</i>	<i>semonten?</i>	1a
<i>Apa</i>	<i>sliramu</i>	<i>mudhut</i>	<i>sega</i>	<i>semono?</i>	1d

*Apa kowe njupuk sega semono? I* LOW  
 QUESTION YOU TAKE RICE THAT MUCH

Marker: Did you take that much rice?

The sentences in this example are ordered from the most formal ‘high’ style (level 3a, known as *krama inggil*) to the least formal ‘low’ style (level 1, known as *ngoko*). Selecting the appropriate ‘level’ of Javanese for a particular interaction involves, as elsewhere, taking account of the relationship to the addressee in context. As elsewhere too, solidarity (how well you know each other) and relative status (determined by such factors as age, wealth, descent, education, and occupation) are important in assessing the relationship. The result may be that each of the participants selects a different level of Javanese. Such as, if I am an ordinary educated citizen speaking to a high government official I will use the highest level (3a) to express respect, but the official will use only level 1, *ngoko*, to me. To very high status Javanese, on the other hand, they will use level 3 to each other. These examples indicate that social background can influence people to use different styles to others.

#### 2.2.2. Indonesian Language:

Based on Abdul Chaer and Leony Agustina (1995) in Indonesian Language, are as follows;

According to Abdul Chaer and Leonie Agustina (1995:29-94), the sociolinguistic aspect is the formality of language, which relates to language users, context of situation and the function of speech. Similar with Joos’ theory (1967) in his book *The styles of five clock*, in Indonesian language based on Abdul Chaer’s and Leonie Agustina’s theory, they are called *gaya* or *ragam beku* (frozen), *gaya* or *ragam resmi* (formal), *gaya* or *ragam usaha* (consultative), *gaya* or *ragam santai* (casual) and *gaya* or *ragam akrab* (intimate). The explanations of these five styles are as follows:

#### 2.2.2.1. “Gaya or Ragam beku” (frozen style)

This style is the most formal style, which is used in very formal situations and ceremonies. In written forms, this style can be found in historical documents for example constitution and other necessary state documents. A sentence, which is started with the words ‘bahwa’, ‘maka’, ‘hatta’ and ‘karena’, is considered “ragam beku”. It usually used long sentence and good grammatical and vocabularies. The example of this style can be taken from the first paragraph in the preamble of 1945 constitution that is “*Bahwa sesungguhnya kemerdekaan itu ialah hak segala bangsa, dan oleh sebab itu maka penjajahan diatas dunia harus dihapuskan karena tidak sesuai dengan prikeantasan dan prikeadilan.*”(Nababan 1991:23).

#### 2.2.2.2. “Gaya or Ragam Resmi” (formal style)

This style is a style, which is used, in formal speech and official meeting. ‘Ragam resmi’ is the same with ‘bahasa baku’ or standard Indonesian which is always used in formal situation like in the ceremony of engagement, students talking with their teacher/lecture in his office, et cetera. One example based on Nababan’s theory (1991:23) of this style is “ *Bapak Suparman menerangkan arti dari peristiwa itu.*”

#### 2.2.2.3. “Gaya or Ragam Usaha” (Consultative Style)

This style is a style usually used in conversation in the school, common discussion such as at school or company. This style is the most operational style and the form between ‘ragam resmi’ or formal and informal or “ragam santai”. The example based on Nababan’s theory (1991:23) of this style is “*Pak Parman terangkan arti peristiwa itu.*”

#### 2.2.2.4. “Gaya or Ragam Santai” (Casual Style)

This style is used in non-formal situation. It is commonly used between friends, in chatting, recreation, exercise, et cetera. The form sentence of this style is usually short, and the vocabulary mostly influenced by dialect. The example: “*Aku nggak ngerti maksudmu.*” ( Nababan 1991:23).

#### 2.2.2.5. “Gaya or Ragam Akrab” (Intimate Style)

This style is a style used among family or closed friends. The varied and complex sentence with clearer articulation is not needed in this style, but it is only enough with very short utterances and the utterances are not complete. It is because both addressors and addressee have had background information about the topic they discussed. Example, “*Nggak ngerti.*” (Nababan 1991:23).

Other examples from Abdul Chaer’s and Leonie Agustina’s theory (1995:94), are as follows:

- a. “*Saudara boleh mengambil buku-buku ini yang Saudara sukai.*”
- b. “*Ambillah yang kamu sukai!*”
- c. “*Kalau mau ambil aja!*”

The degree of formality of sentence (a) is higher/more formal than Sentence (b); and sentence (b) more formal than sentence (c). Sentence (a) called “ragam usaha” (consultative style). Sentence (b) called “ragam santai” (casual style) and sentence (c) called “ragam akrab” (intimate style).

### 2.3. Lexical and Grammatical Characteristics for Standard Indonesian

According to Abdul Chaer (1986:5), the characteristics commonly used help determine which speech style can be considered formal style and non-formal. Standard Indonesian and non-standard are characterized as follows:

1. The consistent use of “me-“ and “ber-“ consistently and explicitly. For example:

Table 2.1. The Consistent Use of “me-“ and “ber-“ Consistenly and Explicitly

Bahasa baku (Standard Indonesian)	Bahasa tidak baku (Non-standard Indonesian)
a. Gubernur <u>meninjau</u> daerah kebakaran.	a. Gubernur <u>tinjau</u> daerah kebakaran.
b. Pintu pelintasan kereta itu <u>bekerja</u> secara otomatis.	b. Pintu pelintasan kereta itu <u>kerja</u> secara otomatis.
c. Anaknya <u>bersekolah</u> di Bandung.	c. Anaknya <u>sekolah</u> di Bandung.

2. The use of conjunction such as “*bahwa*” and “*karena*” consistently and explicitly. For example:

Table 2.2. The Use of Conjunction such as “*bahwa*” and “*karena*” Consistently and Explicitly

Bahasa baku (Standard Indonesian)	Bahasa tidak baku (Non-standard Indonesian)
a. Ia tidak tahu <u><i>bahwa</i></u> anaknya sering bolos.	a. Ia tidak tahu anaknya sering bolos.
b. Ibu guru marah kepada Sudin <u><i>karena</i></u> ia sering bolos	b. Ibu guru marah kepada Sudin, ia sering bolos.

3. The consistent use of the pattern of verb phrase Aspect + Doer + Verb explicitly. For example:

Table 2.3. The Consistent Use of the Pattern of Verb Phrase Aspect + Doer + Verb Explicitly

Bahasa baku (Standard Indonesian)	Bahasa tidak baku (Non-standard Indonesian)
a. Surat Anda sudah saya terima.	a. Surat Anda saya sudah terima.
b. Acara berikutnya akan kami putarkan lagu-lagu perjuangan.	b. Acara berikutnya kami akan putarkan lagu-lagu perjuangan.
c. Rencana itu sedang kami garap.	c. Rencana itu kami sedang garap.

4. The use of synthetic construction. For example:

Table 2.4. The Use of Synthetic Construction

Bahasa baku (standard Indonesian)	Bahasa tidak baku (non-standard Indonesian)
a. Anaknya.	a. Dia punya anak.
b. Membersihkan.	b. Bikin bersih.

## (2.4. Sambungan)

c. Memberitahukan.	c. Kasih tahu.
d. Mereka	d. Dia orang

5. The limited member of grammatical regional dialects, for example:

Table 2.5. The Limited Member of Grammatical Regional Dialects

Bahasa baku (standard Indonesian)	Bahasa tidak baku (non-standard Indonesian):
a. Dia <u>mengontrak</u> rumah di kebayoran.	a. Dia <u>ngontrak</u> rumah di Kebayoran.
b. <u>Mobil</u> paman saya baru.	b. <u>Paman</u> saya mobilnya baru.

Based on Abdul Chaer's and Leonie Agustina's theory (1986:88), conversation in Indonesia mostly used the form of colloquial. Colloquial language is a social variation, which is usually used in daily spoken utterances, such as, *dok* (=dokter), *prof* (=professor), *let* (=letnan), *ndak ada* (=tidak ada), et cetera.

According to Kridalaksana (1984:94), these examples below that follow are phatic forms, used in everyday utterances involved in Javanese and Sundanese languages which are adopted into colloquial Indonesian:

1. *Kok* indicated surprise, often combined with irritation about something that happened unexpectedly.
2. *Mbok* indicates gentle request or a soft swear,
3. *Lho* indicates surprise or a mild shock.
4. *Lha* points to something as mentioned in the sentence.
5. *Wong* is the explanation for something not being as expected.
6. *Ding* is sudden retraction of what one has just said.

The elements that are non-standard Indonesian: *kenapa*, *situ deh*, *bilang*, *dong*, *kasih*, *nggak*, *sih*, *gini*, *ini hari*, *kok*.

According to "Tata Bahasa Baku Bahasa Indonesia" (1992:171), the terms of intimacy have several ways, first, by using nickname and pet name, and by using enclitic *-nda* and/or personal name *+ku* (my personal name), such as,

*ayahnda, ibunda, kakanda, Jimmyku*, or sometimes by using words that show intimacy such as *tercinta, tersayang*. The last by using all kinds of combination such as *Dik Lies, tambatan hatiku, adikku tersayang* (Sudjarno 1981:267-268).

The writer used this theory to analyze the data in her research. So this theory is more or less like guidelines to analyze all the data from the subjects.

The basic classifications of speech styles that the writer got from the dialog are just formal style, consultative style, casual style and intimate style. The following table is as follows:

<p><b>Formal:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Must have subject and predicate.</li> <li>- Usually there is an article such as, <i>-lah, -pun</i>.</li> <li>- Some vocabularies are standard.</li> <li>- The sentence structures are more complex. E.g: “Bapak Superman menerangkan arti dari peristiwa itu.” (Nababan 1991:23).</li> </ul>	<p><b>Consultative:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Should have subject and predicate but some vocabularies are not standard ones.</li> <li>- Needs background information. Used by strangers.</li> <li>- Deals with public information. E.g: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ “<i>Saudara boleh mengambil buku-buku ini yang Saudara sukai.</i>” (Abdul Chaer 1986: 94).</li> <li>▪ “<i>Pak Parman terangkan arti peristiwa itu.</i>” (Nababan 1991:23).</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p><b>Casual:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Characterized by ellipsis.</li> <li>- The form sentence of this style usually short and Influenced by dialect.</li> <li>- The relationship is between friends and equal status. E.g: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ “<i>Ambillah yang kamu sukai!</i>” (Abdul Chaer 1986:94)</li> <li>▪ “<i>Aku tidak mengerti maksudmu.</i>” (Nababan 1991:23).</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><b>Intimate:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Characterized by ellipsis and extraction, involves gesture.</li> <li>- The relationship is very close or kinship.</li> <li>- This style is only enough with very short utterances and the utterances are not complete. E.g: “<i>Nggak ngerti!</i>” (Nababan 1991:23).</li> </ul>

The writer used some theories shown in this chapter because she wants to analyze the data in her research. So the theory of Joos'(1976), *Abdul Chaer's*, *Leony Agustina's*(1986), *Harimurti Kridalaksana*(1995) and *Tata Bahasa Baku Bahasa Indonesia* (1992) is more or less like guidelines to analyze all the data from the subjects.

#### **2.4. Review of Related Study**

In this part, the writer would like to present a study that is closely related with hers. The study that she is conducting is written by Meiza Wilansari (1999), the title is "Gus Dur's speech styles in the Jaya Suprana's show of the Televisi Pendidikan Indonesia Station." In this study, she investigates the types of speech styles produced by Gus Dur specifically. In her theory, she used Joos' as the main theory and the supporting theories are Nababan and Holmes theories.

She uses qualitative approach in collecting the data and does observation and managing the data since it deals with the data in the form of long dialog. The contexts in which speech styles that are used occur naturally. In analyzing the data, she identified the characters of styles that Gus Dur uses. The finding indicates that the dominant style is consultative styles.

From this explanation, in my thesis, I have similar study with hers that is first, about the speech style. As I have read her thesis especially from her review of related literature and analysis, I can know more and has much knowledge about speech style. In addition, I also identified styles used by the speaker in the dialog. Second, in my thesis, I also used the theory of Martin Joos, Nababan and Holmes theory.

The difference from the previous study mentioned above is that the writer investigates speech styles that occur in "Selamat Datang Pagi" dialog on RCTI. On the other hand, the previous study was about "Gus Dur's speech styles in the Jaya Suprana's show of the Televisi Pendidikan Indonesia Station." Thus, the analysis and finding of speech styles that occur in "*Selamant datang pagi*" dialog will be different with *Gus Dur's* speech styles in the *Jaya Suprana's* show of the *Televisi Pendidikan Indonesia* Station.