

CHAPTER II

THEORY AND METHOD

2.1 Theoretical Framework

2.1.1 Speech Styles

Speech style exists closely to social dialect. According to Joos (1967), a speech style can be determined through how formal one speaks, even if one speaks the same language. A scale of formality exists in this case; therefore, a style can also be determined through it. People use different language styles for the same individual when they meet at different locations or contexts, i.e., using a formal style during important meetings and speaking casually at coffee breaks. Utama & Abdullah (2022) point out that speech styles are separate forms of language that speakers use to convey ideas through spoken words and tone of voice. Additionally, Giles's theory (1973) on communication emphasizes how speakers adjust their speech to influence how others view their social identity. He mentions how people are able to converge upward to seem more upper class, or downward to appear more lower class.

2.1.2 Language and Society

The relationship between language and society is inseparable. Deckert (2011) emphasizes the "socio-" in "sociolinguistics" and explains how it refers to how language is implemented in social situations, and how individuals converse with one another on interpersonal and broader, cultural, national, and international levels.

Wardhaugh (2006) divides this relationship into three possibilities. The first is that social structure influences or determines linguistic structure, e.g., the age-grading method, in which children's diction differs from that of older children and mature adults. This refers to the change of speech style of certain age groups, while the speech style of their community as a whole does not experience such change (Ghazanfar et al., 2024). Studies that discuss the effects of speakers' regional, social, ethnic origin, and gender identity on their language and ways of speaking are determined by social requirements as well (Ghazanfar et al., 2024).

The second possible relationship consists of how linguistic structure and/or behavior affects the speaker's social structure. One's social class can be assumed from one's way of speaking. For instance, Fraser (1998) claims that the working class is characterized by non-standard style and grammatical deviation, while the upper class is significant by the opposite and their use of 'U' vocabulary, which is vocabulary that is mostly found in the upper class.

His third possible relationship is that both language and society may influence each other. The fourth and last possibility contains no relationship at all; although such a relationship could exist, present attempts of characterization are premature. Because this analysis will focus on how the two characters' language style acts as an implication of their social class, the second of Wardhaugh's (2006) possibilities will be taken into account.

2.1.3 Speech/Social Factors

Holmes (2013) explains that the concept of speech factors affects particular uses of speech style. She claims that there are four of these factors, which involve:

1. The participant, a) Who is speaking and, b) Who are they speaking to?
2. The setting or social context of the interaction – where are they speaking?
3. The topic – what is being talked about?
4. The function – why are they speaking?

The participants refer to the speakers and recipient in an exchange, e.g. a conversation between a wife and husband would differ from a conversation between a boss and worker. The setting or social context of the conversation is relevant as well, as people converse differently depending on where they are, such as at home or work. An example of contextual speech is in Hamdany and Damanhuri's (2017) study, in which the sentence “**I'd** say we've got some potential here. What do you think, **Hansen? Could you** write up some prototypes for these?” is polite or formal due to the conversation happening in a conference room during a work presentation.

Additionally, the topic of the conversation may affect style in a way that a serious discussion about global conflict would stir people to discuss carefully. As for function, the aim or purpose of the interaction – whether it is to be informative, comfortable, or social – may also be important.

Diction and speech style are affected by these factors. She emphasizes that these are “basic components in sociolinguistics that explain why we do not speak in the same way all of the time” (Holmes, 2013). This is underlined by her example in her book.

- a) Refuse should be deposited in the receptacle provided.
- b) Put your rubbish in the bin, Jilly.

She compares the grammar of sentences (a) and (b) and states the differences. She describes sentence (a) using a more passive grammatical structure, such as *should be deposited*, which avoids referring to any persons. In contrast, sentence (b) implements a more imperative form of *put*, the possessive pronoun *your*, and an address form, *Jilly*. Holmes states that although both sentences have the same message or speech function, they are not interchangeable. If a mother used the form of sentence (a) to tell her child to pick up their trash, it would be an abnormal way of speaking to someone she knew well.

2.1.4 Five Language Styles

According to Joos (1967), speech style refers to the form of language used by a speaker, which is measured by its degree of formality. He mentions that more than one form of English can be used at the same time and place, and labels frozen, formal, consultative, casual, and intimate as the measurements of the level of formality in spoken and written English.

2.1.4.1 Frozen

Joos (1967) describes this style as one that is commonly used for print and declamation. Its indicative feature is its ubiquitous use of scientific vocabulary and a consistently serious – often flat – tone. Grammar is highly concerned in this style, and the participation and intonation of the speakers are absent. Additionally, this style often uses long and complex sentences with good grammar and vocabulary. It is used for people who want to remain strictly social strangers, hence its stiff rules. However, it can also be said that this style is used for only very formal settings such as speech for diplomacy, palaces, or other occasions. Simamora and Sherina (2022) add that attendees on the occasion are often persons of high status or influential figures. America’s Declaration of Independence is classified as the frozen style due to its serious and flat tone, with the lack of participation and speaker intonation:

“That whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety and Happiness. Prudence, indeed, will dictate that Governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes; and accordingly all experience hath shewn, that mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed.”

2.1.4.2 Formal

The formal style lacks the presence of participation, including that of the speaker. The speaker of this style avoids using personal pronouns like ‘I’, ‘me,’ and ‘mine’ and leans more to the formal code label ‘one’ or even ‘myself’ in some rare situations. Because it is designed to inform (Joos, 1967), intimacy is also frequently avoided to inform the opposing speaker of the formal frame in which the conversation is taking place. Information spoken in the formal style requires prior planning before it is delivered to a wide audience. Its pronunciation should be explicit and the grammar should be elaborate. Additionally, the formal style could be used in formal situations in which the speakers have only met for the first time or when one of the parties is of a higher position (Joos, as cited in Broderick, 1976). It employs complex sentences, with one of the leading code labels “may”, “might”, e.g., “May I present Mr. Jimmy?” The formal style can be implemented even when it is spoken to only one listener, like a conversation with two strangers (Mulya & Mahmud, 2023)

2.1.4.3 Consultative

This style is considered the ‘good mature style’, often occurring in semiformal interactions. It is normally spoken in situations where two speakers are of equal social setting but lack an intimate relationship. According to Joos (1967), consultative code labels involve oral and non-vocal reactions from the hearer to signal the other speaker of his/her attentive listening. They do not interfere with the continuous flow of the utterances of the speaker. Common examples would be the utterances *I see, yes, I know,*

that's right, and *mhm*. In addition, this style is grammatically complete. The complete proper sentence, e.g., "I believe that I can find one.", is necessary in the Consultative style. Additionally, conjunctions such as "and" and prepositions like "on" are mostly used in this style, e.g., "Do you have the time on you, please?" (Joos, 1976)

Unlike the prior style, consultative-style speakers are never required to plan their phrases initially before they say them and are allowed to repeat them for as many times as required. This is a style that is used on semi-formal occasions and one that is ubiquitous amongst all speakers. Additionally, it is often employed amongst small groups or even strangers. Kadang, Burhamzah, and Nurfadhilah (2024) also underline that sentences that employ this style are shorter than sentences employing the formal style. Additionally, this style is needed for daily conversation.

Utterances that use consultative style often lack subjects and/or predicates, but still employ the standard English vocabulary and consistent correct grammar. Although this is still considered a formal style, it is not as complete as the formal speech style.

2.1.4.4 Casual

Casual style is marked by an arbitrary list of formulas, all very stable, which are learned individually and used to identify the style for the hearer's convenience (Joos, 1967). People normally use this style for daily conversations with others who are close to them, platonically and romantically. In casual style, speech is much more concise, with speakers frequently omitting the weak words of English usually in the

initial part of a sentence for practicality. The most common sets of words that are omitted in casual style are auxiliaries, pronouns, articles, and *be*. ‘It would have been a good thing if...’ becoming ‘Been a good thing if..’. Some ellipses are also phonological: the consultative ‘Can I help you?’ is turned into the casual ‘C’n I help you?’ (Joos, 1967). Mulya and Mahmud (2023) add that conversations that employ this style usually address people by a nickname, speak in a fast pace, and use slang. This characteristic is mentioned in Simamora and Sherina’s (2022) study, where a Korean character refers to someone using nicknames without surnames or honorifics, making it classified as casual: “**Min-woo** wants to see me, so I’m heading over.”

Similar to ellipses, slang is also utilized by speakers using this style of speech. Slang is a set of words that deviate from the standard language and are normally spoken and known by a particular community. It is considered very casual and informal, and would sometimes be seen as disrespectful if a speaker were to use it in a formal setting. For instance, the British Cockney slang *apples and pears* for ‘stairs’ and *trouble and strife* for ‘wife’. (Holmes, 2013).

Like the Consultative style, the Casual style lacks subjects and/or predicates. It is characterized by ellipses and has a non-standard English vocabulary that employs slang. Additionally, its syntactical structure is inconsistent i.e., “Been a good thing if...”

2.1.4.5 Intimate

Intimate style is used between speakers who are very close and have known each other intimately i.e., family members, couples, close friends, etc. It excludes public information so that utterances pointedly avoid giving the addressee information from outside of the speaker's skin (Joos, 1967). The point of the intimate style is to remind the addressee of some feeling (usually unspecified) instead of informing. This would usually only work if they both know the code (Joos, 1967).

Two elements make up the systematic features of this style: (1) Extraction, and (2) Jargon. Extraction is not ellipsis; dissimilarly, it involves the speaker's extraction of a minimum pattern from some casual sentence. It hardly contains wording, grammar, and intonation, but only employs only part of them. For example, the sound 'Engh' is an empty word but serves as a code label for intimate style. The intonation in which the sound is uttered has a conveyed message only meant for the addressee. Additionally, Mulya and Mahmud's (2023) explains that this style contains intimate expressions, e.g., "dear", "darling", "honey", "hon", "babe", etc. (Simamora & Sherina, 2022).

Slang is nonexistent, but jargon makes its place in this style. Intimacy does not need to be indicated by slang to show that the other speaker is an insider; jargon is enough to show that relationship. Each intimate group must invent its own code, so accordingly, jargon is severely limited in its use of public vocabulary.

2.1.5 Upper-class Standard vs. Lower-class Non-Standard Style

Fraser (1998) mentions the significance of the features of non-standard style commonly found in the working class, among others:

- 1) Multiple negation: “I didn’t go nowhere.”
- 2) Subject/verb noncord: “We was the only ones.”, “I were there yesterday.”
- 3) Conjugation regularization: “She done it.”, “I were there yesterday.”
- 4) *Them* used as a demonstrative: “I’ve seen them students.”
- 5) *Ain’t* for *be not* or *have not*: “How come that ain’t working?”. “You ain’t been around there, have you?”
- 6) *Never* for general negation: “*I never went to school today.*”
- 7) Comparison: “She’s more better than him.”, “He’s the most toughest.”
- 8) Adjective form for adverb use: “They done it very nice.”

Chambers (as quoted in Coupland, 2007) explains that ‘the variants that occur in everyday speech are linguistically insignificant but socially significant’, meaning one’s speech style is impressionable for one’s place in society. He supports this claim by referring to the sentences below:

Adonis saw himself in the mirror (grammatical, standard)

Adonis seen hissself in the mirror (non-standard)

Chambers says that the first sentence is emblematic of the middle class – a more educated or relatively formal speech. While the second sentence he labels as emblematic of the working class – uneducated or highly colloquial speech. He uses this idea of status to point out a direct link between ‘standard grammar’ and a higher, more educated class – likewise with the non-standard and working class. Moving forward,

he adds that the social significance of linguistic variants is never about their presence or absence in one's speech, but rather their frequency in one's speech compared to another's.

2.2 Research Method

This sub-chapter will be dedicated to explaining the kind of methods used for the research. It will begin with a description of what type of research is conducted and the reasons for choosing it. The data and data sources, as well as the methods of data analysis and collection will follow henceforth.

2.2.1 Type of Research

I chose to implement the qualitative method to conduct this study. The reason for such a choice is to be able to observe closely the auditorial data from 'Kingsman: The Secret Service' and gain a deep understanding of each datum. Moreover, this research utilizes the descriptive technique to analyze sentences uttered by Eggsy Unwin and Harry Hart in the film above and connect them with their respective social classes.

2.2.2 Data and Data Source

All sentences uttered by characters Eggsy Unwin and Harry Hart in the movie *Kingsman: The Secret Service* will act as the primary data of this study. The writer's choice to only analyze the two characters is supported by how they have an almost equal number of utterances, therefore making them fit to compare each other. The contrasting speech style is effectively spotted.

The data are strictly obtained from Matthew Vaughn's 2014 spy movie *Kingsman: The Secret Service*, which has a duration of 2h and 10m. Therefore, all the data samples used for this study are auditory, taken, and written down from utterances of characters Eggsy and Harry.

2.2.3 Method of Collecting Data

Due to the focus of the data concerning the relationship between speech style and social class, data collection has been done through observation and collected purposefully. According to Grieve (2021), the observational approach in linguistics involves the analysis of how language varies naturally, whether it is across different languages, dialects, registers, and speakers. Therefore, observation is imperative in the method of data collection. In addition, purposive sampling is done by choosing participants for analysis deliberately through their characteristics (Cohen et al., 2002). The research implements this process because the data were chosen and highlighted according to certain characteristics the writer deems important.

To obtain the spoken data, the writer rewatched the movie repeatedly and noted down every utterance spoken by the characters. Firstly, the writer picked only scenes that contain utterances by Eggsy Unwin and Harry Hart, which were then followed by note-taking of those scenes. Every data was classified into different 'scenes', which involve the categorization whenever a scene or interaction cuts to a different environment. Secondly, for each data of the characters, the writer began labeling each utterance according to Joos' theory and will be filtered according to it. Consequently,

the labeled data will be calculated into percentages, which the writer will then sort in a descending order based on which of Joos' language styles appear in Eggsy and Harry from most often to least, as well as the social factors that influence them. Following the step, those occurrences will be related to the contrast of how each character acts according to their social class.

2.2.4 Method of Analyzing Data

The data were analyzed using a thematic approach. The collected data were sorted into their respective language styles according to Joos' theory. Primarily, the data were first identified and classified into the theories mentioned earlier. Utterances that are classified as using standard or non-standard grammar with grammar deviation will be labeled as such. Once they are tabulated per scene, each scene will have a label about the scene's Setting/Context, according to Holmes' concept of social factors.

Subsequently, the respective classifications of speech styles will be sorted in descending order from most often to least and ubiquity respectively. The final results will be related to Eggsy and Harry's social class based on their speech. The findings are presented structurally to ensure comprehensibility. Although the method of this research is qualitative, I used numbers to classify the data to present the frequency of how the data are spread out according to most often to least.