

**THE USE OF SPEECH STYLE OF *MENAK* PEOPLE IN ORDINARY
CONVERSATION AT SURALAGA VILLAGE, EAST LOMBOK**



AN ARTICLE

By:

SITI LATHIPATUL HIKMAH
NIM. E1D110116

**ENGLISH DEPARTMENT
FACULTY OF TEACHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION
UNIVERSITY OF MATARAM**

2014

APPROVAL

An article entitled: “**The use of speech style of *Menak* people in ordinary conversation at Suralaga village**” has been approved on January 2015

First Consultant,



Prof. Drs. Mahyuni, M.A. Ph.D
NIP.196312311988031023

Second Consultant,



Ahmad Zamzam, M.Hum
NIP. 197612312008121002

Acknowledged by:

Head of Language and Art Education Department
Faculty of Teacher Training and Education
Mataram University



Dra. Siti Rohana Hariana Intiana, M.Pd.
NIP: 196603311993032002

THE USE OF SPEECH STYLE OF *MENAK* PEOPLE IN ORDINARY CONVERSATION AT SURALAGA VILLAGE

Siti Lathipatul Hikmah

Latifa140110@gmail.com

ABSTRAK

Penggunaan Gaya Bahasa oleh Orang Menak pada Percakapan Sehari-hari di Desa Suralaga

Penelitian ini meneliti tentang penggunaan gaya bahasa oleh menak pada percakapan sehari-hari di desa Suralaga pada dua situasi yang berbeda yakni 'sesama menak' dan 'antara menak- non-menak'. Selain itu, penelitian ini juga mengidentifikasi pola-pola bahasa pada interaksi masyarakat dan faktor penyebab perbedaan pola interaksi tersebut. Data yang dibutuhkan pada penelitian ini berupa percakapan-percakapan masyarakat yang diperoleh melalui empat teknik seperti teknik merekam, pengamatan, wawancara, dan catat. Setelah itu, data tersebut dianalisis dalam beberapa tahap; pemilihan data, transkripsi, identifikasi, klasifikasi, dan deskripsi. Hasil penelitian ini menunjukkan bahwa gaya bahasa yang digunakan oleh sesama menak dan antara menak- non menak adalah gaya 'tengaq' dan 'jamaq'. Pola bahasa, terkait penggunaan gaya bahasa, pada interaksi masyarakat berbeda disesuaikan dengan lawan bicaranya. Perbedaan ini disebabkan oleh beberapa faktor yaitu umur, status social, dan hubungan sosial.

Kata kunci: *gaya bahasa, pola bahasa, Desa Suralaga,*

ABSTRACT

This thesis deals with the use of Speech style of *menak* people in ordinary conversation at Suralaga village. This study aims to investigate the use of speech style in two communication settings; 'among *menak*' and '*menak* -non *menak*' setting. Besides, it also identifies the language patterns of the interactions and the factors influencing the differences of pattern of their interactions. The data needed are in the form of conversations of the people and gained through four techniques such as recording, observation, interview, and note taking. Afterwards, the data were analyzed in five stages i.e. data selection, transcription, identification, classification and analysis. This study shows that *tengaq* and *jamaq* style are applied by the society whether among *menak* and by between *menak*-non *menak* seting. The language patterns, in terms of the use of speech style, of society's interaction are different depending on the interlocutors they face. The factor influencing the differences of the interactions are age level, honorary, and social distance relationship.

Key terms: *speech style, language pattern, Suralaga village*

INTERODUCTION

Indonesia constitutes a multi-ethnic and multi-language country representing an interesting socio-linguistics setting. This means that Indonesia has many varieties of ethnic languages. Based on the data from Language Center of National Education Department in the year of 2010, there are more than seven hundred vernaculars spread in Indonesia. However, every dialect in some regions is not applied entirely, since every single people have dialect of certain language pattern which in sociolinguistics called idiolect. Thus, every people do not definitely comprehend the words uttered by the interlocutors when they conduct the conversation although they may at the same region and same standardized language.

Naturally, language is meant as the communication tool. In daily life, Human needs to convey information through language. Besides, language is very helpful to express one's feelings or idea. In accordance with that, language may indicate who we are and how we think. Further, language is also known as the identity of a group. It means that particular groups may have particular language which differentiate them with the other groups. It also can be seen at the appearance of some language varieties in society. As a result, language is not only as the communication tool, but also as the identity of a community member or group.

Based on the elucidation above, it can be assumed that language amends dynamically in society. Language is defined as social product formed by social culture which contain values. Consequently, misunderstanding and non-appropriateness probably occur in a conversation. Sasak language is a good example for this case because it has various level there such as *utame* 'prominent', *tengaq* 'medium', *jamaq* 'ordinary', and *kasar* 'intimate' style. These styles are determined by the social stratification noble '*mènak*' and non-noble '*non mènak*' people appeared after the domination from Balinese kingdom.

One of the most interesting topics that interesting to be discussed is *Mènak* people related to their speech. *Mènak*, traditionally, is known as the highest level in Sasak society that the behavior of the commoners toward them is very special in some respects include in using an appropriate speech style. Everyone who talk to them have to use the high level commonly called *alus* style (refined language) to respect them. Thus, generally, people claimed that *alus* style is the property of *mènak* people (Mahyuni, 2006: 2). However, today, it seems that the function of *alus* is changed or Mahyuni (2006: 3) says this as the effect of social change. Consequently, *alus* as *mènak*'s speech style is obviously not only used among *mènak* but also toward the appropriate non-*mènak* people.

The phenomena above motivate the writer to conduct the study about speech style of *Mènak* people. This study was grounded at Suralaga village, East Lombok, West Nusa Tenggara. Suralaga is a village which use one of those five dialects in sasak, *ngeno-ngene*, *meno-mene*, *geto, gete*, *kuto-kute*, and *meriaq-merikuq*, that is *geto-gete* dialect. Yet, one may use Bahasa Indonesia to communicate if he/she is an educated people. Besides, Bahasa Indonesia is used if the two speakers do not understand what the interlocutor words. For instance, the people who have married with the people from the other village for example Suralaga people married with one from central Lombok, they usually use Bahasa Indonesia.

Suralaga with population around 8,918 people consist of approximately 4019 male and 4882 female. It is about 5 % are the *Mènak* people of the population. However, the prominent nobleman '*mènak utame*' is not found there. Thus, the social stratification remains are *Mènak biase*, *perwangse* 'ordinary nobles' and *bulu ketujur* 'the commoner'. Based on those social stratification, there are four speech style in use: *utama*, *tengaq*, *jamaq* and *kasar* (Mahyuni, 2006: 96). The difference of each style is on the vocabularies items. These four 'style' can be illustrated as below adapted from Mahyuni's example 'Have you

eaten?’ on his book in sasak Ganti language. However, *kasar* style will not be exemplified since there is no *kasar* form in Suralaga. It will be presented in Suralaga language:

utama : “*Sampun dekaji majengan?*”

tengaq : “*Sampun plungguh medaran?*”

jamaq : “*Wah ke pe mangan?*”

From those examples, it is clear that each level or social stratification has different style especially on the lexical items (vocabularies). In their daily life, they may switch style based on with whom they talk and in what situation for instance the same speaker may employ *tengaq* and/or *biasa* according to high or low status of his/her interlocutor. However, the lower level will construct refined language ‘*alus*’ if they talk to the higher level.

The situation above motivates the writer to carry out the research about use of speech style in ordinary conversation in Suralaga in two different setting of communication: (a) communication among *ménak*, (b) communication between *ménak* to non-*ménak*. Nevertheless, conversation among non-*ménak* people will not be investigated because the main focus of this study is speech style of *ménak* people which identically use refined language.

THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVE

Language, as its function, is very crucial for human life. Every states, people never apart from the language because language is the medium to interact with the other. Everyone cannot live without language whether on verbal and nonverbal language. In doing everything, language always exist in order to express the human feeling. Each community, just like each individual, has its own language that expresses the ideas, values, and attitudes of its members. It indicates that language constitutes the mirror of human’s mind. Thus, language reflects our culture and even influences our thought process then regard as the power of language. The concept of this is firstly proposed by Edward Sapir and Benjamin Whorf which state that the way we think is determined by our language. Moreover, Mahadi and Jafari(2012), in their article, raises the hypothesis of B. L. Whorf and E. Sapir which suggest that a language determines and resolves that thought and perception of its speakers.

In a hand, the hypothesis is acceptable and gives the light that language and culture has close correlation. In the side hand, the concept of Whorf-Sapir about language and culture is controversial. This concept is too tight that does not cover the all language situation. A number of experts (Elmes,n.d; Paul and Kempton, 1986; and Wardaugh,1970:1) give much attention to this hypothesis and take a conclusion that language and human’s cognitive affect each other; culture has significant effect in language and culture is reflected in and transmitted through human language. This statement of this also can be found in Mahyuni (2006: 3) in his book *Speech Style And Cultural Consciousness Of Sasak Community* as he says:

“a social change is taking place in the Sasak community. This change is indicated by the shift in people’s perception about cultural norms and values reflected in the language use”

The concept of Safir and Whorf is also criticized by Sumarsono (2004, pg. 61-65). He clearly states that hypothesis “the human view about their environment is determined by language” cannot be accepted utterly. He gives some proofs to oppose the hypothesis; (1)

the physical and social environments of society are reflected by their language, (2) social class and values effect to the language.

Language and culture play big role in human society. The two affect each other. Some experts, as mentioned above, have discussed about the correlation between the two. We can see how culture is reflected in language use in *Sasak* community include in Suralaga village, Lombok island that will be discussed in this study. However, this study will not investigate more about the experts' view about how language and culture has close relation, but his study will at least give the brief knowledge about obviously language is as the reflection of one's culture. For example, the speech styles ; the *alus* style (traditionally blongs to noble style) is different from *jamaq* style (commoner style). Moreover, this study focuses on the use of speech style itself in society.

'Style' of speech is a social product. It is as the picture of the speaker/s in a community. Bell's principle, according to Coupland (2007: 97), states that stylistic latitude derives from and contained by the social variation visible in the community. The visible facts in sociolinguistics are every single people speak distinctively on their own way and there is no single style of the speaker (Coupland, 2007: 54). Thus, we may say that style uttered by every single people is inconsistent.

Speech style issues in multilingual ethnics, include in Sasak community, become interesting to be investigated by considering that varieties of languages in a community reflect the social norms and value (Mahyuni, 2006:95). Thus, in far, speech style is related to language use which indicates polite behavior. In accordance with that, every single people will choose the particular style to communicate with the interlocutor to show his/her respect. For this case, some researchers have their own terms to determine the factors influencing person's style to show the politeness. Brown and Levinson (1987) (cited in Mahmud, 2013:2) classify the influencing factor become three parts; power, distance and rank of imposition whereas Holmes (1995) (cited in Murni, 2013: 2) says that 'solidarity-social distance dimension, the power of dimension, and formality are the dimension influence of one's style. In his research on Bugis language, Mahmud (2013: 1-5) found that there are some factors which influencing of being polite for Bugis such as Social status, age, gender, familiarity, and situation. In other case, Mahyuni (2006) in his book *Speech style and cultural consciousness in Sasak community* states social factors take big role in this case such as power relationship of the speakers, topic, and setting of the conversation.

Before knowing the factors influencing of one's style in a communication, we have to focus on the pattern of their attractive interaction. A number of experts agree that lexical choice such as 'verbs', 'pronouns', and 'nouns' produced by the speakers determine their respect level to the interlocutor. In addition, Mahyuni (2006), who conduct the research about speech style in Sasak community, sees that lexical items such as 'demonstrative and personal pronoun', 'questions', and 'imperatives' are more suitable to be discussed because they represent the style of the speakers.

In general, For Fairclough (2003: 115) styles are realized in a range of linguistics features:

1. Phonological features; pronunciation, intonation, stress, rhythm
2. Vocabularies and metaphor- one are of vocabularies which varies with identification is interestingly adverbial as 'dreadfully', 'frightfully', and so forth.

In line with that, those findings of the researchers are completing each other. Moreover, those can be the consideration for this study to answer the question about factors influencing one's speech style.

RESEARCH METHODS

This study is descriptive qualitative because it intends to elicit the interactional patterns phenomena in the society: the interactive communication of noble and non noble people in Suralaga especially the use of speech styles in ordinary conversation. The fieldwork of this study is in Suralaga village, East Lombok, West Nusa Tenggara, Indonesia. The study was focus on the speech style of noble ‘*menak*’ people in Suralaga. **Thus, the data were in the form of conversations. The populations were all of the people in Suralaga and the samples were those who were captured by the recorder and determined after investigation.**

There were four techniques in collecting the data: observation, recording, interview, and note taking. The writer observed the culture, interaction, geographic and social identities such as social status, education, gender, and age level through non participant observation. In term of language situation, the researcher observed conversations of the people include language use and language pattern of their interactions through participant observation. Besides, Recording is the main technique to record the conversation of the people. In addition, some people from noble and non noble people include the prominent figure were interviewed to gain more information about speech style and linguistics situation there. In addition, note taking was also needed to write the important information for example to note the technical terms of noble Sasak language. Then, the data collected were selected based on the criteria; the conversations have to involve *menak* people, the range of age of people is $20 \leq 70$ years old and the people were not speech defect. Then, the data were transcribed in the form of written form. The next stages is identification. In this stage, the data were identified the speech styles in Suralaga village. After knowing the types of speech styles in the fieldwork, data were classified into groups based on the types of such speech styles. The last was describing and explaining the result of the analyzed data. This study is expected to explain some matters; speech style used among *mènak*, speech style used by *mènak*-non *mènak*, language pattern of their interactions and factors influencing the difference of their interactions.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

4.1 Speech Styles among *menak* people

Table 4.1 Total of *Alus* Expressions mostly used among *mènak* and *mènak*-non *mènak* in ordinary conversation based on the data gathered

| <i>Expressions</i> | Meaning | Number of tokens | Percentages of tokens |
|--------------------|---------------|------------------|-----------------------|
| <i>Niki</i> | This | 14 | 41,18% |
| <i>Tiang1</i> | I | 9 | 26,47% |
| <i>Tiang 2</i> | *Disc. Marker | 3 | 8,82% |
| <i>Nggih1</i> | Yes | 2 | 5,88% |
| <i>Sampun</i> | Already | 6 | 17,65% |
| Total | | 34 | 100,00% |

Table 4.2 Total of *Tengaq* Expressions mostly used among *mènak* in ordinary conversation, which appear, based on the data gathered.

| Expressions | Meaning | Number of tokens | Percentages of tokens |
|-------------|---------|------------------|-----------------------|
| <i>Wah1</i> | Already | 16 | 13,56% |

| | | | |
|-----------------|--------|-----------|----------------|
| <i>Aok</i> | Yes | 4 | 3,39% |
| <i>Nono/ no</i> | That | 13 | 11,02% |
| <i>Nini/ni</i> | That | 6 | 5,08% |
| <i>Nene</i> | This | 4 | 3,39% |
| <i>Tene</i> | Here | 1 | 0,85% |
| <i>Tono</i> | there | 5 | 4,24% |
| <i>Aku/ku</i> | I | 5 | 4,24% |
| <i>Ida /da</i> | She/he | 30 | 25,42% |
| <i>Épé</i> | You | 12 | 10,17% |
| <i>Apa</i> | What | 3 | 2,54% |
| Total | | 99 | 100,00% |

Among *ménak* speakers in Suralaga may use three styles i.e *tengaq* and *jamaq* styles while *utama* style ‘the highest style’ is absolutely not employed because the generation of highest level strata which hold and appropriate use *utame* style that is ‘*Raden*’ is not found in the fieldwork. Thus, the noble people use *jamaq* (second level of *alus*). Moreover, unfortunately, just certain lexical items of *alus* are used by them since mostly influence by the the modern era and there are no the extensive socialization by the old generations.

The use of each style is *based* on the degree of formality and respect (Mahyuni: 2006). This concept also found in Suralaga people. Thus, *ménak* speaker may address *jamaq* or *tengaq* toward the other *ménak* in the conversation whereas traditionally they have to address the other *ménak* by using *tengaq*.

Tengaq style is one of the types of styles in noble Sasak community in general and in Suralaga in particular. This style denoted the politeness of the person toward the other people who are supposed to be respected appropriately.

This phenomenon show in the example below, *alus* words are bolded:

(1) RU : *pe santrang ka ida loh Mq.kaka tuan Nung no.*
You accompany please her to *Mq.Kaka Hajj Nung DEM*

“Accompany her to *mq.kaka Nung*” *(*mq. Kaka* is uncle)

KI : *mangkin ka tiang nyalin lek tiang juluk.*
Now DISC I change disc I first
“Okey. But, I will change my cloth first”

The conversation (2) involves two *menak* people RU (senior) and KI (junior) in RU’s house. In this conversation, KI used *alus* lexical items such as *mangkin* ‘now’ and *tiang* ‘I’ to show her respect to RU, senior *ménak*. However, it is contrast with the words uttered by RU who used *jamaq* style to KI. This condition, in general, always occur where the junior *ménak* use *alus* style or *tengaq* to the senior *ménak*.

The data on the previous table 4.1 and 4.2 show that most of people of *ménak* use *jamaq* in the daily conversations. *Jamaq* style in ‘among *ménak*’ environment is used to show the solidarity. Moreover, a senior speaker may use *jamaq* to the junior *ménak*. Based on the data, it seems that the frequency of the *jamaq* expressions in the conversations great enough. The most *jamaq* lexical item is *wah* ‘already’ which appear

16 times during the conversations. And, in contrast, *alus* style of demonstrative pronoun *nike* ‘that’, personal pronoun *pelungguh* ‘you’. During the conversations recorded, there is no the appearance of such *alus* expressions. Thus, it indicates that most of people may change such expressions with *jamaq* styles. The following example illustrates the condition:

(2) NU : “*Ngantiq-ang pe aku?*”

Bring- AFF you me

“Will you bring it to me?”

DK : “*lupaq ku tuan aji*”

Forget I Hajj

“I forgot, Hajj”

NU : “*Astaga*”

“Oh my god”

The example (2), both speakers are senior *mènak* people at the similar age but different in religious status. Yet, both of them use *jamaq* style of personal pronoun *pe* ‘you’, and *ku* ‘I’. This is common and acceptable in society if both *mènak* speakers use *jamaq* style. Back to the previous table 4.1 and 4.2 that data show the percentages of *jamaq* personal pronoun *ku* ‘I’ is around 4.24 % or 5 times appear in the conversation. Then, the expression *epe* ‘you’ appear 12 times or 10.1 %. This proves that *jamaq* style still use in ‘among *mènak*’ environment.

4.2 Speech Style between *Menak- non Menak*

Speech styles used in this environment is *jamaq* style. This can proved by the higher percentages of *jamaq* appeared in the conversations. For the clearer, the tables below show the percentages of expressions of each style appear in the communication between *menak- non menak* people.

Table 4.3 Total of *Alus* Expressions mostly used between *mènak- non mènak* in ordinary conversation in general, which appear, *based on the data gathered*

| <i>Expressions</i> | Meaning | Number of tokens | Percentages of tokens |
|--------------------|------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------|
| <i>Niki</i> | This | 20 | 54,55% |
| <i>Tiang 1</i> | I | 10 | 15,15% |
| <i>Tiang 2</i> | *Disc. Marker | 2 | 3,03% |
| <i>Nggihl</i> | Yes | 3 | 4,55% |
| <i>Napi</i> | What | 3 | 4,55% |
| <i>Plungguh</i> | You | 3 | 4,55% |
| <i>Silaq</i> | Please | 2 | 3,03% |
| <i>Sampun</i> | Already | 7 | 10,61% |
| Total | | 66 | 100,00% |

Table 4.4 total of *jamaq* expressions mostly used between *mènak- non mènak* in ordinary conversation in general, which appear, *based on the data gathered*

| Expressions | Meaning | Number of tokens | Percentages of tokens |
|--------------------|----------------|-------------------------|------------------------------|
|--------------------|----------------|-------------------------|------------------------------|

| | | | |
|-----------------|---------|------------|----------------|
| <i>Wahl</i> | Already | 27 | 11,44 % |
| <i>Aok</i> | Yes | 19 | 7,31% |
| <i>Nono/ no</i> | That | 20 | 7,69% |
| <i>Nini/ni</i> | That | 6 | 2,31% |
| <i>Nene</i> | This | 15 | 5,77% |
| <i>Tono</i> | there | 5 | 1,92% |
| <i>Aku/ku</i> | I | 36 | 13,85% |
| <i>Ida /da</i> | She/he | 56 | 21,54% |
| <i>Ēpè</i> | You | 47 | 18,08% |
| <i>Apa</i> | What | 5 | 1,92% |
| Total | | 236 | 100,00% |

In ‘*mènak-non mènak*’ encounter, the styles that frequently we found are *tengaq* and *jamaq* same as in ‘among *mènak*’ communications. The usage of *tengaq* is very low. The data point out that the percentages of *jamaq* style is higher than *tengaq* style (see table 4.5 and 4.6). Such result of the data is very significantly present the real situation in the fieldwork. This explains that most of people use *jamaq* style in their daily interactive communication.

In a certain setting, *tengaq* is employed in ‘*mènak-non-mènak*’ encounter to, of course, show the politeness toward the interlocutors. This fact can be explained as the excerpt below:

(3) MA : “*maap pak aji tiang ganggu niki*”
 Sorry sir Hajj I disturb this
 “I’m sorry, Hajj, I disturb you”

DT : “*nggih silak*”
 Yes please
 “It does not matter”

The setting of this conversation is at a school while MA came to DT to consult about the report he made. The status they hold is balance. It means that they have different status level which not one of them become lower than another. This fact can be explained by MA is a *mènak* people and teacher while HM is a headmaster and non-noble people. As a result, they may want to respect each other. The words “*tiang*” and “*niki*” prove that MA try to show his respect to DT. Conversely, DT utters the expressions “*nggih silaq*” to allow MA to reveal his purpose to meet him.

Contrastively, in other example, there is no *alus* expression uttered by EV (non *menak*) when she talked to BS (senior *menak*) as illustrated by fragment of the conversations below:

(4) EV : “*Ngajar epe?*”
 Teach you
 “are you a teacher?”

BS : “*Tene aliyah*”
 Here Aliyah
 “Yes, I’m. I teach at Aliyah” (Aliyah means the Senior high school)

EV : “*Pantesan yakna asing ruampe*”
 I see not unfamiliar face-POSS
 “oh, that’s why you are familiar for me”

The data demonstrate the use of *jamaq* style proved by the appearance of expressions of personal pronoun “*epe*” “you” and possessive pronoun “-pe” “your” uttered by EV (non *mènak* people).

In sum, the postulate about the *mènak* should be addressed in *alus* is entirely not implemented by the most of people in Suralaga. Thus, to respond *mènak* people, the non *mènak* people mostly use *jamaq* style. This phenomenon is common and acceptable in society. Another excerpt below illustrates the using of *jamaq* style between *mènak* and non *mènak* people.

(5) M : *Pe kembe, denda?*
 You go dear
 Where are you going, dear?

HF : “*Meta batur. Nak lina arenda*”
 Looking for friend, disc Lina name POSS.
 “I am looking for my friend. Her name is Lina.”

MA : “*Nak lina?*”
 Disc. Lina
 “Lina?”

FI : *Aok. Awan pe Putradi. Imbe balen-da?*
 Yes. Wife disc Putradi. Where house-AFF
 “Yes. Putradi’s wife. Where is her house?”

MA : *Oo aok, awan pe putradi? no ho balen-da denda*
 I see wife DISC Putradi? DEM DISC house-poss dear
 “yes, I see. His house is over there, dear”

The excerpt above indicates that both MA (*mènak*) and FI (non *mènak*) use *jamaq* style to communicate each other. There is no *alus* or *tengaq* style used by as the lower strata to address MA. Uniquely, besides, FI is a younger than MA. This phenomenon is rare to found in some areas in Lombok. Thus, we may assumed that, for some cases, power and different social strata not influence one to use *alus* as a must and allow the norms.

4.3 Language Pattern of their communicative interactions

In this stage, this study contained the important thing related to the language pattern of ones toward the different people. This study makes a result that caste system in Suralaga becomes unnecessarily point to require ones to employ *alus* in everyday verbal communication. *Alus*, as the highest style of speech in Sasak community, include Suralaga village, befall a big consideration to be used. This can be proved by fact that most of *mènak* people not use *alus* as their style in their community even in their family member. This because the lack of knowledge about *alus* including its lexica items and solidarity. We may see the *jamaq* expressions instance words “*aok*” or “*wah*” in the circumstance of ‘among *mènak*’ communication

instead of “*nggih*” “*sampun*”. This may be caused by the same status and age level for example among old people or among young people or older to younger *ménak*. However, this rule may be broken by some *ménak* people, *jamaq* form is also acceptable to be used for the younger to older people. This condition can be seen in the conversation below:

- (6) IR: “Nak Na, **pe** ronas ka piring **no**”
 Disc. Na you wash please plates DEM
 “Na, wash those plates!”
 RT: “**aok**. Nengka julug.”
 Yes now first
 “Yes, wait a moment”

The example above verified that not all noble people families use *alus* in their family member especially from younger to older people. There is no *alus* forms in the sentence. RT (junior) that hopefully employs *alus* or *tengaq* style, obviously uses *jamaq* word “aok” “Yes” to respond IR (senior *ménak*). However, it does not become a big problem in their community.

In some studies, *alus* can be employed to non *ménak* people who have high power in society such as prominent figure, or a Muslim scholars *tuan Guru*. This claim also found in society. The conversation below shows the evidence of the use of *alus* toward non *ménak* people.

- (7) HM : “*Judulnya niki miq., e., peralatan dan mesin gih?*”
 Title-poss this sir tools and machine, QT
 “ Sir, the title is ‘tools and machines’, isn’t it?”
 MA : “*nggih*”
 Yes
 “Yes, that’s right”

The data above, show that non noble people (MA) employs *alus* word *nggih* to respond HM who hold non *ménak* status.

In the other situation, *alus* is employed to the stranger. *Alus* can be change directly depend on the interlocutor, if the interlocutor use *alus* during the conversation, so *alus* will be maintained.

4.4 The factors influencing the patterns of their interactions

a. Age level

The use of each style is determined of how old the interlocutor we talk to. Both ‘among *ménak*’ and ‘*ménak*-non *ménak*’ setting, age level is the main factor determining the use of styles. The younger people have to be humble and respect toward older people. The older people will not use high style to the younger because they states “*nganakangta*” which means that all of younger people are supposed as their children by them and should respect to the older one. The following evidence is taken from ‘among *ménak*’ conversations:

- (8) L: *Pira niki kak sri? Pira Dji-Sam-Soe saik kak sri?*
 H-Q this sister Sri? H-Q Dji-Sam-Soe one Sri?
 “How much is this, Sri? How much is one cigarette Dji-sam-Soe, Sri?”

S: *Imbe no dik?*
 REL DISC little sister
 “Which one do you mean my little sister?”

Here, both speakers are *ménak* in different age level; L is 28 years old and S is 45 years old. Thus, L employ *Alus* style of demonstrative pronoun *niki* for this as the polite sign.

In other cases, the use of *jamaq* style is frequently seen in the conversation between people the people who are in the similar age illustrated as below:

(9) RT : “**pe** kembe ke **nini**?”
 You go QM DEM.
 “Where will you go?”
 EV : “**ne** wah **ku** keliling”
 DEM already I go-around
 “I have just go around this village”

It is different from the previous conversation (8), no *alus* or *tengaq* style appears here while RT and EV is in different caste. EV who is in low status ‘commoner’ show the use of *jamaq* style to RT who is a high status ‘noble’ people. This phenomenon caused by both the speaker and interlocutor are in the same age level.

b. Social status

The second one, honorary of society is important to be considered to the people to use *alus* in a conversation. The honorary in this case is defined as the status held by a person. The higher a status of a person, the more appropriate they get *alus* form from the other people. For instance, a person who bears religious status i.e hajj, and as headmaster in a school will use the appropriate style depending on their respect to the other. For the clearer, the example below is available, MA is a teacher who hold (senior) *ménak* status and KP is a hajj and a head master of an elementary school who hold non *ménak* status.

(10) MA: “*data I dari kantor niki untuk pengisian peralatan dan mesin niki.*
 Data REL from office this to fill tools and mechine

Plungguh, sampun napi, tiang selseaikan niki”.

You already what I finished this

I’ve filled the data of equipments and machines”

HM: “*O, sampun, sudah tiang, di kantor kemaren.*”

O, already already I at office yesterday

“O, I’ve received it at the office yesterday”

A number of *alus* form (bolded words) appear in the utterances of both speakers meant they try to respect each other. MA switched two languages that are bahasa Indonesia and Sasak *alus*. it seems that this case is the strategy to show respect and formality. And conversely, KP also understand and did the strategy. As the theory, MA is proper to be addressed by using *alus* by people because he is a senior and educated people. However, KP, the commoner, was obviously responded well by using *alus* by

KP. The reason for this phenomenon is; KP has higher social status related to occupation and religiosity than MA has.

In short, *जार करंग* ‘commoner’ may receive *alus* form from *ménak* because of his honorary in society even less toward the *tuan guru* (moslem scholar). It is not surprising that *tuan guru* get *alus* style from the people because they are seen as the highest status in society. Thus, the carefulness in delivering best language happens, and as the result people keeps *alus* style to communicate.

c. Social distance relationship

The relationship of the speaker and interlocutor determines what style of speech should be applied. There are two types relationship in this case that are close and distance relationship. The first relationship is defined as ‘intimacy’. The people who are, possible, include this category are they who are on the similar age. The style that mostly used by them is *jamaq* style. The latter relationship is often related to the distance of the speakers. Thus, the people who are on this line are caused by the difference of social status such as between the head of village and commoner. In daily conversation, they usually may use *jamaq* and/or *tengaq* style, but to show their respect to the interlocutor, the of course, use *tengaq* atyle. As the evidence, the examples below are available to be analyzed:

(11) SR : *Epe apake?*
You what?

“What do you want?”

DI : *Kepeng-ku*
money-POSS

My money

SR : *Pirake?*
Quest.
“How much?”

DI : *Limaolas*
“fifteen
“Fifteen rupiahs”

The conversation above conducted by a seller (SR) and a buyer (DI). The transcript above indicated that age and social status are not considered whereas DI is a non *ménak* people while SR is a senior *ménak* people. It is not allowed the traditional role of language: ‘power’ determines one’s language. There is no *alus* words that illustrate the respect uttered by DI. However, it is acceptable in society. Factor caused this situation is ‘intimacy’ proved by the attendance of *ku* ‘my’ possessive form of *aku* “I”.

CONCLUSIONS

This study is about the speech style of *Ménak* people in Suralaga village. The results of this study show that Suralaga people especially non-menak people are lack of *alus* expressions in their communicative interactions. Commonly the people mostly use *jamaq*

style in their interactions. For detail, there are some points will be explained related to this study as below:

1. Styles of speech that appear in among *menak* speakers are *tengaq* and *jamaq* styles. *Uniquely*, *Jamaq* style is the dominant style used among *menak* speakers. This can be represented by the percentages on the table 4.2 and 4.3 which shows that *jamaq* expressions are frequently used that is about 99 times appear on the corpus while *tengaq* style about 34 times. The comparison of the two is significant; 74.43% for *jamaq* style and 25.56% for *tengaq* style. In addition, it seems that they lack of vocabularies of *alus*. *Alus/tengaq* expressions that may we found based o the data in hand are *niki* 'this', *plungguh* 'you', *tiang* 'I', *mangkin* 'now' and *napi* 'what'.
2. In '*menak*- non-*menak*' environment, the styles of speech used are *jamaq* and *tengaq*. Again, *jamaq* style become the dominant style used by the people whether from *menak* to non-*menak* and non-*menak* to *menak*. The percentage of *tengaq* style is significant about 21.85% (66 times) and *jamaq* is about 78.14% (236 times). Thepercentages indicate that *jamaq* style is also used dominantly in '*menak*- non-*menak*' setting of communications in Suralaga village.
3. Patterns of their communicative interaction are various. In their daily conversations, *menak* people mostly use *jamaq* style whether in their family member or in society. *alus/jamaq* style is still used by junior *menak* to respond senior *menak*. In addition, in *menak*-non *menak* environment, *jamaq* also become dominant style in use. The speaker either a *menak* or a non *menak* will utter *jamaq* expressions when they communicate. He/she may use *alus* if the interlocutors employ *alus* or if his/her interlocutor has big power in society.
4. There are three major factors affect the patterns of their communicative interaction: age level, social status, and social distance relationship. Everyone mostly attuned to use *jamaq* style in speech although the addressee is *ménak* people. *Alus* become crucial if distance lying between speaker and addressee. The distance here means that the interlocutors and the speakers have different social status. Thus, *alus* is as the variable of politeness to show respect to the appropriate people to be respected.

Bibliography

- Ayeomoni. 2006. *Nordic journal of african studies 15(1): code-switching and code-mixing: style of language use in childhood in yoruba speech community*. Nigeria : Obafemi Awolowo University.
- Borbély, A. (2005). *Changes in Bilingual Language Choice Influenced by Real and Apparent Time: Panel Study in the Process of Language Shift in a Romanian Minority Community Living in Hungary*. Research Institute for Linguistics, Hungarian Academy of Sciences
- Carston, R. (1999). *Review of Herbert H. Clark, Using language*. 1996. Pp. xi+432. *Journal of linuistics*, 35, pp167-222
- Coupland, N. (2007). *Style: Language variation and identity*. New York: Cambridge University press
- Clark, H. (1996). *Using language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Fairclough,N.2003. *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Kempton, P.K.U.W. 1984. What is the Sapir-Whorp-Hyphothesis? *American Anthropologies* 86, 85-79.
- Mahadi and Jafari. 2012. *Language and culture*. International journal of Human and social science. Vol.2. No. 17. USA: Center for promoting ideas.

- Mahyuni.2006. *Speech Styles and Cultural Consciousness in Sasak Community*. Mataram, Lombok: Cerdas Press.
- Martini.2012. *Language and group identity: a case study of Aik Bukak community*. Mataram university
- Mahmud,M., 2013. *The roles of Social status, Age, Gender, Familiarity, and Situation in being polite for Bugis Society*. *Asian social science*; vol.9. No. 5. USA Canadian Center of science of science and education.
- Meyerhoff, M. (2006). *Introducing Sociolinguistics*. New York: Routledge.
- Nilep, Chad. 2006. *Code Switching” in Sociocultural Linguistics*. Colorado Research in Linguistics. Vol. 19. Boulder: University of Colorado.
- Othman, M.F.A. 2006. *Language Choice Among Arabic-English Bilingualism in Manchester, Britain*. *School of Language, Linguistics and Cultures*. Manchester.
- Rahman, A.R.M.D.M., et.al. n.d. *Patterns of Language Choice in Education Domain: The Malaysian Context*.
- Riehl C. M. 2005. *Code-switching in Bilinguals: Impacts of Mental Processes and Language Awareness*. Proceedings of the 4th International Symposium on Bilingualism, ed. JamesCohen, Kara T. McAlister, Kellie Rolstad, and Jeff MacSwan, 1945-1959. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.
- Searle, John R. 2006. What is language for landaufnlsavas. What is language: some preliminary remarks.
- Sophocous, Andry. 2011. *Switching code and changing social identities in face to face interaction*.
- Sumarsono (2004). *Sociolinguistik*. Yogyakarta :PUSTAKA PELAJAR
- Wardhaugh, Ronald. 1970. *Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis 14. p.paper given at the fourth annual TESOL conversation*. San Fransisco. California.
- Walters, Joel. 2005. *The sociopragmatic-Psycology interface*. London:Lawrence Erlbaum Associate.
- Widyaningsih, Intania. 2012. *Language And Group Identity: A Case Study Of Aik Bukak Community*. University of Mataram
- Winter. 2010. *The functions of code-switching in a korean sunday school sun-young shin*. Bloomington: Indiana University press
- Yanti, Raihan E.A. (2012). *Language Choice Among Nobles And Nobles : A Case Study In Plampang Sumbawa Besar” Refined Language Maintenance Amongmembers Of Nobles And Nobles Sasak Family At Majeluk Mtaram*. University of Mataram.
- Yusra,K. 2012. *Language and Social Solidarity: A New Horizone in The Study of Language and Social Realities*.Mataram: Cerdas