**CHAPTER II**

**LITERATURE REVIEW**

1. **Slang**
2. Definition of Slang

In daily communication, we should use informal language style with our friends. For example in Indonesian language we often use sentence *“lu lagi ngapain?”* to ask what our friend does at that time, either verbal communication like conversation or written communication like chatting. In English language that informal sentence is named by slang.

According to Sandberg which cited by Forsskahl, “slang is language that takes off it coat, spit on its hands – and goes to work”. It means slang is language which has its own role and meaning in its usage. On the other hands, Forsskahl defines *“slang as a means to mark group identity”[[1]](#footnote-1)*. It can be understood by slang as a tool to know someone identity.
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Adams in Danesi has stated that slang is the informal and restricted language.[[2]](#footnote-2) However, Danesi in his article defines “slang as word magic in modern guise serving both the sacred and profane functions of human life. It covers the whole range of functions from secrecy to colloquial dialogue.”*[[3]](#footnote-3)* In other words, he says that slang is used to express the profane and sacred words in daily conversation.

Another expert defines slang through various approaches. The sociological approach, slang is ascribed the two opposite purposes of keeping insiders together and outsiders out. The stylistic approach, Dumas & Lighter in Mattiello have stated that “slang is not accepted as good, formal usage by the majority”. The last approach is linguistic, slang is distinguished from the standard language in both its morphology and its semantics.[[4]](#footnote-4)

In summary, slang is the informal language used for daily communication usage. It is also used to identify of someone social group. Sometimes, it is used to express secrecy and profanity in daily conversation. Slang also can be defined in various approaches, the sociological, the stylistic, the linguistic and the other approaches.

1. Functions of Slang

Viewed from its usage, according to Eble & Munro in Mattiello slang has many functions in language, the functions are as the follows:

1. To establish and reinforce social identity or cohesiveness within a group or with a trend or fashion in society at large.
2. To gain acceptance in a group and to preserve group solidarity.
3. For such social purposes as being on the same speech level with one’s audiences, facilitating social intercourse, and inducing friendliness or intimacy.[[5]](#footnote-5)

Patridge in Adamo identifies the functions of slang are:

1. To be different, startling, or original.
2. To display one’s membership of a group.
3. To be secretive or to exclude others.
4. To enrich stock of language.
5. To establish a friendly rapport with others.
6. To be irrelevant or humorous.[[6]](#footnote-6)
7. Characteristics of Slang

According to Mattiello, there are many characteristics of slang viewed from its sociological properties, they are: group-restriction, informality, freshness, playfulness, privacy and localism.[[7]](#footnote-7) Allan and Burridge (2006) add some characteristics of slang, such as clipping and imitative.[[8]](#footnote-8)

* 1. Group-restriction

This is the characteristic deals with the collocation of slang expressions in group communication. This characteristic shows that slang words or expressions sometimes can be understood by only the member of group and slang is used to express their solidarity.

* 1. Informality

Slang language is used in very informal communication, so one of it characteristics is informality. Informality means that slang is used to soften the seriousness or formality in daily communication, in order to make the communication enjoyable.

* 1. Freshness

Slang words or expressions are always increasing and decreasing age by age based on the language development. That is why slang language always fresh and up to date. People often use slang language is to avoid the monotony of ordinary language, and they usually use slang is to be shown fashionably by others.

* 1. Playfulness

Slang is usually playful, since it manipulates words and their meanings. The jocular use of slang is illustrated, for example like words by *nana* (banana) and *cake* are used jocularly for a foolish or silly person.

* 1. Privacy

Sometimes, people use slang language is to hide their private identity. It generally creates a sense of intimacy among in group members, but at the same time it may create a sense of exclusion or even rejection among those people who are not part of the group. For example, word *babe* is used by teenagers for calling their boy or girl friend for the purpose to hide their boy or girl friend name or identity.

* 1. Localism

They are many regional differences in slang. British, American, and Australian slang, although they share a common language (English), are viewed as different of it. Example, word *bloke* is to change word man or fellow in Australian and British slang, but in American word *guy* is used for it.[[9]](#footnote-9)

* 1. Clipping

Clipping is one of the characteristics of slang language. Clipping means slang which is made by deleting some parts of longer words become a shorter form in the same meaning. For example, word *rents* from standard English ‘parents’, *cuz* for ‘because’ and *bro* for ‘brother’.

* 1. Imitative

Imitative means that slang words or expressions imitating the Standard English words, using Standard English words in different meaning or combining two different words. The example is *wanna.* This word is derived from phrasal words ‘want to’. Word *wanna* is only appropriate in spoken English. Imitative in this term also can be defined as construction.

1. A Few Historically Attested Slang Varieties
2. Seventeenth-Century English Thieves Slang

Table 2.1 Seventeenth-Century English Thieves Slang

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Slang | Standard English |
| Flick | To cut |
| Glimflashy | Angry |
| Fam-grasp | Agree with |
| Glym stick | Candlestick |
| Deuswins | Two pence |
| Flicker-snapt | A glass broken |
| Rum cully | A rich Coxcomb |

1. Nineteenth-Century British and American Slang

Table 2.2 Nineteenth-Century British and American Slang

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Slang | Standard English |
| Step into one’s last bus | To die |
| Absquatulate | To depart, hastily |
| Rumbumptious | Obstreperous |
| Catawamptious | Eager, avid |
| Cantankerous | Ill-humored, etc |
| Fericadouzer | A knock-down blow |
| Slantin(g)dicular | Slanting, oblique |

1. Nineteenth-Century Oxford College Slang

Table 2.3 Nineteenth-Century Oxford College Slang

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Slang | Standard English |
| Internatter | International |
| Brekker | Breakfast |
| Bedder | Bedroom |
| Ecker, eccer | Exercise |
| Deaner | Dean |
| Padder | Paddington station |
| Queener  | Queen St. Cinema |
| Boder  | The Bodleian Library |

1. Recent American College Slang

Table 2.4 Recent American College Slang

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Slang | Standard English |
| Bod | Body ‘a (person’s) body’ |
| Rad | Radical ‘excellent’ |
| Buel | Body + fuel ‘food; to eat’ |
| Scrump | Screw + bump ‘have sex’ |
| Slorch | Slut + whore + bitch vomit + comatose |
| Vomatose | ‘disgusting’ |
| MDG | Mutual desire to grope |
| MLA | Massive lip action[[10]](#footnote-10) |

1. **Sociocultural**

Johnson states that studies about anthropology, applied linguistics, psychology, and education have taken up term sociocultural[[11]](#footnote-11). He also says that “a sociocultural perspective positions social activities and the language used to regulate those activities as being structured and gaining meaning in historically and culturally situated ways”[[12]](#footnote-12). It means that sociocultural influences language of people. Rogoff in Johnson states that “a sociocultural perspective argues that human cognitive development can be understood only in light of the cultural practices and circumstances of their communities – which also change”[[13]](#footnote-13). This is appropriate to the characteristics of slang, they are culture and time restriction and localism.

According to J. Zuengler, E. Miller in N.F. German (2003), sociocultural perspective considers “language as a tool for achieving social and psychological ends, as a resource for managing everyday activities, including the negotiation of identities.”[[14]](#footnote-14) To know something about people, we should know their language or their language style in order to make the interaction with them. Sociocultural perspective also tries to analyze the power dynamics in situated interactions where one or both parties must use a language they have not yet mastered.

* + - 1. Intercultural Communication

Intercultural communication is the way to communicate with others in different culture, it is located at the level of interaction between members of such ever-shifting entities intermediate between humanity and individual human beings: communities, cultures, ethnic groups, nations.[[15]](#footnote-15)

According to Blommaert and Jef Verschueren (1991) there are at least three communicative processes to identity the group.

The first is to be situated at the highest level of linguistic structuring at which choices have to be made from a variable and negotiable range of possibilities: language choice. The second is while language choice is often a very conscious strategy inspired by socio-political motives, it assumes a degree of automaticity under conditions of gradual shift, which turns it into an altogether different phenomenon. The last is to be situated on the same continuum, is code switching.[[16]](#footnote-16)

Blommaert (1991) has stated that a vague and broad notion of culture is used in an explanatory way in many accounts of intercultural communication. The characteristics of this notion are:

1. Monolithic: culture, race, ethnicity are put together into one complex of influences on communication.
2. Stable: it is always there a priori. This cultural influence seem to be independent of discourse internal adaptation.
3. Transcendental: conflicts in intercultural communication are seen as cultural conflicts that arise independently of social, political, etc.[[17]](#footnote-17)
	* + 1. Effective Communication

Communication canbe understood as the process to get the information for many purposes. According to Pagano in Turnbull to accomplish effective communication, message need to be interpreted and responded to in a befitting manner, with both verbal and nonverbal communication being taken into account,[[18]](#footnote-18).

Ibrayeva argues that the conflicts between people for example costumer and front-desk manager can be solved by effective communication.[[19]](#footnote-19) It means, effective communication can help us to solve our problems.

1. **Pragmatics**

To analyze the slang terms used in Black Panther movie, the researcher applied the pragmatic approach. Pragmatics is the study about speaker meaning. Morris which cited by Akmajian has stated that pragmatics is the study about relation of signs to their user.[[20]](#footnote-20) It can be concluded that the scopes of pragmatics are form, context and speaker meaning.

Griffiths has distinguished between pragmatics and semantics. Pragmatics is the study deals with utterance meaning, and semantics deals with sentence and word meaning.[[21]](#footnote-21) He also defines pragmatics as the study about the interaction of semantics knowledge with our knowledge of the world, taking into account context of use.[[22]](#footnote-22)

Another expert has stated another definition of pragmatics. Kreidler says that pragmatics focuses on a person’s ability to derive meanings from specific kinds of speech situations. He also states the pragmatic functions, such as:

* 1. To recognize what the speaker is referring to,
	2. To relate new information to what has gone before,
	3. To interpret what is said from background knowledge about the speaker and the topic of discourse, and
	4. To infer or fill in information that the speaker takes for granted and doesn’t bother to say.[[23]](#footnote-23)
		+ 1. Pragmatics in Film Synchronisation

It is has known above that Pragmatics is the study about the relations between signs and their users. If these users belong to a different cultural world than those for whom the signs were originally intended, we can predict major clashes between these two worlds. “This is the situation which prevails in film synchronisation: here only the verbal part of a global sign system consisting of visual, auditory, and rhythmic stimuli is translated, then this new product is offered to people belonging to more or less strongly divergent culture,” Niemeier[[24]](#footnote-24). It means, in analyzing the movie using pragmatic approach, the semiotic theories will be stressed.

* + - * 1. A semiotic framework for the evaluation of film synchronisation
1. Semiotic categories in sign systems

In semiotic point of view, the context conditions are important in film synchronisation. Because, semiotic point of view is apart particularly from the influence of different sign vehicles, and the cultural context conditions of the sign receivers which may contribute to intercultural misunderstandings in the reception of films.[[25]](#footnote-25)

It is obvious that the pragmatic aspect of the semiotic processes taking place between the sign vehicles of film and the interpreters is the most relevant one in the present analysis context.[[26]](#footnote-26)

1. Application of semiotic categories to film synchronisation

Neimeier in Blommaert (1991) states that semiotic offers a more global basis for the analysis of film synchronisation because it considers a film as an organic entity made up of a narrative plot and language. It analyses the cooperation of all semiotic systems, and an another level, it considers each signifying system in its own right.[[27]](#footnote-27)

1. **Black Panther**

Black Panther is one of the popular American movies in 2018. It is produced by Marvel Studio and distributed by Disney Studios Motion Pictures. The movie which released on February 16th is directed by Ryan Coogler and he was one of the writers of this movie’s scenario. The genre of this movie are action, adventure and scientific fiction. Indeed, this is one of the amazing movie to watch.

Black Panther movie is starred by Chadwick Boseman as T’Challa (Black Panther), Michael B Jordan as his rival (Erik Killmonger), Lupita Nyong’o as Nakia, Danai Gurira as Okoye, Letitia Wright as Shuri (T’Challa’s sister), Daniel Kaluuya as W’Kabi, Martin Freeman as Everett K. Ross, Winston Duke as M’Baku, Sterling K. Brown as N’Jobu, Angela Bassett as Ramonda (T’Challa’s mother), Forest Whitaker as Zuri, Andy Serkis as Ulysses Klaue and many casts else.[[28]](#footnote-28)

This movie is talking about a tribe in Africa named Wakanda. Wakanda is a fiction tribe in Marvel comic. This tribe is very rich of natural resources and technologies, until people out of Wakanda hunt Wakandans’ resource of wealth, that is Vibranium. Vibranium is one of Wakandan tribe’s natural resource which is made to develop the technology development in Wakanda.

The king of Wakanda, T’Chaka, is passed away, and his son T’Challa becomes the next king who starred by Chadwick Boseman. There are many obstacle in preserving his throne as Black Panther, including the interferences from his cousin, Erik Killmonger who has a grudge to the king T’Chaka who has killed their father. Erik Killmonger wants to carry away the throne and he kills T’Challa. But, actually T’Challa is not dead. He is going to take his throne back. Finally, Erik Killmonger is beaten by T’Challa, and T’Challa gets his throne back.
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