

# English Idiomatic Equivalence on the Way of Speaking of Women in Pannampu Traditional Market Community: A Sociolinguistic Perspective

Prisna Aswarita Putri  
Institut Agama Islam Negeri Palu  
Palu, Central Sulawesi, Indonesia

Hamzah A. Machmoed  
Faculty of Cultural Sciences - Hasanuddin University  
Makassar, South Sulawesi, Indonesia

**Abstract:- English Idiomatic Equivalence on the Way of Speaking of Women in Pannampu Traditional Market Community: A Sociolinguistic Perspective.** This research aims to figure out the English idiomatic equivalence on the way of speaking of women in Pannampu traditional market community, and displaying the way strong expletives are used in their everyday speech. It was conducted within Pannampu traditional market community and Hasanuddin University Makassar. Data were collected from field and library research. They consisted of recordings of everyday speech and any other secondary sources. The research employed an ethnographic qualitative design with a functional semiotic analysis approach. In collecting data, the researcher employed participant observation where the object collected had been specified before. This research displays that the way of speaking of women in Pannampu traditional market community was carried out by contextualized casual language (the words that are used indexing the context constructing the meaning), the use of clitics and particles, and also by employing conduplicatio rhetorical system (the repetition of word or words exists to highlight the meaning). Furthermore, it is figured out that the way strong expletives are used in everyday communication are by indexing the names of food, animals, bodily effluvia, sexuality, and the state of human intelligence.

**Keywords:- Sociolinguistics, Way of Speaking, Women, Strong Expletives.**

## I. INTRODUCTION

When it comes to a matter having to do with language and gender, it has been presumably stated that women and men do apply language use differently. Numerous scholars have pinpointed this issue e.g., Zimmerman and West in Fasold[1] and Gal in Weatherall[2], resulting in such kind of conclusion that their differences in language use vary from phonological, morphological, and syntactical aspects. These kinds of differences, from a sociolinguistic perspective, come up as the result of the rules practiced within society, which, carry the normative value of what to do and do not.

As the data gained from her research on herself and her acquaintances, Lakoff[3], stated that one of the distinguishing features of language use by gender is the

strength of expletives. As for men, using strong expletives can be tolerated, while for women, it cannot. This is highly related to the stereotype in most societies around the world that the appropriate language used by women in expressing surprise and anger is weak expletives.

According to de Klerk in Murphy[4], the expletive is the word that is highly related to sex and excretion which can be divided into two; strong and weak. How an expletive is classified is proposed by Lakoff[3], as follows:

*The difference between using “shit” as opposed to “oh dear” lies in how forcefully one says how one feels - perhaps, one might say, choice of particle is a function of how strongly one allows oneself to feel about something, so that the strength of an emotion conveyed in a sentence corresponds to the strength of the particle.*

Language is a complicated, changed, and subtle thing[5]. In South Sulawesi-Indonesia, the local languages are Makassarese, Buginese, Torajanese, etc. they have their own way of expressing the language. Example, the Buginese speaker use a various strategy of apology in apologizing[6]. Strong expletive is used mostly in casual languages, such as the communication among close friends and family relatives, and those which takes place in the traditional market as well. During the pre-research observation in Pannampu traditional market, the researcher encountered a number of women who were frequently using such strong expletives which, on the contrary, were less uttered in other areas in Makassar. The use of strong expletives seems to be very normal among women talk in that community.

The researcher considered the way of speaking, in regards to everyday speech, was needed to be investigated since it was used the most and virtually represents the nature of one's being. Moreover, the habitual use of strong expletives by women in that community made their way of speaking peculiar. By conducting this research, the researcher set goals in figuring out how the way of speaking of women in Pannampu traditional market community was carried out and the ways of the strong expletives used by the women in the community.

Theoretically, this research expectedly would enrich the elaboration of social relations women bond in a particular community which constructing their way of

speaking. That was done by conducting participant observation in a community living within *Pannampu* traditional market community and conducting an in-depth analysis of the way of speaking of English society as displayed in the movie *My Fair Lady* (1964). Practically, it was expected to foster mutual understanding between insiders and outsiders of a particular community in regards to the way of speaking used and to trigger others to conduct research in the scope of Sociolinguistics.

## II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Some scholars have conducted researches on this issue and were taken as the previous related studies. Each previous study displays three main points this research draws attention to; language and gender, way of speaking, and strong expletives.

### 2.1. Lakoff (1975)

She in her work *Language and Women's Place* proposed a notion of Gender Register, in which, the language used is distinguishably applied by women and men. These linguistic features are on lexical and syntactical levels.

On the lexical level, women use more detailed color descriptions such as "mauve" in describing the color variation of purple, while men do not. Secondly, they are able to use both feminine and neutral adjectives while men are not. Thirdly, women are expected to use, and virtually do use weaker expletive than men. Member of American society Lakoff investigated have more tolerance to men when saying fuck or shit, while women should replace those words with oh dear! or other weak expletives.

On the syntactical level, women normally use indirect requests to ask for help, tag questions for expressing their uncertainty of the statement delivered before, and raising intonation of any statements to transform them into interrogative form.

### 2.2. Sherzer (1983)

He in his book *Kuna Way of Speaking* conducted research of Kuna way of speaking by analyzing any related linguistic documents and checked out some varieties of the language covering the traditional speech situations, acts, and components in the speech community. In his research, he covered the relationship between ritual and every day speeches in Kuna society. This research displays the ways of speaking among San Blas Kuna Indians of Panama, and from the research result, it was revealed that the way of speaking in Kuna society was based on the ritual varieties of language. It could be seen by pinpointing the name of the language, in which, using the name of Kuna tribe Kantule for the name of the chief language, stick doll language, everyday Kuna language, and other varieties of the language.

### 2.3. Daly et al (2004)

In the journal *Expletives as Solidarity Signals in FTAs on the Factory Floor* examined the uses and functions

of the expletive fuck in interaction among workers in one of New Zealand soap factories work team. From the data collected, they concluded that it typically required a deep understanding of the cultural norms and values of the community of practice involved for acting in ways which were contextually appropriate.

### 2.4. Winiasih (2010)

She in her thesis *Swearing in "Basa Suroboyoan": a Sociolinguistic Analysis* investigated the swearing-in Basa Suroboyoan (the casual language used in Surabaya). From the investigation, she then figured out that the forms of swearing-in Basa Suroboyoan were found in the base and derived form, in the phrase, and clause. Secondly, the characteristics of swearing forms were referring to many conditions, such as animal, body parts, food, place, and onomatopoeia. Thirdly, the function of swearing-in "Basa Suroboyoan" basically was emotive. Lastly, code-switching in the form of language was code-switching involving Javanese and Indonesian, Javanese and English, and Javanese and Arabian.

This research elaborated one of the woman's registers Lakoff pinpointed in her research; strong expletives used by women. Thus, it expectedly gave a contribution to the development of the theory associated with this research. The differences between this research and Daly et al and Winiasih lied on the social situations engaged. These different social situations obviously led to different results.

In order to accurately analyzing the way of speaking, it was needed to cope with the use of language and social relations engaged. In relating language and society, one should avoid the pitfall of misconception between the terms 'Sociolinguistics' and 'Sociology of language'. Sociolinguistics, according to Wardhaugh[7], one investigates how social attributes such as gender and educational status affect the way people employ linguistic features in their communication, while in Sociology of language, one investigates what the society do with their languages, that is their attitudes that account for functional distributions of speech form in societies.

Hymes[8] proposed an ethnographic framework namely the SPEAKING framework displaying factors affecting the way of speaking employed by members of society: (1). Setting and Scene; setting is concrete circumstances such as time and place, while the scene is psychological circumstance such as the degree of formality, (2). Participants, (3). Ends; the goals of communication, (4). Act sequence; the forms and contents of what is communicated, (5). Key; verbal, paraverbal and non-verbal cues, (6). Instrumentalities; the choices of channel, (7). Norms of interaction and interpretation; it is cultural, (8). Genre; types of utterance e.g. lectures, pray, poem, riddle etc.

In critically analyzing discourse, Blommaert[9] pinpointed the interaction between discourse and social structure where social structure established the context formulated within the text. The context shaped how the

interaction went along. As different context affecting one's perception towards a text, the meaning was created by the way text match the slot of context.

Contextualization, as it was explained by Gumperz in Blommaert[9], is any aspect of context that takes responsibility for any interpretation to stand in for discovering the meaning of a text. As for this contextualization, one can predict what others' unsaid intention, purposes, and goals of uttering such words by pinpointing verbal, non-verbal, and behavioral cues produced in one's interaction. Blommaert noted that the essential relation of interpretation and contextualization was that of context affected the meaning of the text, and vice versa. A common text may lead to any different kinds of interpretation due to some kinds of context covering the process if its exchange from the producer to the receiver, as well as this kind of context can wholly change the atmosphere covering the relation between them. Thus, it can be concluded that in order to comprehend social sense-making, one must comprehend the context in which it is developed.

As contextualization has something to do with interpretation, it is a production of two minds combined as well. Being a producer of a text and introducing the context covering it, the speaker remains incomplete without the listener, as the receiver who takes part in the interaction. Here, the role of the listener is a granter, whether the context carried within a text delivered by the speaker fits the social condition where the interaction takes place. This is what so-called contextualization is dialogical. Being dialogical does not mean that it must be cooperative. The contextualization may also be achieved in conflictive encounters. Besides, the concept of contextualization may appear in inexistence. Interactants may execute their communication without carrying the same background knowledge of linguistic cues used. It also can be achieved in a state of asymmetrical power relation in such interaction. They may have a different level of access to control the process of handling the interaction. Doctor-patient interaction leads the doctor to access the control of communication higher than the patient. And so is in the interaction of parents-children.

In coping with contextualization, one needs to cope with the components of discourse. Discourse consists of denotational text and interactional happening in the performance, in which, in order to cope with the uptake of it, one needs to take a side on the balanced view where the denotational text and interactional happening in the performance are equally taken into account and related as well.

According to Silverstein in Sandarupa[10], the denotational text is structure-related features, it is grammar-focused. The utterance of this text is called a text sentence, which contains a proposition. The information carried out in this utterance is explicitly delivered, so it is stated that in denotational text, the analysis explains what a text forms structurally. Interactional happening in performance is the pragmatic sense of the utterance, in which, the analysis

explains what a text forms contextually. Social relations of the interactions involved in speech events and the social situations affect the construction of its meaning. For example, one says "I am preparing for my exam". The denotational text of this utterance is that she will face examination and preparing everything to get a maximum score. Yet the sentence can transform into a polite refusal when the social relation of interlocutors are senior and junior at the campus in which the senior asks his junior to have a date. When the meaning is implicitly delivered, the interactional happening in performance is taken into account.

As it is explained above, to cope with the uptake of the balanced view and relating denotational text and interactional happening in performance, it is needed to use a functional semiotic approach (Silverstein in Sandarupa[10]). This approach is based on Peircean semiotic triadic relation. Sandarupa[11] used the term meditational text which is similar to the functional semiotic approach proposed by Silverstein. He stated that this approach is a concept that relates utterance and its context. Utterances carry out indexes that point out how context is judged.

As it is stated that Semiotics is a study of signs and their use, functional semiotics theories cohesive and coherent cues that establish the regularity of a text, indexing the relevant context and interactional states of the text. Silverstain in Sandarupa[11] stated:

*"A sign, or representamen, is something which stands to somebody for something in some respect of capacity. It addresses somebody, that is, creates in the mind of that person an equivalent sign, or perhaps a more developed sign. That sign which creates I call the interpretant of the first sign. The sign stands for something, its object. It stands for that object, not in all respects, but in reference to a sort of idea, which I have sometimes called the ground of the representamen"*

Based on the elaboration above, it is stated that sign consists of some components; sign as representamen, object, and idea. Besides, there is also interpretant, as the sign created in mind.

### III. METHODOLOGY

#### 3.1. Research Design

Ethnographic qualitative method was employed to find out the answers of the questions set for the research.

#### 3.2. Sources of Data

Data were collected from field and library research. The data were recordings of everyday speech of women in Pannampu traditional market community and any other secondary sources.

#### 3.3 Social Situations

According to Spradley[12], what to be observed in doing qualitative research is the social situations; actor, place, and activity. The social situations of this research were

women in Pannampu traditional market community, focusing on their everyday speech.

### 3.4. Methods of Collecting Data

In collecting data, the researcher employed participant and mini-tour observation, in which, according to Sugiyono (2014), is doing observation narrowly with specific facets. It was done by recording the communication among women in the community then sorting the data which contains strong expletives as the data analyzed.

### 3.5. Methods of Analyzing Data

The facets were: (1). Transcribing the data collected, (2). Morpheme-by-morpheme and then idiomatically translated into English to show the equivalent terms, (3). Analyzing the data by employing a functional semiotic approach, in which, bridging the denotational and interactional text. According to Silverstein in Sandarupa[10], denotational text is structure-related features, it is grammar-focused. The information carried out in this utterance is explicitly delivered, so it is stated that in denotational text, the analysis explains what a text forms structurally. Interactional text is the pragmatic sense of utterance, in which, the analysis explains what a text forms contextually. And finally, (4). Verifying the data collected to draw conclusions.

## IV. FINDING AND DISCUSSION

### 4.1 Findings

The findings elaborated the representation of data in some social situations which displayed how the way of speaking of women in *Pannampu* traditional market community was carried out and the way the strong expletives were used by them.

#### 4.1.1 How the Way of Speaking was Carried Out

##### Social Situation 3

A group of middle-school girls was gossiping about her friend who did not make it to come to their gathering. It took place in the living room of one of the girls' houses. The girl who was gossiped about was supposed to come since she was also in the team preparing the stuff for the culinary art exam tomorrow at their school. The fact that she was absent made her friends angry. The speech acts employed were declarative and exclamation.

##### **Girl 1: (8) *Indah toh nda bae na, sigappai Hajrah.***

*Indah toh nda bae na, sigappai i Hajrah*

Indah (dialect) no good (clitic) very same deixis  
Hajrah Indah isn't nice anymore, neither is Hajrah.

##### **Girl 2: (9) *Kenapai?***

*Kenapa i?*

Why (3sg.obj, deixis) her?

What happened?

##### **Girl 3: (10) *Sok lupdar mi, sundalaka.***

*Sok lupdar (lupa daratan) mi sundala-ka.*  
Acting (abbrev) chesty (clitic) has bitch. (clitic)  
She's acting chesty, bitch!

##### **Girl 1: (11) *Iyyo, sok cuek mi. Iyo cuek mi. Sundalaka.***

*Iyyo. sok cuek mi. iyo cuek mi.*  
Yes acting indifferent has yes indifferent (clitic) has.

##### *Sundala-ka.*

Bitch (clitic)

Yeah, she's acting indifferently. She's indifferent. Bitch!

The data displayed a lot of clitics used within the conversation. Clitic, as it explained in Merriam-Webster dictionary, is a word that is treated in pronunciation as forming a part of a neighboring word and that is often unaccented or contracted.

When particle *toh* was used in the middle of a sentence such as in data 8 and 14, function to highlight what was said. When it was used at the end of the sentence, it functions as tag question.

Clitic *-i* that follows a verb in Makassarese language is used as the third singular person, in which, the identity of the person has been explained in the previous clause, as in *sigappai* which is shown in data 8, and *kenapai* which is shown in data 9. This clitic is the actor-focused construction marker, used to refer to the actor that executes the action.

Clitic *-mi* is perfective, added to a verb for expressing the action that has been done by the actor. It can also be inferred that something is already done. In this conversation, it is shown in data 10 and 11. In this social situation, the clitic *-mi* can also be interpreted as to let something happen, as shown in data 13. So *biarmi* means just let it be.

Clitic *-ka* usually appears after strong expletives, functions to stress the strength of what is said. It was shown in data 10 and 11. This clitic is the indexical cue of the anger state of the speakers toward their friends who did not come.

In order to stop their friends from their gossiping activity, girl 3 used particle *nah*. *Nah* is the indexical cue of future action, implying that the verb it is embedded to will be executed. In this social situation, it was shown in data 17.

There were two strong expletives used in this social situation; *sundala* (bitch) and *kabbulamma* (son of bitch). To soften the strong expletive *kabbulamma*, Makassarese people sometimes use the term *kabulampe*, as the pun of it. From this social situation, it could be inferred that the way women in that community carried out their way of speaking was by employing clitics and particles. The clitics and particles were described in table 1:

**Table 1. Clitics in Makassarese Language and Dialect**

Makassarese Clitics and Particles	Use	Function	Example
_e	Embedded to the last word in sentence	Dialect marker	<i>Minggirko tawwae!</i> (Step aside, please)
Na	After verb or adjective	As intensifier, it means ‘very’	<i>Tara’ na kaue!</i> (He’s an asshole, you know)
Toh	In the middle of the sentence  At the end of the sentence	Highlight what is said  Tag question	<i>Indah toh nda bae na.</i> (Indah is really bad)  <i>Mulut-mulutku ji toh?</i> (This is my own mouth, isn’t it?)
_i	Embedded to the verb	Actor focus construction marker	<i>Kenapai?</i> (What happened with her?)
Mi	After verb	Perfective marker, used to describe something is done/someone has changed.  Letting something happen	<i>Sok lupdar mi.</i> (She’s acting indifferently).  <i>Biarmi.</i> (Let it be)
_ka	Embedded to open syllable word	Highlight the meaning	<i>Sundalaka!</i> Bitch!
Nah	At the end of the sentence.	Future expression  Asking permission	<i>Ku panggilki nah</i> (I’ll call her)  <i>Malampi nah?</i> (How about in the evening?)
_a	Embedded to closed syllable word	Highlight the meaning	<i>Telanga!</i> Cunt!
Di	At the end of the sentence	Asking permission	<i>Bermalam biasama di Rappokalling di?</i> (How about I spend night at Rappokalling?)
Pi	After verb/adverb	Future expression	<i>Malampi.</i> (In the evening, then)
Ji	In the middle/at the end of the sentece  In the middle of interrogative	Highlight the meaning of idea delivered  Asking question	<i>Na bilang memang ji.</i> (She told me)  <i>Sudah ji ditelfon mama?</i> (Have (you) called mom?)

Table 1 displayed the clitics and particles used as the characterization of how the way of speaking was carried out, shown on data 8 to 11. Besides, from the data, it was also inferred that the way of speaking of women was carried out by employing contextualized casual language, and by conduplicatio rhetorical system, as shown in data 11.

**4.1.2 How the Strong Expletives Used by Women in the Community**

**Social Situation 7**

A group of women approximately forty years old were bought at one of meat’s shops in the market when they start their gossiping. They gossiped about someone who had just left the shop. The speech acts employed were declarative and exclamation.

**Woman 1: (33) *Itu tiap hari toh, lain-lain menu. Selalu datang maccoba-coba.***

*Itu tiap hari toh, lain-lain menu. Selalu*  
(deix) She everyday (clitic) different menu. Always

*datang ma coba-coba.*  
Come (ac.pref) taste.

Everyday, (we serve) different menu and she always comes to taste.

**Woman 2: (34) *Na bilang memang ji itu nah. Na bilang memang ji.***

*Na bilang memang ji itu nah.*  
(3sg.sub) She say indeed (clitic) (deix) (clitic)

*Na bilang memang ji.*  
(3sg.sub) She say indeed (clitic)

She told me that. She told me.

**Woman 3: (35) *Ka tarasi itu paeng. Udede* (giggling)**

*Ka tarasi itu paeng. Udede!*  
So shrimp paste (deix)that then. Gosh!

She is such a grub, then. Gosh!

In their conversation, in order to keep the conversation on track in discussing food issues, the strong expletive used here also derived from a food name. One of the speakers uttered *tarasi* which literally means condiment made from pounded and fermented shrimp or small fish, or shrimp paste. It transforms into a strong expletive which was usually employed for expressing the feeling of upset. This term was used because it smells strongly bad, indexing the one who has referred to this strong expletive as a bad person.

The word *tarasi* is considered to have the equivalent meaning with 'grub', which, literally means to dig, or a kind of small insect or larva, which is edible. It is also slangily used to refer to food or something that is extremely delicious. But then, it is contextually transformed into an expression that describes someone who is dirty and gross and possesses bad habits. In conjunction to the negative value, it comes out, the word becomes an expletive for Australian people who use it in their communication. The word 'grub' was admittedly spoken by the Education Minister of Australia, Christopher Pyne, in May 2014 at a parliament meeting, to address the Opposition Leader, Bill Shorten, and made him being highly criticized by the citizens of Australia. (The Sidney Morning Herald[13]).

**Social Situation 7**

In this social situation, the data was in full Makassarese language, while the others were broken Makassar-Indonesian dialect. Below conversation was done among family, in front of the future bride house (wedding party preparation). Bride's mother was busy cooking with others from the same neighborhood, her daughter was peeling unions, while the son was busy looking at his phone and sitting on the chair.

**Mother: (42) *Lampako rong malliangna ce'la* (yelling at her son)**

*Lampa ko rong malliang nga ce'la*  
Go you clitic buy (clitic) I salt  
Buy me salt, please.

**Son: (43) *edede, mangnganga Ma. Sinampe pi.***

*Edede mangngang nga Ma. Sinampe pi*  
(Intj) Ugh tired (clitic) I Mom. Later (clitic) then  
Ugh, I am tired, Mom. Later, then.

**Mother: (44) *Kuttuna anak-anaka, lombo tedongko kau. Mentong, lombo tedong.***

*Kuttu na anak-anaka, lombo tedong ko kau.*  
Lazy(clitic)very children big buffalo (clitic)you you.

*Mentong, lombo tedong.*  
Definitely, big buffalo.

You are a very lazy boy. You are just like a big pig.

**Daughter: (45) *We Aco, kodi-kodina tanjaknu. Galau mami oke.***

*We Aco, kodi-kodi na tanjak nu.*  
(intj)Hey Aco ugly (clitic) very face your.

*Galau mami oke.*  
Gloomy (clitic) okay.

Hey Aco, how bad you are!  
All you do just being gloomy all day long.

**Son: (46) *Songkolo, singkamma tong bajik tanjak-na. Nai kana galauka? Tena ji kapang.***

*Songkolo, singkamma tong bajik tanjak-nu.*  
Glutinous rice same clitic good face you

*Nai kana galau ka? Tena ji kapang.*  
Who say gloomy I? No clitic maybe

Damn! Do you think you are good? Who say I am gloomy?  
Of course I am not.

Within the conversation, the mother referred to her son as *tedong* (buffalo), the animal that indexing laziness, combined with the adjective *lombo* that literally meant 'big'. Thus, it could be concluded that the mother used indexical cues which sent the message that her son was a lazy-big boy. The reason was that he made excuses when asked to buy salt. In Western society, the animal which indexes laziness is the pig. Following the conversation between her mother and her brother, the daughter then concluded that her brother just avoided her mother's order and pretending to be tired. She used the term *tanjak* which literally means 'face' to represent his whole personality.

Another strong expletive used in this social situation was *songkolo* which literally meant 'glutinous rice'. From the interactional happening in the performance analysis, this kind of food become strong expletive word, used to swear in Makassarese society. This word was the indexical cue for something sticky, which referred to something obnoxious, even though the real food is yummy. Other terms used as strong expletives by them are listed as follows:

**Table 2. Other terms used as strong expletives**

Strong Expletives	Makassarese	English		
		Literal Meaning	Idiomatic Equivalence	Idiomatic Meaning
Food's name	<i>Tarasi</i>	Shrimp paste	Grub	Someone dirty/having bad habit
Animal's name	<i>Songkolo</i>	Glutinous rice	damn	Expression of dissatisfaction
	<i>Tedong</i>	Buffalo	Pig	Lazy
Bodily Effluvia	<i>Telang Tara'</i>	Vagina ass	Cunt, bitch asshole	Bad woman Bad person
Sexuality	<i>Sundala Kabbulamma Sunna'</i>	Fuck, bitch Son of a bitch shit	Fuck, bitch Son of a bitch shit	Bad woman Bad person Expression of anger
State of Human Intelligence	<i>Tolo/dongo/dondolo</i>	Stupid, dumb	Stupid, dumb	Stupid, dumb

## 4.2 Discussion

### Way of Speaking of Women in Pannampu Traditional Market Community

This research showed that the way of speaking of women in *Pannampu* traditional market community was characterized by a lot of clitics and particles usage and by employing contextualized casual language.

Even though it has been stated before that the women in the community did not hesitate to bluntly express their feelings and thoughts, they employed some contextualization terms as their way of speaking. In this research, the contextualization was displayed in most of the data, for instance, the use of the word '*tanjak*' which literally means 'face' in data 45, the context covered the social situation transformed the meaning into the personality, so the 'face' was used to represents the 'whole' person, not just the face.

It was also carried out by using conduplicatio rhetorical system. Conduplicatio is a rhetorical term used to illustrate the repetition of a word or words in neighboring phrases or clauses, either to highlight the ideas or to strengthen the expression of feeling. This is typically found in literary works such as the novel, even in songs, but it is seldom for the way of speaking (Harris, 2003). The speaker used this rhetorical system in their everyday speech to highlight the message they want their listener to receive. Conduplicatio rhetorical system terms are displayed in data 3, 11, 13, 16, 19, 34, 39, and 44.

The strong expletives used most likely in kinship relationship, in which, older family member addresses it directly to the younger ones, while the use of strong expletives by a younger family member was to express the anger or upset feeling to the emotion delivered in the conversation, not directly to the speaker who is older than him/her. And for the age range, the teenager was found the most frequent strong expletives users, since they were still easily shaped by the environment.

## V. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

From the elaboration of findings and discussion, it was shown that the way of speaking of a particular community is something unique, which varies from community to community. It depends on the cultural norm and normative value employed within it. Those who are the outsiders of the community should cope with culture cover the social situation happening in the community before starting to judge or interpret what is said.

Furthermore, the researcher concluded that the way of speaking of women in *Pannampu* traditional market community was carried out by the use of a lot of clitics and particles, contextualized casual language, and conduplicatio rhetorical system. They also used the names of food, animal's names, bodily effluvia, sexuality, and the state of human intelligence as their ways of using strong expletives. The researcher does hope there will be more researchers on the way of speaking. It will be useful to display the uniqueness of a particular community. The researcher also hopes to other scholars to analyze other linguistic features which also subsumed in the study of critical discourse analysis. Moreover, the researcher hopes there will be next studies investigating the issues deeper and more accurately.

## REFERENCES

- [1]. R. Fasold, *Sociolinguistics of language: Vol. II*. Cambridge: Basil Blackwell Inc., 1990.
- [2]. W. Ann, *Gender, Language, and Discourse*. Oxford: Routledge Inc., 2002.
- [3]. R. Lakoff, *Language and Women's Place*, vol. 1, no. Language in Society. New York: Harper&Row Publisher, 1975.
- [4]. B. Murphy, *Corpus and Sociolinguistics: Investigating Age and Gender in Female Talk*. Edinburgh: John Benjamin Publishing Company, 2010.
- [5]. M. R. A. Latief, N. J. Saleh, and A. Pammu, "The effectiveness of machine translation to improve the system of translating language on cultural context," *IOP Conf. Ser. Earth Environ. Sci.*, vol. 575, no. 1, 2020, doi: 10.1088/1755-1315/575/1/012178.

- [6]. Zulkhaeriyah, N. J. Saleh, A. H. Yassi, and F. Rahman, "Strategy of Apology in Buginese: A Sociolinguistic Study," *ELS J. Interdiscip. Stud. Humanit.*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 188–196, 2021, doi: <https://doi.org/10.34050/elsjish.v4i2.14015>.
- [7]. W. Ronald, *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. Cambridge: Blackwell Publishing, 2001.
- [8]. H. Dell, *Ways of Speaking, Book Section of Explorations in the Ethnography of Speaking*. London: Cambridge University Press., 1974.
- [9]. J. Blommaert, *Discourse: a critical introduction*, no. 1999. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- [10]. S. Sandarupa, "The Voice of the Child: Constructing the Moral Society Through the Retteng Poetic Argumentation in Toraja, Sulawesi, Indonesia," 2013.
- [11]. S. Sandarupa, "Membangun Kesadaran Metabahasa Tentang Kearifan Lokal Toraja dan Kontribusinya pada Pembangunan Karakter Bangsa," 2015.
- [12]. S. James, *Participant Observation*. New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston, 1980.
- [13]. L. Megan, *Grub? Christopher Pyne Denies Dropping C-Bomb in Parliament*. Sidney: The Sidney Morning Herald News, 2014.