



## Article

# Facultative Liaison as a Formal Register Marker in French Oral Communication

Nani Kusrini<sup>1</sup>, Sajarwa Sajarwa<sup>2</sup>, B.R. Suryo Baskoro<sup>3</sup>, Hayatul Cholsy<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>French Education Department, Universitas Lampung, Indonesia

<sup>2-4</sup>French French Litterature, Universitas Gadjah Mada, Indonesia

## SUBMISSION TRACK

Received: March 23, 2023  
Final Revision: May 03, 2023  
Available Online: May 10, 2023

## KEYWORDS

Facultative liaison, style/register, formal variety, French oral communication

## CORRESPONDENCE

E-mail: [sajarwa@ugm.mail.ac.id](mailto:sajarwa@ugm.mail.ac.id)

## A B S T R A C T

Language variations based on the level of formality in spoken communication are not only determined by particular words or morphosyntax but also phonological elements. The concept of formality itself is considered the most important dimension of the variety of styles or registers. This study aims to describe the forms of facultative liaison in present-day French communication and liaison consonants formed by the linking process, to explain whether facultative liaison is still a marker of formal variety, and to reveal the factors that influence its use. This research is a sociolinguistic study with qualitative data using 15 recorded speeches by several politicians (formal) and 21 vlogs from French YouTubers (informal) with a total duration of 6 hours. The results of this study show that facultative liaison is used much more in formal than non-formal communication. Most forms of facultative liaison are a series of verbs être + determinative, auxiliary verbs être/avoir + participe passé (past participle), noun + adjective. It can be concluded that the more formal the communication, the more facultative liaisons are used. The liaison consonant [t] appears the most often, and the dominant factors in the use of facultative liaison are stylistics including formality, shared knowledge, etc, the sensitivity of formality, and the linguistic intuition of the speaker.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Gilbert La Rocque (1943 – 1981), a Canadian writer said *'Ily a un langage pour chaque situation'* (Every situation has its own language). In daily life, the language used adapts to the situation. The language used in meetings with colleagues is different from the one used when bidding on goods in the market. The difference in language is based on more than just the situation. Nababan (1984), Pateda (1987), and Chaer (2010) explain that differences in region, group or social conditions, language situations, level of formality, and differences in years and times can cause language variations. Meanwhile, this language diversity is also not only caused by heterogeneous speakers but also by the social interactions that are carried out. The term to refer to this difference is commonly called a register.

Register has many definitions. Its definition that is widely known includes language varieties related to certain fields of work (Wardhaugh, 2002), language variations based on the domain (Coupland, 2007), and language settings about what language is used for (Halliday in Coupland, 2007). The same thing is expressed by Moreau (1997) that the term register refers to linguistic variations adapted to certain social situations. More narrowly, register, which is a variety of language used for a specific purpose, is associated with, among other things, the level of formality of communication (Hartman and Stork in Alwasilah, 1993).

The term speaking style, which William Labov first introduced in a sociolinguistic context, is used to refer to a style of speech associated with a particular social group, time, and place (Coupland, 2007). So, in this case, the register can be equated

with style because it also refers to the level of formality. The same opinion is confirmed by Holmes (1992) and Trudgill (1974) in Gadet (1996) that the registered concept can be equated with the style concept, which refers to language variations that reflect changes based on situational factors such as place, time, and topic of conversation.

Formality itself has become the concern of linguists and sociolinguists, and the formal/informal dimension is even referred to as “the most important dimension of variation between styles” (Heylighen and Raele, 1999 in Pavlick, E. & Tetreault, J, 2016; Li, H., Cai, Z. & Graesser, A.C., 2013). However, there has yet to be common understanding of formal language. Some define formal language depending on situational factors (Rokhman, 2013) such as social distance and shared knowledge (Sigley, 1997; Hovy, 1987; Lahari et al., 2011 in Pavlick, E. & Tetreault, J, 2016). Meanwhile, according to Labov (1972) in Akhtar, R. & Riaz, M. (2019), the assumptions underlying the definition and formal approach are mostly characterized by “attention to special forms” such as the number of adjectives (Fang & Cao, 2009) or abbreviations (Abu Sheikha & Inkpen, 2011) in Pavlick & Tetreault (2016). Heylighen and Dewaele (1999) define formality as “avoidance of ambiguity” and then formal power is defined as something that is “separate”, “impersonal”, “objective”, “explicit” and less “context-dependent” and “vague”. “. The definition of formal or informal language is determined by many factors including certain linguistic forms, situations, shared knowledge, the social distance between speakers, and less depending on context.

Regarding formality, French recognizes several register classifications called *niveau de langue* (Gadet, 1996). They are generally classified into three, namely *le registre soutenu* (formal variety), *le registre courant/standard* (standard variety), and *le registre familier* (colloquial style). Apart from lexical, morphosyntactic and semantic elements, linguistically phonological elements can also be markers of language variation (Antoni et al, 2019; Zuleha, 2010; Nandra & Reniwati (2006) in Gustina et al, 2018). It is also conveyed by Bouten & Gadet (2003) that language register depends not only on word choice, but also on changes in phrases, the use of tenses and modes. The non-linguistic phenomena also play a role in determining the level of language such as facultative liaisons, the adverbial form *ne* in negation, and interrogative

types.

Words in utterances often sound different when pronounced one by one. In speech, these words are pronounced sequentially, so these sounds can undergo a number of phonetic modifications in a certain manner that are influenced by the surrounding sounds, especially at word boundaries (Oladipopo, 2014). In French, the words in speech are bound together as if without pauses. Speakers who pronounce five or six words sound like only one. This connection of sounds also sounds beautiful because sentences flow smoothly by eliminating sounds that can produce discordant sounds and avoiding hiatus (Palsgrave, p. 1530 in Laks, 2014).

There are several processes of connecting sounds in a speech in French. One of them is liaison which is defined as the pronunciation of a silent consonant at the end of a word when it is followed by a word that begins with a vowel sound in a phrase (Abry & Abry, 2007; Grevisse & Goose, 2008; Kamoun et al., 2016; Gadet in Ferrat, 2012). For example, the phrase *beaucoup à faire* when pronounced individually [bo.ku][a] [fɛʁ] becomes [bo.ku.pa.fɛʁ]. Sometimes a silent consonant can change into another consonant, for example, the phrase *les enfants* [le] [ɑ̃fɑ̃] which becomes [le.zɑ̃.fɑ̃]. This process produces the sound [z] as a link between the two words that make up the phrase.

Linking phenomena such as liaisons can be found in other languages such as English. However, a significant difference lies in their classification. Liaison in French is classified into three, namely mandatory (*obligatoire*), facultative/optional, and forbidden (*interdite*). The factors underlying the realization of liaison in speech are broadly divided into two, namely linguistic (lexical, prosodic, morphosyntactic) and sociolinguistic (stylistic, speech situation, regional origin, socio-cultural, age, etc.) (Fougeron et al, 2001; Eychenne, 2014 in Racine & Detey, 2016).

Facultative liaison or free variation reflects the speaker's choice to carry out a liaison or not, but its realization depends on many factors. In addition to linguistic factors, the realization of this type of liaison is also influenced by sociolinguistic factors including age, area of origin, level of education, social status, and variety of languages (Malecot, 1975; Booij & De Jong, 1987; De Jong, 1987 in Chevrot, et al, 2013; Racine & Detey, 2016; Liégeois, 2017).

Concerning language variety, besides showing naturalness in speaking, facultative liaison can be used as a differentiating factor between colloquial variety, standard variety and formal variety. This is confirmed by the opinions of Delattre (1966), Agren (1973), Anderson (1975) in Fougeron et al. (2001) and Kamoun and Ripaud (2017) that facultative liaisons are found in many formal registers (*recherché, élaboré, soutenu, soigné*). In other words, the less formal the register is, the less facultative liaison is used (Abry & Abry, 2007). So, it can be concluded that facultative liaison can be a marker of formal variety. It is also evidenced by the results of the study by Adda-Decker et al. (2012) who used the NCCFr corpus, that very little facultative liaison is realized in conversations between students or between friends (informal).

Several studies have been conducted to look at the use of liaisons over a long period, among others, by Leon (2007) and Ashby (2003) in Dugua & Baude (2017), the result of which is that there is a decrease in the use of the number of facultative liaisons with increasing time. Similar research was also conducted in the context of public speech, especially by French male and female politicians, including by Encrevé (1988), Villejuif (1975), HPOL corpus 1 and 2 which were then analyzed for trends by Laks & Peuvergne (2017) with the result that during 100 years, the use of mandatory/obligatory liaisons has been relatively stable, while the use of facultative liaisons has decreased. In addition, there is a difference in the realization of liaison between male and female political figures, namely by 13% and the use of facultative liaisons has decreased by less than 40%. From the results of these studies, a significant decrease in the use of facultative liaison indicates a stylistic difference, especially in the realm of political speech. In other words, the role of facultative liaison as a style marker might change. Moreover, Laks (2014) strengthened since the occurrence of social and cultural divisions in 1968, linguistic stratification increasingly abandoned.

Developments in the field of technology have given rise to many forms of public speech not only by political figures but also by artists, and intellectuals in the media sector, all of whom fill the auditive space of French speakers and can also be in the form of vlogs or podcasts as is currently developing. The public speech itself is the main observatory to find out developments or changes in

the field of phonology as stated by Encrevé (1988) in (Laks & Peuvergne, 2017) that political speech conveyed through the mass media is the main object of linguistic and sociolinguistic research.

From several differences of opinion and research results regarding the use of facultative liaison, it could still be conceivably hypothesized that this type of linking in French oral communication may still mark the formality of the situation of communication or in other words, facultative liaison may still become the formal register marker. Meanwhile, the classification of liaison on several references is different. It indicates that liaison is also dynamic. In addition, to the best of the researcher's knowledge, no research has compared the use of liaison in the context of public speech with entirely different levels of formality. It is essential to know the realization of the current context. Therefore, this study aims to describe the forms of facultative liaison in public speech in different contexts, namely formal and informal, the forms of facultative liaison used, and the factors underlying their use.

## II. METHODS

It is sociolinguistic research that aims to explain the forms and factors that underlie the use of liaison facultative in French public communication. For the data source, 36 monologue videos published on YouTube in 2021-2022 with a total duration of 6 hours were used and divided into two criteria: formal and informal. For the formal category, the data is in the form of recorded speeches for 3 hours in 15 videos from French political figures, namely French President Emmanuel Macron (EM), Ex-Prime Minister Jean Castex (JC), and French politician Marine Le Pen (MR). Meanwhile, for informal communication data, 21 vlogs from the most popular French YouTubers were used with a total duration of approximately 3 hours, namely Cyprien (CP), Norman (NR), and Nattoo (NT). The data in this study are all forms of facultative liaisons pronounced by these characters. The data will be encoded in the form for example (5/FM/JC/2) which means the fifth data in the formal category from Jean Castex in the second video.

The listening method was used for data collection by listening to the use of language and then proceeding with note-taking techniques. After transcribing speeches and monologues from

thirty-six videos, all forms of liaison were

identified by repeatedly listening to the recordings. A native speaker did the validity of this data. All liaison forms were collected, analyzed and classified according to Grevisse & Goose's latest classification.

The structures of forms included in the mandatory group according to Grevisse & Goose (2008) are determinant+adjective, determinant+noun, subject+verb pronouns, verbs+pronoun *en/y*, after the forms *c'est* and *il est* (impersonal), monosyllabic adverbs (negation), after monosyllabic prepositions and certain compound words/expressions. While the forbidden group consists of a singular noun + adjective, after the conjunction *et*, plural nominal elocutionary, the ending *-es* in the second person singular conjugation. The facultative liaisons are forms that are not included in both lists.

After facultative were collected, an analysis was then carried out to determine the combined patterns (structures) and the liaison consonants used. Meanwhile, a deeper analysis by comparing situations, speakers, and other aspects through references studies was held to answer questions about the function of facultative liaison as a marker of formal registers and the factors behind the use of facultative liaison.

### III. RESULTS

After the data from the monologues is collected, they are classified based on the word categories that make up the optional liaison. The results of the analysis are presented in Table 1 and Table 2.

From 21 vlogs with a duration of 2 hours 59'3", 34 forms of facultative liaison spread in five types of structure were obtained. The most common structure found in the informal category is a sequence of verb être + words that follow

(determinants, adjectives, adverbs, prepositions, and pronouns) or 59% of the total data, followed by verbs être/avoir + *participe passé* (26%) and verb + verb/infinitive (15%).

Meanwhile, for the category of formal communication, the facultative liaison structure classification is shown in Table 2. Of the 15 videos in the formal category with a total duration of 3 hours 1' 39," there were 173 forms of facultative liaison identified. Based on the analysis, this amount can be classified into 12 structures. Identical to informal contexts, the most common facultative liaison structures are verb être + which follow (determinants, adjectives, adverbs, prepositions, pronouns) (23%) followed by verbs être/avoir + *participe passé* (20%) and plural nouns+ adjectives (14%).

## IV. DISCUSSION

### Forms of facultative liaison

One of the objectives of this research is to identify the structure or form of facultative liaison in formal and informal communication in French. From the total duration of monologues in formal and informal contexts, 173 data were obtained respectively spread over 12 types of structures and 34 data within 5 structures. Similar liaison structures are most found in both communication contexts: combination of the verb être + which follows (determinant, adjective, adverb, preposition, and pronoun as well as the verb être/avoir + *participe passé*. Here are some examples of the formation of facultative liaison in the most common sequence found in both formal and informal contexts:

a) **verb être + which follows.** Être is an auxiliary verb that occupies a predicate in a sentence and can be followed by several other word categories, namely determinants, adjectives,

Table 1. Forms of facultative liaison in a formal context

No.	Structures	Number of data	Example(s)
1.	Verb <i>être</i> + words which follow (determinant, adjective, adverb, preposition, pronoun)	20	<i>Je suis <u>hyper</u> content, s'ils étaient <u>amoureux</u>,</i>
2.	Verb <i>être/avoir</i> + <i>participe passé</i>	8	<i>Vous avez <u>investi</u> là-dedans, Mon problème s'est <u>envolé</u></i>
3.	Verb+verb/infinitive	5	<i>Nous allons <u>écouter</u> Ça doit <u>être</u> dur à vivre</i>
4.	Plural noun+adjective	1	<i>Les étoiles <u>évanescents</u></i>
5.	Verb+adverb	1	<i>j'avais <u>environ</u> dix-sept ans</i>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>34</b>	



namely a sequence of verb + adjective (attribute), auxiliary verb of third person + *participe passé*, and *quand/dont* + word that follows. Meanwhile according to Abry & Abry (2007) the optional liaison are plural nouns + adjective, verb + verb/prepositions, preposition + determinants/polysyllables adverbs. There are structures in both lists completed by these findings namely être + preposition/ determinant/ adverb/ adjective/ pronoun, so it is not only followed by an adjective or preposition but also adverb/preposition/ determinant/ pronoun. Likewise, with the conjugation of auxiliary words (*avoir/être*) + *participe passé* which according to Grevisse & Goose (2008) is limited only to the first person. This form can also be found in the conjugation of auxiliary words for the second and third person. In addition to these differences, there are several facultative liaison structures that are also not found in these references, namely between conjunctions (*mais*) + words that follow, conjunctions (*et*) + words that precede, nouns + prepositions, preposition + preposition detailed in tables 1 and 2.

As previously explained, a consonant is needed to link the two words in a liaison. It can come from the final consonant of the first word or another consonant. These forms are usually called liaison consonants. The following table describes the consonants used in forming the facultative liaisons in this study.

Table 3. Liaison consonants

Liaison Consonant	Informal	Formal	Total
[t]	24	106	130
[z]	10	64	74
[p]	0	2	2
[n]	0	1	1
	34	173	207

The most common liaison consonants are [t], [z], [p], and [n]. Consonants [p] and [n] only exist in formal contexts. The consonant liaison [t] is found in sequence using verb être for the third person and the word that follows it. The results of this study corroborate the results of the research by Dugua & Baude (2017) that if the consonant

/z/ liaison dominates for all types, both mandatory and optional. On the other hand, specifically for the facultative liaison, the /t/ consonant is found the most because it is largely contributed by the use of the auxiliary words être and *quand*.

### Facultative Liaison as a formal register marker

This study used data sources that were classified into two types of communication based on context, namely formal and informal. The duration for informal communication is 2 hours 59' 34" while for formal communication it is 3 hours 1' 30". With almost the same length of duration, the total number of facultative liaison forms is significantly different, namely 34 and 173. In addition, the number of combined structures is also different, namely 5 and 12 for each context.

Analysis conducted by Laks & Peuvergne (2017) shows that the difference in the use of liaison by political figures (formal) and in the PFC corpus (non-formal) is only 5%. If it is said that the use of obligatory liaison is relatively stable, then the difference between formal and informal contexts will not be too great. However, in this study, the opposite result was obtained. The difference between the two is very large, up to 81%. These results strongly confirm that the role of facultative liaison in speaking style or register differentiation is very significant and supports the opinion of Arby & Arby (2007), Hamon (1983), and Grevisse & Goose (2008). On the other hand, these results contradict the opinion of Laks (2014) which states otherwise. The French typology that combines words in utterances gives rise to this merging process. Liaison, especially facultative liaison, apart from playing a role in creating ease or fluency in pronunciation, this form can also be a differentiator among registers, and this type of liaison marks formal registers, as argued by Bouten & Gadet (2003).

### Factors influencing the use of facultative liaison

In contrast to modern French, the final consonant of the first word was pronounced. Since the 16th century, word-ending consonant lost their phonetic value (Bennet, 1991). In this case, liaisons bring back the final consonant of a word when a vowel sound follows it. In addition to these historical factors, Dellatre (1955) details several other factors that underlie the use of liaison, especially facultative liaison, namely phonetic, prosodic, syntactic, and stylistic factors.

For phonetic factors, liaison is more often formed in vowel sounds than consonant sounds. For example, the nominal phrase *des nations unies* (37/FM/EM/2) [denasjõzɥni] whose last word ends

in a vowel sound is linked more often than if it is consonant, such as in *des secteurs économiques* (144/FM/MR/) [sɛktœʁzɛkɔnɔmik]. This can be seen in the amount of data.

Prosodically, the formation of liaison can also be influenced by the length of the elements being linked, the intonation of the sentence, and also stress. According to Delattre (1955), *plus les adverbes ou prépositions sont courts, plus ils lient* (the shorter the adverb or preposition, the easier it is to combine). For example, the sequence of an adverb consisting of one syllable + determinant in the sentence *Que ce soit à la maison, dans un restaurant [...]* (FM/JC/1) is linked more strongly than the sequence of polysyllable adverb + preposition in *Le ministre d'outre mer est actuellement en Nouvelle Calédonie* (80/FM/EM/4). That is the reason why the sequence polysyllable adverb + words which follow is classified into the facultative liaison group.

Meanwhile, from the syntactic factor of connecting words in utterances using liaison, there are specific rules so that obligatory, facultative and forbidden liaison forms emerge. Liaison is formed in meaning groups, noun phrases, verbal phrases, and prepositional phrases (Abry & Abry, 2007). The importance of syntactic cohesion between the first and second words in liaison is also emphasized by Hutin et al (2022) and Grammont (1914) in Laks & Peuvergne (2017), who say that if there is no cohesion then there is no liaison. The example sentence *'Sa maison est grande*, linking *maison* and *est* with the consonant liaison [n], is included in the forbidden liaison because *sa maison* and *est grande* are different phrases. According to Delattre (1955), liaison is also partly regulated by the degree of closeness in the compound words. The level of closeness of this sequence can be seen from the possible gaps that exist. For example, the probability of a pause between *grands hommes* [gʁɑ̃zɔm] in the phrase *ses deux grands hommes* (FM/EM/4) is smaller than that in *conséquences immédiates* [kɔ̃sekɑ̃szimedʒat] (56/FM/EM/2) because of the ties in *grands hommes* stronger than in *conséquences immédiates*. Stronger bonds are classified as obligatory liaisons, and vice versa.

Among these factors, in this study, stylistics is an essential factor. It is emphasized by Delattre (1955) that the speaking style is the dominant factor in the use of facultative liaison. Someone chooses a language style based on the communication

situation at hand. Wardhaugh (2002) emphasized that you can speak very formally or informally, your choice being governed by circumstances. In the context of this study, the speeches delivered by Emmanuel Macron who is the current President of the French Republic, Jean Castex the former Prime Minister of France, and Marine Le Pen a French woman politician are embodied in official situations, namely state speeches or speeches at political party meetings addressed to the wider French community, mainland France and also French citizens outside mainland Europe. Meanwhile, the communication made by French YouTubers is addressed to particular groups, especially their subscribers, in a everyday situation, which is also marked by the use of the subject pronoun *Tu* for their vlog.

The results of the analysis show that facultative liaison is used more by French political figures in the form of speech which is categorized as a formal communication situation compared to French YouTubers in the opposite category, thus strengthening Arby's opinion (2007) that the more informal a variety of language is, the fewer forms of facultative liaison are used. In other words, this facultative liaison can be one of the defining characteristics of the formal variety of spoken communication in French.

On the other hand, the notion of formality itself has many sides. Formality according to Heylighen (1999) and Dewaele (2000) in Li, et al. (2013) is divided into two, namely surface formality and deep formality. Surface formality is defined with attention to the form respecting the convention or the form itself, while deep formality is intended for a clear understanding, clear and precise. Liaison itself is a linguistic phenomenon in French whose rules are binding on the community of users. French presidents, political figures, and YouTubers are part of the French-speaking community who use liaison as the existing convention (although there are some violations), and also use facultative liaison which is more in the formal variety. Especially for leader, presidents and prime ministers, as essential figures in a country or government, the use of good language or according with standards or conventions should be present in them as leaders.

In addition to communication situations or settings and language conventions, the use of formal or informal varieties is also influenced by the topic being discussed. This is emphasized by Labov (2006), Stolarski (2013), Ernestus et al

(2015), Kouwenhoven et al (2015) in Koppen et al (2016) that the topic of conversation is one of the parameters that determine the variation of formal or informal language. If the speaker and the speech partner have the same shared knowledge about something, then the speaker does not need a lot of effort so that the speech partner can understand the message being conveyed. Therefore, the choice of language will certainly fall on every day (non-formal) language. Instead, they will use formal language to avoid ambiguity or misunderstanding. So, the topic of discussion (knowledge) conveyed by political figures becomes a factor that determines the choice of language or way of speaking. When conveying matters related to the state and society, for example, government policies, the Covid-19 pandemic, and the war between Russia and Ukraine, the presidential election is something that is not necessarily known or understood by the general public, so attention and clarity are needed in delivery. In contrast to the topics of conversation conveyed by Youtubers about traveling, parties, fashion, and so on, in short, these things are consumed by young people.

To avoid misunderstandings or for the sake of clarity of the message, the debit or the number of words per unit of time also plays a role. The discharge between formal and non-formal languages is different. In a formal context, the language is pronounced clearly and carefully either in reading or in direct speech, which is different from the informal context. Formal language is characterized by attention to special forms, and for this reason, speakers try to use standard forms (Labov, 1972 in Heylighen, 1999). The difference in liaison realization in the context of discharge is proven by Adda-Decker, et al (2012) that liaison realization (including facultative liaison) decreases with increasing speech speed. It can be concluded that speaking discharge affects the realization of liaison, namely that facultative liaison is more formal in variety with standard discharge. In addition, Leon (2007) in Dugua & Baude (2017) suggest that among young people, there is a secondary accent in communication, often expressive so that the liaison is lost or not realized.

Although in total the realization of facultative liaisons in the formal group is more than in the informal group, there are still differences in the realization among individuals. When compared between the use of facultative liaison by Jean

Castex (JC), Emmanuel Macron (EM), and Marine le Pen, it is known that the French president uses this type of liaison more than others. Table 4 shows the comparison of the numbers between the three.

**Table 4. Comparison of facultative liaison in formal context**

	<b>Number of realisation</b>	<b>Duration</b>	<b>Average (in seconds)</b>
JC	54	72 minutes 59 seconds	81
EM	95	69 minutes 25 seconds	43
MR	24	33 minutes 15 seconds	83

If Boë & Tubach (1992) in Chevrot et al (2013) use the number of words to express the frequency of liaison, namely every 16 words, in this calculation the unit of seconds is used for each facultative liaison realization. From the table above it is known that every 43 seconds there is 1 form of facultative liaison used by EM, while almost twice longer for JC and MR. Regarding to the difference amount of facultative liaison used by these three politicians despite the same context of communication, it can be assumed that other factors also take part.

Researches by De Jong (1994) in Racine & Detey (2017), Malécot (1975), Ashby (1981) in Hutin et al (2022) prove that age is also a factor that determines the use of liaisons and that liaisons are more widely used in older people. Meanwhile, Grevisse & Goose (2008) stated that liaisons are used more by people who come from outside Paris. If it is related to the age factor and the place of origin, this does not seem appropriate because EM is the youngest and JC is also from outside Paris.

Apart from these individual characteristics, moreover facultative means whether it can be used or not, the differences in the use of facultative liaison in formal contexts are also inseparable from among others the preference, the speaker's sensitivity to the formality of a communication situation, or the speaker's linguistic intuition as conveyed by Hutin et al. (2022).

Related to individual characteristics, gender is also an important factor but due to the lack of data, it is not discussed in this research. In the gender context, the results of previous studies resulted in branching conclusions. Analysis from Malécot (1975) and Booij & De Jong (1987) in Hutin et al (2022) show that facultative liaison is more used by women, while Ashby (1981)'s result

is the opposite. Meanwhile Durand et al. (2011) in Hutin et al (2022) found that there is no statistical difference in the use of the two. For conclusions, the use of facultative liaison in the context of public speech in formal and informal contexts shows a very significant difference in number. This indicates that this form of liaison still plays a significant role in distinguishing styles, especially in public speeches. The most common forms of morphosyntactic found between the two contexts tend to be identical. In addition, apart from linguistic factors, factors of the communication situation such as the level of formality, shared knowledge, speaker's sensitivity of formality and linguistic intuition determine the use of this type of liaison.

## V. CONCLUSION

Many factors determine success in communicating. Sociolinguistic competence is characterized by the mastery of many variations according to the social context. The use of particular forms is not related to right or wrong

but is more or less precise (Lister, 1996). Likewise, according to Grevisse & Goose (2008) that the use of appropriate registers for certain communication situations is a social demand. Their inappropriate use may represent a deviation from the norm of conduct. This study shows that the role of facultative liaison as a style differentiator and as an utterance to expedite speech as well as to eliminate hiatus in oral communication, especially in the context of public speech, is still very relevant. Even though the number of uses of facultative liaison in formal and informal contexts is much different, the morphosyntactic categories of each constituent word tend to be identical for the two communication contexts. The results of this study are not exhaustive, with more data sources from different figures it is very possible to obtain a more varied form of linking. A deeper study of speakers' individual reasons and speakers' attitudes towards the use of facultative liaisons might clarify more about this phenomenon.

## REFERENCES

- Abry, D & Abry, J. V. (2007). *Phonétique : technique et pratiques de classe*. Paris: CLE International
- Adda-Decker, M., Delais-Roussarie, E., Fougeron, C., Géndrot, C., Lamel, L. (2012). La liaison dans la parole spontanée familière : explorations semi-automatique de grand corpus. *Revue Française de Linguistique Appliquée*, 17(1), DOI: 10.3917/rfla.171.0113
- Alwasilah, A.C. (1993). *Pengantar Sosiologi Bahasa*. Bandung: Angkasa
- Akhtar, R. & Riaz, M. (2019). Formality in academic writing: Investigating stylistic competence of undergraduate EFL Learners. *University of Wah Journal of Social Science*, 2 (1). pp. 01-20
- Antoni, C., Irham, Rosni, G. (2019). Language variation in Minang colloquial language spoken in Kabun region : Sociolinguistics study on millennial citizens. *Jurnal ARBITRER* 6(2), p.92-98. DOI : 10.25077/ar.6.2.92-98.2019
- Bennet, W. (1991). Liaison in French, *Word* 42:1, 57-88. DOI : 10.1080/00437956.1991.11435832
- Boutet, J. & Gadet, F. (2003). Pour une approche de la variation linguistique. *Le Français aujourd'hui*, 4(143), p.17-24
- Chaer, A. & Agustina, L. (2010). *Sociolinguistik : Perkenalan awal*. Jakarta : Rineka Cipta
- Chevrot, J-P., Ddugua, C., Harnois-Delpiano, M., Siccardi, A., Spinelli, E. (2013) Liaison acquisition : debate, critical issues, future research. *Language Sciences* 39, p.83-94. DOI : 10.1016/j.langsci.2013.02.011
- Coupland, N. (2007). *Style : Language variation and identity*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press
- Delatour, Y., Jennepin, D., Léon-Dufour, M., Teyssier, B. (2009). *Nouvelle Grammaire du Français : Cours de Civilisation Française de la Sorbonne*. Paris : Hachette
- Delattre, P. (1955). Les facteurs de la liaison facultative. *The French Review* 29(1), pp. 42-49
- Ferrat, S. (2012). L'usage de la liaison et l'entrée dans la lecture. Mémoire de recherche. Master Metiers de l'Éducation. Université Orleans. <https://dumas.ccsd.cnrs.fr>. Diakses tanggal 7 Februari 2021 pukul 15:20

- Fougeron, C., Goldman, J-P., Dart, A., Guélat, L., Jeager, C. (2001) Influence de facteurs stylistiques, syntaxique et lexicaux sur la realization de la liaison en français. 8ème Conférence Traitement Automatique des Langues Naturelles. <https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-02437268>
- Gadet, F. (1996). Niveaux de langue et variation intrinsèque. *Palimpsestes : revue de traduction*, p.17-40, DOI : 10.4000/palimpsestes.1504
- Grevisse, M & Goose, A. (2008). *Le bon usage : grammaire française*. Bruxelles : Éditions de Boeck Université
- Gustina, L., Nadra, Manita, R. (2018). Phonological variation in Serawai language that used by Minangkabau and Serawainese in Kota Manna South Bengkulu. *Jurnal ARBITRER* 5(1), P.8-16. DOI : 10.25077/ar.5.1.8-16.2018
- Hamon, A. (1983). *Grammaire Pratique : Guide pour tous*. Paris : Usuels Hachette
- Heylighen, F. & Dewaele, J. M. (1999). Formality of language : definition, measurement and behavioral determinants. Internal report centre 'Leo Apostel'. Free university of Brussels.
- Kamoun, C & Ripaud, D. (2017). *100% FLE : Phonétique essentielle du français Niveau B1-B2*. Paris: Didier
- Kamoun, C & Ripaud, D. (2016). *100% FLE : Phonétique essentielle du français Niveau A1-A2*. Paris : Didier
- Koppen, K., Ernestus, M., Van Mulken, M. (2016). The influence of social distance on speech behaviour : Formality variation in casual speech. *Corpus Linguistics and Linguistic Theory* DOI : doi.org/10.1515/cllt-2016-0056
- Laks, B. (2014). Diachronie de la liaison en français contemporain : le cas de parole publique (1999-2011).
- Liégeois, Loïs. (2017). Acquisition des liaisons nominales et verbales : de la léxicalisation à l'abstraction des constructions. *Langue Française* 194, pp.125-144. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26449147>
- Li, H., Cai, Z. & Graesser, A.C. (2013). Comparing two measures for formality. Proceeding of the twenty sixth international Florida artificial intelligence research society conference
- Lister, R. (1991). Question forms, conditionals, and second person pronouns used by adolescent native speaker across two level of formality in written and spoken French. *The modern language journal*, 80(2), pp.165-182
- Moraz, M. Et Prikhodkine, A. (2011). Phonétique et approche actionnelle : une mise en pratique. *Revue A Contrario*, 1(15). 99 – 116.
- Moreau, M. L. (1997). *Sociolinguistique : Concept de base*. Mardaga : Édition de Mardaga
- Nababan, P.W.J. (1984). *Sociolinguistik : Sebuah Pengantar*. Jakarta : Gramedia Pustaka Utama
- Oladipopo, R. O. (2014). *Aspects of connected speech processes in Nigerian English*. *SAGE Open*, 4(4), p. 1-6. DOI : 10.1177/2158244014560527
- Pateda, M. (1990). *Sociolinguistik*. Yogyakarta : Gadjah Mada University Press
- Pavlick, E. & Tetreault, J. (2016). An empirical analysis of formality in online communication. *Transactions of the association for computational linguistics* 4, pp.61-74
- Racine, I. & Detey, S. (2016). La liaison dans un corpus d'apprenants : Le projet <Interphonologie du français contemporain> IPFC. *Corpus* 15. Diakses dari <http://journal.openedition.org/corpus/308>
- Rokhman, F. (2013). *Sociolinguistik : Suatu Pendekatan Pembelajaran Bahasa dalam Masyarakat Multikultural*. Yogyakarta : Graha Ilmu
- Wardhaugh, R. (2002). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. New Jersey: Blackwell Publishing