

Whose speech is
better?



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

Donna Jo Napoli's article entitled " Whose Speech is better?" discusses the issues of language variation. The author describes how language changes through time. Napoli does not only conclude one single case in her essay, she elaborates every detail that the linguistic readers should understand.

She also based her claims through observations, teachings, experiments, and some historical facts. Though this, she could provide better analysis on language variation. In the beginning of the essay, Napoli describes her assertion with simple and plain speech but as the issue of the topic goes on, the author discusses relevant information, arguments, debates, and claims of two sides especially in the construction of " It's me" and " It's I." Napoli's arguments are simple but convincing because she does not depend on the technical formations alone but also through the casual utterances of common people. From this, the author justifies her claim in a narrow but specific perspective. Therefore, the central claim of the author is to discuss and analyze the language variation in a common situation rather than through technical implications made by the grammatical rules.

As I searched for the full citation of the article, I could not find the publisher and date of publication - only the author's name and title of the paper are existent all over the essay. However, in the last page of the paper, there is a bibliographical part that shows the basis of the author in discussing her points. Nevertheless, the information regarding the paper itself is not provided. On the other way around, the titled of the article fits the topic of the author's point of view.

Napoli bases her arguments from the question in her title. Therefore, it shows that the author does not want highfaluting words to portray her title – simplicity and commonness are more important, just like the her claim throughout the article. What I like about the article is the author's way of justifying her thoughts. She claims the fact that language exists in many ways depending on the context or situation. " Although we cannot explicitly state the rules of our language, we do choose to use different rules in different contexts.

We happily exploit variation, which we encounter in a wide range, from simple differences in pronunciation and vocabulary to more marked the differences that involve phrasing and sentence structure (Napoli 30-31)." However we not always have to become technical as we converse to other people because the essence of our speech becomes worthless. I personally believe in this fact because language transforms every time and we could not control that. If we rely in the grammatical rules, we could not able to describe our emotions or feelings in a profound way. Like speaking in front of the public; because we want to give the audience formal speech, we sometimes forget to speak from our hearts – we just tell the people our goal and then finish.

This is what Napoli is trying to convey. Language is not static because it lives within us. Therefore, it changes through time. It only means that I like the assertion of the author as she unravels the perspectives of the common people and not only the mindsets of the ' technical' linguistic authority that imposes the ' quality' and ' formality' of language. When it comes to the organization of the article, I can see that that the paper is well-written with a combination of casual and formal words that the author used.

Each points are being clarified by the author is a specific detail so that her readers will understand her case. The word choice, sentence structure, paragraph construction & overall organization of the paper help the topic and the author's assertions to become understandable. " We don't all hear things the same way. When we haven't heard something clearly, we ask people to repeat what they said. But sometimes we don't realize we haven't heard something clearly until our appropriate response is corrected.

At times the other person doesn't correct us and the miscommunication remains, leading to variations other difficulties (Napoli 31)." From the way on how we converse, we listen, and we understand the language is depicted all throughout the paper. That is why readers have the capability to connect their language acquisition and usage through this paper. As I have read the whole paper, I could not distinguish any significant flaws. Every concept, term, and factual evidence are thoroughly described and analyzed by the author.

It only means that she is aware of all the details that she is writing. In the latter part of the paper, Napoli stated that, " When we consider variation in language, we must give up the idea of errors and accept the idea of patterns (Napoli 33)." This is somehow the conclusion of the author after discussing her points. For her language variation is alive in every way and the society should accept this fact. Even if some linguistic authorities tried to stop or control the transformation of language, they could not avoid the changes because if a group of people could not understand one another, change in variation and cases will be seen.

Therefore, language will transform into a new formation that we could not manage. In conclusion to this, the article went to a significant path of realization. The author wants to prove the point that sometimes, we do not really need to depend on grammatical rules to speak or converse with other people. We say our pieces depending on the person we are talking to.

If we talk to our parents, there is a form of respect and obedience; if we talk to our friend, there is a form of humor and simple construction; and if we talk to our teachers, there is a form of knowledge and formality. These examples show that language is also a game of life. There are certain ways and social environment that we need to depend to be able to speak better. Whether we like it or not, language is alive and will continue to live as long as there is human who speaks. The author's point of view is simple but complex.

She deconstructs the traditional idea about language because she lies within the side of the common people or the society as a whole.