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Abstract

In the past few years, technology has incredibly developed. It also influenced the communication mode. Before, for making appointment with lecturer, students needed to do face-to-face communication, then it changed into email, and now just simply through messaging application. One of the most used messaging applications is Whatsapp. Whatsapp has become a medium to communicate between students and lecturers in Universitas Kristen Satya Wacana (UKSW). Whatsapp features are identical with short and informal conversation. These features allowed variation in language used by students. Thus, this study was conducted to see the interaction between students and lecturers. This study used qualitative method where the researcher analyzed students’ sample chat and interviewed the participants. The participants of this study were twelve students from freshmen year (batch 2018) up to senior years (batch 2015) of Faculty of English and Arts in UKSW. In explaining the data, the researcher provided some of the sample chats and figure with further explanation. The result indicated that the participants used various language choices, codes, domains, addresses and styles. The relation that students had with the lecturers also became factors of the language choice variation. Through the obtained result, this study might give an insight for the lecturer to be aware of the students’ language choice in Whatsapp.

Keywords: messaging application, Whatsapp, language choice, code, domain, address, style.

INTRODUCTION

Communication has become a vital aspect in daily life. Likewise, communication between students and lecturers is important to build relation in
learning process. Hagenauer and Volet (2014) state that teacher-student relationship (TSR) become one factor that influence students’ success. Moreover, according to da Luz (2015), a good relation between teacher and students will also influence students’ motivation in the learning process.

As digital technology has enormously rise in recent years, the type of communication which emerge is online communication. Online communication application which is admired by university students are Electronic mail (E-mail) and Instant Messaging (IM) application (Lancaster & Yen, Huang, Hung, 2007). However, IM applications such as WhatsApp, Facebook Messenger (Bailey, Schroeder, Whitmer, & Sims, 2016) have become popular applications preferred by adolescent (Barry & Tom 2009). Similarly, Lancaster et al. (2007) say teenager prefer to use IM than E-mail since it provides real time communication between two persons.

Students in Faculty of Language and Art in Universitas Kristen Satya Wacana (UKSW) use Whatsapp as medium to communicate with the lecturer. Whatsapp itself got the third rank after Facebook and Youtube (Statista, 2018). This rank was based on data that Statista had in April 2018, related with the most popular social networks worldwide, ranked by number of active users with 1500 million active users in worldwide.

The diversity of communication modes allow more variation of language choice. This has made more researchers interested in studying about language choice. The studies of language choice are often done only to study in
one particular group yet different domains. Previous study was done by Fahmee and Fung (2016) focused on the English code in online written communication among Maldivian professionals. Fahmee and Fung use three domains, which are family, friendship, and work. The result shows that Maldivian professional tend to use English in work domain with 61.4%, compare with family domain and friendship domain with 48.6% and 55.2%. Yet, other study conducted by Lee (2014), analyzed Hongkong’s students language choice and self-presentation in social media. She chooses Facebook as the setting of her study. The result of her study shows that the Hongkong’s student use different code which is affected by the domain. This makes the researcher interested to study variation of the language choice in Indonesia context with mainly focus on education as the domain of the study.

The current research aim to analyze students’ language choice in Whatsapp. To achieve the aim, question will be used in this study: 1) What is/are the students’ reason to use different language choice in messaging application? 2) What is/are the factor(s) that affect student in choosing different language choice? This research is expected to give contribution for lecturer or student teacher relate with students’ language choice in Whatsapp. It is also hoped that it will be beneficial for lecturer and student in raising the awareness of language choice in messaging application.
LITERATURE REVIEW

Language choice

Some researchers defined the meaning of language choice. Wardhaugh (2006) states, “When we speak, we must constantly make choices of many different kinds: what we want to say, how we want to say it, and the specific sentence types, words, and sounds that best unite the what with the how” (p.260). Besides, Fahmee and Fung (2016) describe language choice as part of phenomenon in Sociolinguistics that require the speaker to choose the language depend on the purpose. Dweik and Qawar (2015) also give definition about language choice as “… a careful selection of word, phrase, clause or sentence of another language within the speaker's linguistic repertoire” (p.4). In addition, they say that choices that speaker make in language context include “appropriate register, genre, style, medium, or tone of voice in relation to the interlocutor (who), topic (what), context (where) and medium (how) in every talk” (p.4). Referring to the previous definitions, language choice can be defined as a selection of words which require the speaker to adjust the language depend on the context in communication. This include code, address, domain and style.

Code

Holmes (2013) mentions code as a word used by Sociolinguists to define any set of linguistic forms which relate to social factors in language context which covered diverse accents, linguistic styles, dialects and languages. Hudson (1996, p.22), as cited in Wardhaugh (2006), also has the same
definition as Holmes. He defines code as a ‘a set of linguistic items with similar
distribution. Meanwhile, Wardhaugh (2006) defines code as language which is
indicate to the system that people use in communication. According to the
definitions, we could say that code can be seen as an inevitable phenomenon
that always happen in daily life which include sounds, words, and grammatical
features (Wardhaugh, 2006, p.25). Also, referring to Wardhaugh (2006), code
here can be interpreted as language. In the Faculty of Language and Arts,
students communicate in English, Indonesia, and Javanese which is considered
as an example of codes.

Address

Address is part of language choice in Sociolinguistics. Yin (2010) states
address as “systematic and variable social phenomenon, thus making it a
significant social linguistic variable” (p.196). Yin also mentions that
educational background, the social state, the age, the situation can be factors
that influence the addressing. Furthermore, Norrby and Wide (2015) say that
addressing is taking big part in social life since it builds relation among people.
In other words, address construct social hierarchy and it lives within the
society.

Wardhaugh (2006) mentions that there are two types of degree when
people address someone. They are asymmetrical address and symmetrical
address which are distinguished by social factors. There are many factors which
are influenced the addresses, some of them are social rank, social distance, politeness, setting and age.

*Asymmetrical Address*

Asymmetrical is a degree where there is inequality address. In Indonesia context, students usually address their teacher with “Bapak” or “Ibu” which has the same meaning with “Sir” or “Ma’am”. When students address their teacher with “Bapak” or “Ibu”, they will not get the same treatment in term of address from their teacher. Teachers usually tend to address their students by their first name. Thus, this is called as asymmetrical address.

Example of Asymmetrical address:

Student A: “Good morning Mr. X”
Teacher X: “Good morning A”

*Symmetrical Address*

In contrast, symmetrical is a degree where people get the same treatment in the way of address. This degree occurs in the circle of friendship, workplace which is affected by age and closeness. In formal situation between business colleague in a company can be the example of symmetrical:

Mr. A: “Good Afternoon Mr. B.”
Mr. B: “Good Afternoon Mr. A.”

Other scholar, Holmes (2013), also mentions about factors which is affected the way of address in some scales called as four social dimensions.
They are social distance, status scale, formality scale and two functional scales. According to her explanation, social distance and status scale can be seen to distinguish the address form. Both social distance and status scale are related to people’ relationship. However, these two dimensions differ and have their own concern.

**Social Distance Scale**

Social distance scale also can be called as the solidarity scale. This scale concerns with the relation that people have. It concerns with setting, politeness and rank. According to Wardhaugh (2006), he explains that people’s addressing is usually based on some terms, such as the title (T), by first name (FN), last name (LN), nickname, or even combination of these. In choosing one of these terms, people will consider the relationship that they have. A doctor named John Smith has many addressees. His family call him by his nickname, “Johniee”, his friends call him with “John”, his patient call him with Dr. Smith, and his colleague call him Mr. Smith. Here, from the example we can see that each person might has various addresses depend on the closeness in the relationship.

**Status Scale**

Status scale relates with the social rank in society. This scale focuses on people’s rank which are included high-low status and used to show their respect. As Yin (2010) identifies that Chinese people has their own term in addressing someone. They will address people based on their job. The pattern
that they use is “family name + title”. Yin mentions some examples, such as “Zhang Xiaozhang” (President Zhang), “Wang Jingli” (Manager Wang), “Chen Laoshi” (Teacher Chen) and “Wu Yuanzhang” (Dean Wu) (p.197). She also mentions, sometimes Chinese people give abbreviation in calling people to minimize the distance, such as Li Ting (Li Tingzhang), Zhang chu (Zhang chuzhang), Guo dui (Guo Duizhang).

**Domain**

Wardhaugh and Fuller (2015) define domain as “one set of circumstances” (p.91). Thus, domain can be seen as a situation where the conversation take place. In other word domain is the setting of the conversation. Meanwhile, Fishman (1972) as cited in Md. Mostafizar Rahman, Chan and Abdullah (2007, p.2) states:

“Domains are defined in terms of institutional contexts or socio-ecological co-occurrences. They attempt to designate the major clusters of interaction situations that occur in particular multilingual settings. Domains enable us to understand that language choice and topic...are...related to widespread socio-cultural norms and expectations”

According to Fishman definition, domain is seen as setting in social context which also include language choice and topic. Therefore, setting, language choice and topic are considered as domains.

Fishman (1972) identifies five domains, they are: family, friendship, religion, education, and employment (as cited in Fahmee & Fung, 2016). Meanwhile, Lee (2014) categorizes domain into two aspects which are
distinguished by social domain and relationship. In social domain, she mentions work, family, and education yet for relationships domain, consist of friends, colleagues, and family.

Example 1. Conversation in Family Domain

Mother: “Anne, it’s time to have dinner. Hurry up!”
Anne : “Okay mum, wait a minute.”

Example 2. Conversation in Friendship Domain

Anne : “I’m bad at Math”
Julia : “Don’t worry, I feel you.”

Example 3. Conversation in Religion Domain

Priest : “Let His face shine upon you and give you peace.”
Parish : “Amen.”

Example 4. Conversation in Education Domain

Students : “Good Morning, Mr. Jones.”
Mr. Jones : “Good Morning, students. Now, please open page 23.”

Example 5. Conversation in Employment Domain

Staff : “Sir, I would like to remind you that this afternoon you will have a meeting with Mr. Smith at 2 P.M.”
Boss : “Ok, thanks.”
Style

Irvine (2001) defines style as part of “system of distinction.” It means that style distinguish the way people interact in the level of formality in a particular situation and context which guided by style (Norrby & Wide 2015). Meanwhile Holmes (2013) mentions that relation is matter in deciding style, yet it relates with the closeness that people have. She mentions there are many factors influence styles, some of them are age, gender, and social roles. Yin (2010) states similar statement as Holmes by saying that there are three factors that influence people in choosing styles, they are power, distance, and the weight of the imposition. Further, she explains, power is related with the hierarchy, distance with relation, and weight of imposition with the strategies that people use in conversation. In summarize, style will be varied since it depends on the relation that people have.

In a conversation, it is possible to switch from one style to another (Homes, 2013). Later, she mentions the example of variation in style which is, formal and casual (informal). Yet, Irvine (2001, p.22) defines style as “social formations (groups, categories, personae, activity types, institutional practices, etc.).” According to Holmes and Irvine’s explanation, we could conclude that styles happen in a conversation which are affected by social context. In addition, refer to Holmes’ statement, there are two kinds of style, formal and informal.
This study is a qualitative research. Higgs and Cherry (2009) define qualitative research as “a way of looking at the world and a constellation of approaches used to generate knowledge about the human world” (p.3). In other words, qualitative research is an approach to explore knowledge relate with human resources.
Context of the Study

This study was conducted in Faculty of Language and Art in Universitas Kristen Satya Wacana. The researcher chose to do research in this faculty because the researcher wanted to observe the Sociolinguistics’ case relate to students’ language choice in messaging application Whatsapp. Moreover, students in this faculty are used to interact with lecturer through Whatsapp. Therefore, this faculty was suitable to do the research.

Participants

The participants of this study were twelve students who came from batch 2018, 2017, 2016, 2015. The researcher chose three random students in each batch. They were named as S1, S2, S3, S4, S5, S6, S7, S8, S9, S10, S11, and S12. The students’ data will be shown in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Name of Participants</th>
<th>Batch</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Senior Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Senior Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Senior Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>S4</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Junior Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>S5</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Junior Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>S6</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Junior Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>S7</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Sophomore Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>S8</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Sophomore Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>S9</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Sophomore Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>S10</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Freshmen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>S11</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Freshmen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>S12</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Freshmen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students’ Data

Figure 2.
The consideration in choosing these students were because the researcher wanted to explore the language choice and gain varies data from each batch. Also, for the students needed to send a sample chat with their lecturer as the requirement. The amount of the participants were considered sufficient to get the data since the students were come from different batch yet had variation in language choices.

**Data collection instrument**

This research used open-ended question and closed-ended questions to collect the data. The researcher used closed-ended question in order to ensure the researcher’s analysis, also open-ended question to gain additional information that might appear during the interview. The researcher conducted the interview with students for gaining additional data related with the sample chat.

There were ten questions which divided into, two questions about personal information, four open-ended questions, and four closed-ended questions. The first two questions related to student’s personal information such as initial name, and batch. Then, for the open-ended questions there were used to gain more information from the students and four questions for closed-ended which was related with students’ sample chat. The questions were related to students’ language choice in Whatsapp and based on the sample chat that they sent to researcher. Therefore, each student might has different questions since it depended on the sample chat also their answer.
Data collection procedures

First, the researcher looked for twelve students from each batch by approaching them through chat. The researcher informed the aim of this study and asked students’ approval in participating in this study. Then, the students were asked to send screenshot of the chat that they had with their lecturer as a sample chat which was used as the data of this study. The sample chats which were used in this study were taken students’ chat log. This was done since the researcher wanted to acquire the naturality of the conversation between the students and the lecturers. Each student sent different amount of sample chats in form of screenshot which will be shown in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Name of Participants</th>
<th>Amount of sample chats (screenshot)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>S4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>S5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>S6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>S7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>S8</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>S9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>S10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>S11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>S12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount of Sample Chats

Figure 3.
After receiving the sample chat, the researcher analyzed the chat in order to prepare the questions for interview. Then, the researcher made an appointment with each student. On the day as agreement, the researcher met the student in person to do the interview. The interview was recorded by smartphones and the participants’ name were kept as anonymous.

**Data analysis procedures**

Before conducting the interview, the researcher has analyzed the students’ chat and categorized the students’ chat according to categories in this study. Then, after the interview was done, the data was transcribed. The students’ names were kept confidential and written as S1, S2, S3, S4, S5, S6, S7, S8, S9, S10, S11, S12.

After that, the researcher made some subheadings in the findings and made explanations for the discussion. The first subheading would discuss about code, then followed by domain, address, and lastly style. In every subheading would consist of the sample chat which related to the subheadings. Also, the researcher inserted excerpt which were taken from the interviews to support the researchers’ explanation.

**Findings and Discussion**

This research found that students used diverse language choices, codes, domains, styles, and addresses, in communicating with lecturers using Whatsapp. It was shown that students used diverse codes which can be classified into three categories, English, Indonesian and mixed between English
and Indonesian. Another finding was that the domain of the conversations was the same yet the topics of conversations were varied. It was also shown that the addresses used by students were of the same category that is asymmetrical address. While the styles found in this study were formal and informal. These findings will be explained further in the following subheadings.

**Code**

This research found that some of the students were still using Indonesian when they communicating with their lecturers, despite of the facts that they were students of English Department. According to the sample chats, there were three categories based on the code that they used to communicate in Whatsapp with their lecturer. The three categories consist of English, Indonesian and mixed English and Indonesian.

**Students’ Code**

*Figure 4.*
The data analysis was presented in Figure 4. According to data analysis, there were five students who used English, four students who used Indonesian and three students who used a mixture of English and Indonesian. The findings will be discussed further below.

*English code*

In this study there were five students who used English as their code to communicate with their lecturer. This result was interesting since the five students in this category were come from all the four batches. The students in this category consist of, S2 from batch 2015; S5 from batch 2016; S7 from batch 2017, and S10 and S12 from batch 2018.

Figure 5. Sample of English Code

As mentioned previously, each student had their own reasons in using English as their code. In the first excerpt, S7 mentioned that she should use English as she wanted to used to communicate with her lecturer in English.

Excerpt 1

“He is my English lecturer, I am majoring in English literature, I took English literature as my bachelor degree so of course I have to talk with him even via chat with English.” (S7)
However, not all students in this group had the same perception as S7’s. Other students in this first category had their own perception towards it.

Excerpt 2

“Because I think it is safest for me to use English rather than Indonesian since I don’t know him well and I don’t know his character and I want to show my respect to him.” (S2)

Excerpt 3

“Because I want to improve my English and give respect for her cause she is an English teacher.” (S5)

Excerpt 4

“I use English because all lecturers say that student must speak in English. So, I just try to speak in English with all lecturer.” (S10)

Excerpt 5

“Because I think it’s more polite to use English because we are in Faculty of Language and Arts.” (S12)

This finding is quite interesting since three out of five students in this category thought that using English was considered polite and could show their respect to their lecturers. Referring to these statements, three students in this category revealed their reason according to it.

Excerpt 6

“It is because I am not close with him, so I just want to establish professional relationship with him.” (S2)
Excerpt 7

“To respect her as an English lecturer since she already learned English deeper than me so I appreciate her by using English.” (S5)

Excerpt 8

“Because I’m an English department student, so I need to practice to use more English when doing something educational like doing interview, chat with lecturer, even talking with my friends in class.” (S12)

According to the students’ statements, we could see that the students shared similar reason. Students wanted to show their respect to their lecturer by using English as they considered English as a polite style. This reason was supported by Holmes (2013) related with social dimensions. Related in this case, there were only three out of four dimensions which supported the students’ statements, they were social distance, status scale, and formality scale.

In general, students in the first category had two reasons. First, English code has became students’ “duty” to be applied when communicating with the lecturers. Second, students considered English as a polite style to show their respect for the lecturers. For the second reason, it was influenced by social distance, status scale, and formality scale which students had with their lecturer.

In English codes group, the study found that four students in this category unconfident with their English. Despite the fact that they used English code to show their respect. They revealed that they needed to check the grammar first before sent the chat to their lecturer.
Excerpt 9

“Of course, I rechecked first, my grammar and all of my text. I’m not confident with it. I even asked my father to check my grammar before I send it to Miss X.” (S10)

S10 was from batch 2018. She asked her father’s help since he is an English teacher. Other students in this category of code also stated similar statement as S10. S1, from batch 2015 said:

Excerpt 10

“When I want to send my chat, I’m afraid that my grammar is wrong, so I usually asked my friends to check my chat.” (S1)

According to S10 and S1’s statement, we could conclude that the students felt anxious when chatted in English. Their statements were similar with the study from Indriyanti (2016) which revealed that the source of students’ anxiety came from their fear of receiving negative evaluation.

*Indonesian Code*

In the second group, there were four students who used Indonesian. Student who used Indonesian S3 from batch 2015, S4 from batch 2016, also S8 and S9 from batch 2017. Students in this group also had varies reasons.

![Figure 6. Sample of Indonesian Code](image)
Excerpt 11

“I feel more comfortable when I use Indonesian because I can express my opinion more freely” (S4)

According to S4’s opinion, we could see that S4 was afraid to use wrong diction also grammar if she used English. Therefore, S4 chose Indonesian as the code since she really knew the pattern and the diction. S4’s statement was similar with Rihulay (2016) which was found that students felt more confident when communicating in Indonesian (L1).

However, the reason on choosing Indonesian was not always came from themselves. Lecturer could also take part in student’s decision.

Excerpt 12

“I use Indonesian because the lecturer asked me. Because it took me some time to think about English words when I want to answer him. So he asked me to use Indonesian.” (S8)

Referring to S8’s statements, we could assume that the lecturer asked her to do so since he wanted to avoid miscommunication which might be happen yet made the conversation went smoothly. In this second group, we could conclude that the reasons in choosing Indonesia as the code was to minimize or avoid mistakes which might be occurred and led to misunderstanding.
**Mixed Code**

For the third group, students used mixed code to communicate with their lecturer. Each student from batch 2015, 2016, and 2018 were in this group. The codes that were used were Indonesian and English. Students used mixed codes depending on the respond that they got from lecturer. As one of students revealed:

Excerpt 13

“Well, I used English but then seeing his responds, he uses Indonesia then I adjust my language.” (S6)

![Image of mixed code communication](image)

Figure 7. Sample of Mixed Code (Indonesian and English)

According to data analysis the writer found that there were two factors which were influenced the choosing of code: (1) internal factor, which came from the students itself; (2) external factor, which came from the lecturer who asked them. As part of language choice, the code also related with the other parts in language choice which will be discussed further below.
Domain

Fishman (1972) as cited in Fahmee and Fung (2016) mentioned five domains: (1) Family; (2) Employment; (3) Education; (4) Religion; (5) Friendship. Meanwhile, this study only focused on education domain. As mentioned in the literature review earlier, domain was not only about setting yet it also included topic.

In this study, there were seven students who communicate with the same lecturers. Two students (S1 and S5) with Lecturer A, two students (S4 and S9) with Lecturer D, and three students (S7, S8, and S11) with Lecturer F. Despite they sent chat to the same lecturers in educational domain, the topic was diverse.

Figure 8. S1’s chat with Lecturer A

Figure 9. S5’s chat with Lecturer A
According to the chat (see figure 8 and figure 9) S1 and S5 sent a message to Lecturer A. The domain was education but the topics were varies. On one hand, S1 asked Lecturer A about her seminar proposal. On the other hand, S5’s message was asking about permission and assignment.

It also happened in another chat, S4 and S9 who sent chat to Lecturer D. Both of them used Indonesia as the code. These following figures also proved that despite of the domain was in education, still the students had various topics.

Figure 10. S4’s chat with Lecturer D

As we can see in the Figure 10, S4 asked for Lecturer D’ signature for a Performance and Accountability Reporting (PAR) in student body. In figure 11, S9 asked about the submission for OMB, (OMB is student orientation for freshmen in University scale).
The last was three students who sent message to Lecturer F. Two students, S8 and S11 with Lecturer F were speaking about student body issues and an event. Meanwhile on S7’s chat, was talking about assignment submission.

Figure 12. S8’s chat with Lecturer F

Figure 13. S11’s chat with Lecturer F
Although the students sent message to the same lecturer, and even had the same domain, still, the topics were diverse. Every student had their own purposes to chat the lecturer. Thus, we could not generalize the topics of a conversation. Then, we could conclude that the domain might be the same, yet the topic which used was varies. It depended on the intention of the sender.

Address

The address that was found in this study was asymmetrical address. As previously mentioned, this address usually can be found in student and teacher’s interaction. However, in the way they address the lecturer were also varies. Here are some sample chats of the students.
Figure 16. S6’s chat with Lecturer E

Figure 15 and figure 16 showed how students addressed their male lecturer. S2 used “Sir” to called the lecturer, so did S6 called his lecturer with “Pak”. “Sir” and “Pak” are basically having the same meaning, yet different code. “Sir” is English words for calling or address man, meanwhile “Pak” is Indonesian words.

The researcher found an interesting finding in this subheading. In Figure 16, S6 used English code to communicate with his lecturer. Despite of using full English code in his chat, he addressed Lecturer E with “Pak”. S6 Mixed English code with Indonesian address. S6 revealed:

Excerpt 14
“...”

In S6’s case, he mixed the language choice between the code also the address. It was supported by Yin (2010) explanation related to factors which were affected the way of addressing. According to S6’s explanation, we could assume that he was affected by his social background as an Indonesian to
address male lecturer with “Pak” also influenced by his education background which was his knowledge about the English addressing system.

![Figure 17. S4’s chat with Lecturer D](image1.png)

![Figure 18. S10’s chat with Lecturer G](image2.png)

Similar with S2 and S6’s case, in figure 17 and figure 18, it showed the address in different codes that the students used to address female lecturer. S4 called her lecturer with “Bu” which is an Indonesian for “Ma’am”, “Mrs.”, “Miss” or “Madam” and S10 addressed by using “Miss”.
Style

Style was divided into two, formal and informal. In this research, most students used formal style, yet the researcher found some students who used informal style while chatting with their lecturers.

![Figure 19. S8’s chat with Lecturer F](image)

As shown in Figure 19, Lecturer F was asking about S8’s free time to arrange a meeting with her. However, S8 replied his message in informal style. It can be seen from her responses which used informal language in Indonesian referring to Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia (KBBI) as the standard parameter of Indonesian. In the first reply, she used informal word “gimana”, according to KBBI, the formal one is “bagaimana”. In the last chat, she replied, “… 2an gimana pak? Habis kelas mau makan dulu hehe.” The italic words showed the informal words. “Habis” in KBBI has varies meaning depend on the context. It can mean “completely used” or “after”. In the chat, S8 used word “habis” to show “after”. However, her diction to use “habis” is considered as informal
word. The formal word for “after” is “setelah”. It also happened with the other words, “mau” which means “want”, “dulu” for “first” (before doing something else) and S8 used “hehe”. The formal words for “mau” is “ingin”. Meanwhile, for “dulu” is kind of abbreviation words from “dahulu” to show that she had something to do something else first). She also used “hehe” in Indonesian, “hehe” is not a word but it is an expression of laughing. Despite she addressed him with “Pak”, but the structure and the style that she used were very informal. It indicated that she had a close relation with this lecturer since she talked very casually with the lecturer.

Figure 20. S9’s chat with Lecturer D

Figure 21. S4’s chat with Lecturer D

Comparing S9’s chat (Figure 20) with S4’s chat (Figure 21), both of them sent message to the same lecturer, Lecturer D. S9 used standardized Indonesia language, meanwhile S4 used unstandardized language. Clearly, we
could see the difference on their style. The S9’s chat used formal style which can be seen from her diction, the choose of wording, used the standard language and without abbreviation. Meanwhile, in S4’s chat, she used formal style yet informal words and abbreviation.

S9 and S4’s reason in using different styles were revealed below:

Excerpt 15

“I use formal since she is my lecturer also, I didn’t know her well and that was my first time to chat with her.” (S9)

Excerpt 16

“I don’t want to make the conversation become too serious or too casual. I just want to make it more relax but stay in control. At first, I didn’t really think that I’m close with her, but after I did several conversations with her, it became closer. She and I often meet to talk about student body. (S4)

From S9 and S4’s statements, we could see that the relation between S4 with Lecturer D is quite closer compared to S9. This was related to Holmes’s social dimension (2013) in social distance in which focusing in the closeness that people had.

Conclusion

This research aimed to answer: 1) What is/are the students’ reason to use different language choice in messaging application? 2) What is/are the factor(s) that affect student in choosing different language choice?. According to the findings, language choice that students used were diverse and it was related one another. They were codes, domains, addresses, and styles. First, for
the codes were divided into 3 categories which were English code, Indonesian code, also mixed code between English and Indonesian. Thus, in every category, students had different reasons on using those codes. Second, domain which every student shared the same domain in education. Even tough, they had education domain, yet the topic were various from one to others. Third, there were variation in addressing which students used to address their lecturer. Fourth, there were two kinds of styles, formal and informal which affected by the closeness that students had with the lecturer.

Referring to the questions, students adjusted their language choice depend on lecturer’s respond. In order to get students awareness about the language choice, there are some of ways to do by lecturer. First, the lecturer could make agreement with the students relate with the language that they use while communicating with the lecturers. Therefore, students will aware with their language since some of students will not pay attention to this before they are told to do so. Secondly, the lecturers need to give a formal respond despite of it takes place in a social media platform like Whatsapp. Most of students will adjust their language depend on the lecturers’ responds in the chats. If the lecturers respond in informal then students will follow. Through this, students can manage themselves in choosing their language while communicate with the lecturers.

This study still has a limitation which is time limitation. The study was limited in time where it was conducted only within several months. Then, the researcher cannot gain various sample data. In consequences, this study cannot
be generalizable in the program level because of the limited sampling. Therefore, for further research, it could be better if there is an extended time in gaining the sample data also having larger amount of participants in order to get varies and diverse result. Then, the data of the study can differ and the result is more detailed.
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APPENDIX

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. What is your name?
2. What is your batch?
3. How long have you known this lecturer?
4. Do you take one of his class?
5. Why do you address him/her with this addressee?
6. What is your reason in using English/Indonesia/Mixed when chat with him/her?
7. Do you feel nervous when chat with the lecturer?
8. Do you checked your grammar before sending the chat?
9. Why do you check your chat before sending it to the lecturer?
10. Do you find any differences if we compare when you communicate via chat and meet the lecturer in person?