

## CHAPTER IV

### CONCLUSION

#### 4.1 Conclusion

This study attempts to cover chats in a community, specifically the Student English Department at Andalas University. This chat was taken to see the scale of formality and the influence of the use of formal style by students on written chats sent by students to their lecturers. The concept of the formality scale cannot be separated from the language style the student uses in communicating, which can reflect the use of language in social relationships with others. The data was based on 27 samples from 90 English Department students with purposive sampling. The data analysis covered theories on the type of language style by Joos (1967) and Holmes (2013) theory of social factors that influence language style.

From the data that has been analyzed, three dominant types were found that were used in chats between students and their lecturers. 3 of 5 types proposed by Joos (1967) were found: Formal, Consultative, and Intimate Style. First, Consultative is the dominant style used by students when chatting with their lecturers, with 14 data (52%). The second type is Casual Style, which has 8 data (30%). Lastly, the type of style found in student chat is Formal Style, with 5 data (19%). However, from the language students use, two types are not found in conversations between students and lecturers: Frozen and Intimate because Frozen is the style with the highest formality. In contrast, the intimate style is only used by people who are emotionally close.

The consultative style is the dominant style students use in their chats with lecturers. This is because the Consultative style is semi-formal, allowing students to interact directly and use interactive language. From the data findings, many students asked questions, provided clarification, and gave feedback while chatting. The consultative style used by students is influenced by various factors, which make the students aware of the language used.

Second, the use of styles can be influenced by social factors that produce language styles: 1). Participants, 2). Settings, 3). Topics, and 4). Function. It was found that Participant 11 had data (41%), followed by the setting found 6 data (22%) and also Function with 6 data (22%), and the last is the Topic found with 4 data (15%). From the percentage obtained, the Participant factor is the most dominant social factor in the data. These findings were obtained through interviews with the student and the language user in the chat. According to the student's statement in their interview, the Participant was concerned because the language used depended on who he was talking to. The lecturer, thesis supervisor, and academic supervisor had different social statuses than the students, so students chose to use words according to the person they were talking to. Then, the Settings and Functions factors have the same percentage, and the use of settings is heavily influenced by online communication. In contrast, in Functions, students communicate in their language to express themselves. Then, the lowest percentage on Topics. Based on the data, it found that the topic factor occurs because students have difficulty discussing a topic, so students choose the language that can convey the topic.

In conclusion, students' use of language style in their chat with lecturers can vary depending on their awareness of the formality scale. From the interview and data analysis, some students are aware of their social status and use the standard vocabulary when communicating with their lecturer. Meanwhile, half of them also stated that sometimes they forgot and did not pay attention to the use of sentences they used. Therefore, the use of language style is shown by how the students choose the appropriate word choice, and it is also influenced by social factors in the use scale of formality by the students.

#### **4.2 Limitations of the study**

The author detected several limitations of this study. The first limitation is that data is found in the object, where only 27 participants used data because the author only took one community scope, the Student English Department Academic Year 2020. Second, the limitation of this study is in the type of language style, of which two types are not found because the scope of the community is limited to students and lecturers only. Third, limitations exist in the data collecting method, which only carries out interviews regarding the use of different types of language styles and social factors that influence this use and which are only carried out from the perspective of interviews with students. This was due to a request from students to keep their participants in the chat.

### 4.3 Suggestion for future research

Apart from the limitations of this study, the study needs to be updated in terms of relevant objects to the times in future research. In future studies, it is hoped that we can analyze students from different cohorts so that this study can become a reference. However, future research needs to vary in terms of objects and adapt to theory so that all types can be found. Aside from the object, analyze social factors on the object to explain each factor in more detail. Therefore, the interview explanations should be analyzed to prove each factor in more detail.

