

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

5.1 Conclusion

In brief, this study is conducted since people use different language styles in communicating with other people via SMS. It tries to find the language styles encountered the most frequently in the SMS and the factors affecting the styles. The students of the English Department of Widya Mandala University were taken as the subjects for this study. Their SMS's were used as the data. Some related concepts were used to support this study.

In order to find out the language styles encountered in the participants' SMS and the social factors which influenced the styles, the writer did a research using a method. First, the data was collected. Then, it was selected. The SMS which is not appropriate was dropped. Next, the data was analyzed based on the parameters (frozen, formal, consultative, casual, and intimate styles, and also Holmes' social factors of communicative interaction). After that, the analysis findings were formulated and discussed. Last, the conclusion was made.

The writer found that only four of five language styles by Martin Joos were encountered in the SMS of the students. The language styles were Formal, Consultative, Casual, and Intimate styles. The most frequently style used was Casual style, which got the highest percentage 75,3%. It was followed by Consultative and Intimate styles in the second place with 9,1%. And the least style with the lowest percentage of occurrence frequency is Formal style 6,5%.

The writer also concludes that only three of four Holmes' social factors (participants, topic, and function) influenced the language style. Apparently, the participants were the most important factors which gave the biggest influence in choosing certain language style. It includes the relationship of the participants, the age difference, and the social status of the participants. In addition, the limited numbers of SMS characters in the cell-phones also gave much influence in determining the language styles used. In fact, the limited numbers of SMS characters made the students use a lot of shortened words and abbreviations, which made the SMS categorized as Casual (the most frequently used style). The least influential factors for the student writing the SMS were the topic and the function.

In short, the writer found out that since the numbers of characters in SMS is limited, the senders tend to use Casual style in which there are many non-standard abbreviations that older people might difficult to understand the meaning of the abbreviations. For some participants, instead of using abbreviations, they prefer to write the sentence fully and complete grammatically. If one delivery does not take in all information they want to deliver via SMS, they will continue it on the next SMS. This is caused by their main consideration that is to whom the SMS is directed, especially to older and respectful people.

5.2 Suggestion

The making of this thesis has some shortcomings and it is still far from being perfect. The inability to collect more data from the students of all semesters is the main weakness of this study. Since, in this study, Intimate style was found the least in frequency of occurrence, whereas it may be plenty of Intimate style encountered in the SMS if only the writers could get more data. Therefore, there are

some suggestions that the writer would suggest to the next researchers who will deal with the same field of study that the writer took.

For the next researchers who are interested in doing the same research, the writer would like to suggest them to use more theories related to this field of study. And also hopefully next researchers can find more problems to be discussed.

In this thesis, the writer was not able to get the data from the students of all semesters because of the limited time she had. Therefore the writer hopes, in the next study which will take English Department students or other group of people as their participants, the next researchers will be able to collect more data from all semester students or more participants to gain a better result.

REFERENCES

- Anonymous. *Business Needs*. <http://www.ericson.com/ericsonbusinessadvantage.html>, traced in August 2006.
- Anonymous. *Future Development and Expectations*. http://www.emory.edu/BUSINESS/et/552fall2000/sms/history_of_sms.htm, traced in August 2006.
- Anonymous. *Particle*. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Indonesian_slang_language, traced in December 2006.
- Anonymous. *Short Message Service*. www.swisscom-mobile.ch/scm/wirglossaren.aspx, traced in August 2006.
- Bell, Roger T. 1978. *Sociolinguistics: Goals, Approaches, and Problems*. London: Bt. Batsford Ltd.
- Breiter, Jackie & Scott Murphy. *Two-way Short Messaging Services (SMS) In Wireless Phone*. <http://www.gsmworld.com/index1.html>, traced in April 2006.
- Chaika, Elaine. 1982. *Language: the Social Mirror*. Massachusetts: Newbury House.
- Chambers, et al. 1988. *Dialectology*. Cambridge: Cambrigde University Press.
- Cook, Guy. 1989. *Discourse*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Crystal, David & Derek Davy. 1969. *Investigating English Style*. New York: Longman.
- Day, Linda. *BSL in its Social Context*. www.bris.ac.uk, traced in August 2006.
- Finegan, Ed. (1997). "Sociolinguistics and the Law". Coulmas, Florian. (Ed). *The Handbook of Sociolinguistics*. Blackwell.
- Holzman, Mathilda. 1997. *The Language of Children: Evolution and Development of Secondary Consciousness and Language*. Cambridge: Blackwell.
- Hudson, R.A. 1980. *Sociolinguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Joos, Martin. 1976. *The Styles of the Five Clocks*. Ed. Nancy Ainsworth Johnson. Current Topics in Language Introducing Readings. Massachusetts: Stanford University Press.

- Kosasih, Felicia. 2006. *The Speech Styles of the Presenters of TRANS TV "CERIWIS" Variety Show*. Unpublished S1 Thesis. Surabaya: Widya Mandala Catholic University.
- Kothari, R. 1990. *Research Methodology: Methods and Techniques*. New Delhi: Wiley Eastern Limited.
- Labov, W. 1992. *Sociolinguistic Patterns*. Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- Leech, Geoffrey. 1974. *Semantics*. Hazell Watson and Viney Ltd.
- Ling, Ay. 2002. *Language Styles and Language Functions of Internet Chatting*. Unpublished S1 Thesis. Surabaya: Widya Mandala Catholic University.
- Lyons, John. 1981. *Language and Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McMillan, James H. 1992. *Educational Research: Fundamental for the Consumer*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Miles, Matthew B. & A. Michael Huberman. 1994. *Qualitative Data Analysis*. California: SAGE Publications.
- Nababan, P.W.J. 1991. *Sosiolinguistik: Suatu Pengantar*. Jakarta: PT Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- Pardjimin. 2005. *Buku Bahasa Indonesia SLTP I*. Bogor: Yudhistira.
- Posavac, E. J. (1997). Review of "Outcome-Based Evaluation". *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 20, 114-115.
- Thomas, L. (Ed), et al. 1999. *Language, Society and Power*. London: Routledge.
- Trudgill, Peter. 1977. *Sociolinguistics: An Introduction*. New Zealand: Penguin Books.
- Trudgill, Peter. 1984. *Introducing Language and Society*. Penguin English.
- Wardhaugh, Ronald. 1977. *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. New York: Longman.
- Webster, Merriam. 1986. *Webster's Third New International Dictionary*. Springfield: M-W, Inc. Publisher.
- Wolfram, Walt. 1991. *Dialects and American English*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.