

# The Sociopragmatic Perspective of Typographical Features in Students' SMS and Whatsapp Text Messages

Ifan Iskandar

Universitas Negeri Jakarta

Email: [ifaniskandar@unj.ac.id](mailto:ifaniskandar@unj.ac.id)

Submitted: 01/30/2020

Revised: 03/02/2020

Accepted: 20/02/2020

E-ISSN : 2579-4574

P-ISSN : 2549-7359

**Abstract.** This study aims to examine the typographical features of English and Indonesian languages in students' text messages delivered to the lecturers and the sociopragmatic perspective of the features collected from respondents of diverse profession and education backgrounds. Content analysis is employed to conduct the study whose data are the typographical features identified in 1,521 students' SMS and that of in 527 WhatsApp text messages and followed by a survey of sociopragmatic attitudes towards the features gathered from 223 respondents. The findings recognize the typographical features of emoticons, vowel deletion, letter deletion, rebus writings—letter deletion, number deletion, letter-number deletion, and images or symbols—and phonetic spelling. The features are employed in various approaches as identified in the ways letters are deleted in the initial, medial and final syllables of the words. Social factor and dimension analyses underpinning the sociopragmatic perspective of the features suggests that the students communicate with older participants in written mode about serious matters for informative function and that the students and lecturers are socially distant between subordinate to superior with high formality degree for referential function which is high information content and low affective content. This social factor and dimension implies the use of formal style which is in line with the respondents' attitudes acknowledging the formal employment of the language in text messaging. Sociopragmatically, the typographical features are supposed to be used only when texting to the equally aged or younger participants, to the participants who are socially equal or lower with no distance, and for social communication functions or topics, not professional ones.

**Keywords:** *Typographical Features, Sociopragmatic Perspective, Emoticons, Rebus Writing, and Phonetic Spelling.*

<https://ojs.unm.ac.id/eralingua>



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/).

## INTRODUCTION

The usage of short message service (SMS) and Whatsapp (WA) among cellphone users compared to email, facebook, or tweeter is contributory to the emergence of electronic-mediated communication (EMC) subsuming the previously developing way of communication, computer-mediated communication (CMC). Until the mid of 2009, SMS has been used by 4,000 millions users around the world with the average number of 50 short messages per month per user (Hillebrand, et.al., 2010). WA, on the other hand, is actively used by 1,500 millions users per month with 60.000 millions texts per day (Stout, 2020). The ubiquity of SMS and WA texts providing the corpora of languages of the electronic messages have been the interests of language researchers.

Studies on language in short messages have been carried out by several researchers with different foci. The foci on the linguistic features of languages in SMS texts are the usage and adaptation of written language towards four modes of computer-mediated communication; email, web chat, instant messaging, and SMS through the reduction of syntactic and lexical features of Swedish in the forms of in conventional abbreviation, spellings and mechanics, and non-alphabetical graphical means or emoticons (Segerstad, 2002; Bieswanger, 2006) the advantages and communicative functions of abbreviation, the omission of subject pronouns, modals, copula and articles, capitals, mechanics and emoticons in 7.500 words of 900 messages (Bosco. & Sum., 2007); the deviation of SMS language from the standardized language structure through the uses of vowel deletion, the deletion of reduplicated words, direct truncation, and numbers or symbols for abbreviation and substitution (Sumitra & Pal., 2009); the morphosyntactic structures of the English language in SMS, and the types of SMS language features used in their written work at a university of technology in South Africa (Chaka, Mphahlele, & Mann, 2015). The focus on the linguistic form also concern the linguistic analysis of WhatsApp conversations among undergraduate students (Otemuyiwa, 2017) and the translation of 30,000 messages of various languages into French in Belgium in which the messages were collected through the project “*Faites don de vos SMS à la science*” or *Give your SMS to Science* (Fairon & Paumier, 2006).

The other foci of the studies are on the sociolinguistic aspect of languages used in texting. They are kinds of words, the lengthiness of the messages, abbreviation, capitals, mechanics, salutations and closings and how the features are used across genders and age groups (Ling, 2005); the linguistic forms and communicative functions in a corpus of 544 participants' actual text-messages (Thurlow & Brown, 2003); the patterns and factors of language choice in text messaging between English and Shona. In the University of Zimbabwe The study concluded that age, sex and perceived ease and swiftness of writing have an effect on the patterns of language choice in text messaging. and the similitude and differences of the use of conventional linguistic and communicative practices to express thoughts among the Cameroonian and Nigerian texters (Elvis, 2009). There is also an interest to study the new trends in digital communication by observing if the language used in WhatsApp text interactions constituted a new language variety (Pérez-Sabater, 2015).

The study of the singularities of language and interactions via Instant messaging (IM) like WA among bachelors is also carried out (Dorantes, Sierra, Pérez, Bel-Enguix, & Rosales, 2018). The collection of research on languages of texting can be found in a handbook that presents the studies of discourse behavior and digital communication particularly on language structures and social interaction (Taiwo, 2010) and in digital literacy repertoires (Tagg & Asprey, 2017). To infer, the abovementioned studies are dealt with the linguistic forms of texting languages, the communicative functions, the sociolinguistic aspects, and the potential use and effect of texting. Despite the diversity of foci in the studies of languages in texting, the present study addresses novel aspects of the area.

This study focuses on typographical features (textisms) in the SMS and WA texts with the students majoring English as the texters, communicating with special textees, their faculty staff. The student-lecturer communication using text and instant messaging for academic purposes is proven to be useful and convenient (Lauricella & Kay, 2013) and that of using WhatsApp shows that students employ more politeness than that of teachers (Mulyono, Amalia, & Suryoputro, 2019). The two studies differ from this study in the sense that this study focusses on the linguistic features of typography and sociolinguistically analyses the respondents' perspectives of the features, while two focus on the usefulness, convenience, and strategies of the student-lecturer communication. Thus, sociolinguistically, this study specifically analyses the texts whose writers are participants with different social factors and dimension, students and teachers, which are assumed to dictate specific linguistic forms of languages. The languages studied are English and Indonesian in two different kinds of social media—Short Message Service and WhatsApp. The further advantage of the study is that it includes respondents of different education and work backgrounds to make the judgements on the use of the typographical features in texting. The study sets out to investigate the use of typographical features in SMS and WA texts and sociopragmatically judge the use.

Most discussions of sociopragmatics are associated with the Leech's notion that pragmatic descriptions are to be pertinent to certain social conditions and that sociopragmatics and pragmalinguistics are parts and parcel of pragmatics (Leech, 2016). Sociopragmatics is the culture specific or the socio-cultural basis to use a certain form of language and it is in this sense that makes sociopragmatics share the similitude with sociolinguistics. The interrelatedness of sociopragmatics and sociolinguistics is traceable in defining sociopragmatic competence as "*the ability to use available linguistic resources in a contextually appropriate fashion*" (Delahaie, 2015).

The sociocultural basis affects the textual communication between students and faculty staff in this study. To address this basis effectively, Holmes' notions of social factors and dimensions is preferred. Social factors and dimensions comprise the social factors of participants, setting, topic, and function and the social dimensions of social distance, status scale, formality scale, and functional scale (Holmes & Wilson, 2017). The social factors and dimensions are formulated into the context of communication between the texters and the textees as the participants in terms of the age (older, equally aged, and younger), the social status (higher,

equally scaled, and lower), the social distance (non-distant and distant), and the topic-function/formality-functional scale (professional and social).

This kind of study on typographical features is also conducted by Chaka, Mphahlele, & Mann (2015), but it is different from Chaka in the sense that it addresses problems with broader coverage. Typography is the art of using and arranging words, letters, numbers, and symbols in a written language (Bringhurst, 2004). In the context of studying languages in texting, the typographical features of orthographically changing the words to adjust contextually to the social media of SMS and WhatsApp are known as textisms (Chaka et al., 2015; Bernicot, Volckaert-legrier, Goumi, & Bert-erboul, 2012). In this study typographical features are narrowed into the ways words are presented by making use of letters, numbers, symbols, and images.

## RESEARCH METHOD

This research was qualitative in nature and carried out by employing content analysis to analyse and describe students' SMS and WA texts to represent their content through enumeration process such as the word frequency calculation and qualitative judgement on the typographical features used in the texts. Survey was also employed to analyse the respondents' attitudes towards the use of the features. The data sources of the content analysis are 1,521 SMS texts comprising 1,201 texts written in Indonesian and 320 in English and 527 WA texts consisting of 425 Indonesian and 102 English texts. These texts were used by students of English Education Study Programme and English Language and Literature Study Programme of Universitas Negeri Jakarta (State University of Jakarta) to communicate with the lecturers.

The survey involved 223 respondents of different education and profession backgrounds. Respondents of education backgrounds are Primary School (SD): 14 respondents, Bachelor Degree (D-3): 4, Graduate Degree (S-1): 161, Master Degree (S-2): 41, Doctorate Degree (S-3): 7. Respondents of profession backgrounds are Civil Servants (PNS) 21 respondents, Private Sectors (PS): 19, Graduate Students: 109, Master Students: 16, Teacher Profession Education (PPG) Students: 35, Lecturers: 23 respondents. The data were the typographical features of English and Indonesian in the students' SMS and WA texts and the respondents' attitudes towards the usage of the features in sociopragmatics perspective.

The SMS texts were compiled using *Nokia PC Suite* to transfer the texts from lecturers phones to the computer and then they were converted to *Excell* using *ABC Amber Nokia Converter*. The WA texts were collected by copying and pasting the texts from WhatsApp Chat operated by using computer instead of cellphones. The data of the texts were collected by the researcher through the identification and presentation of the elements of emoticon, vowel and letter deletion, rebus writing, and phonetic spelling (textisms). The other kind of data, the attitudes, were collected using the questionnaire. Theoretical sampling or confirming and disconfirming sampling were used to carry out the data sampling of the features and the collection of data was ended when new typographical features were no longer identifiable. These data were valid in terms of their authenticity (original and genuine), credibility (accurate), representativeness (representative), and meaning

(purposeful). The data of the attitudes were measured in terms of their content validity.

The data of the typographical features were analyzed by designing the coding frame of linguistic features, classifying the features and check the classification involving intra- and inter-coders, calculating the frequencies of the features, noting the circumstances under which the features are used, and making the conclusion. Data reliability was based on intracoder reliability by using coding scheme to ensure the consistency of data collection and analysis and that of intercoder by involving two doctors of linguistics and one master of translation.

## RESULT AND DISCUSSION

### The types and density of typographical features in students' SMS and WA texts sent to the faculty staff

The kinds of typographical features (TF) found in the study are emoticons, vowel deletion, letter deletion, rebus writing—letter homophone, number homophone, letter-number homophone, and symbols—and phonetic spellings. There are eight kinds and six thousand a hundred sixty three cases of typographical features identified 1,521 SMS texts and that of three kinds and four hundred eighty seven cases in the WA texts. It means that four TF are identified in every SMS texts or 400 percent density and almost one TF for every WA texts, nine of every ten WA texts or 90 percent density (study the table below).

**Table 1.** The Typographical Features of English and Indonesian in SMS and WA Texts in Terms of Kinds, Number of Kinds, Case, and Density

the typographical features in English and Indonesian SMS and WhatsApp texts							
No.	kinds	SMS texts (1,521)			WhatsApp texts (527)		
		number	case	density	number	case	density
a	b	c	d	e	f	g	h
1	emoticon	41	191	12.6%	7	403	76.5%
2	vowel deletion	302	2,825	185.8%	0	0	0
3	letter deletion	1,003	2,482	163.2%	9	71	13.5%
4	rebus writing: letter homophone	48	409	26.9%	0	0	0
5	rebus writing: number homophone	2	23	1.5%	0	0	0
6	rebus writing: letter-number homophone	26	41	2.7%	0	0	0
7	rebus writing: symbol	21	165	10.8%	2	13	2.5%
8	phonetic spelling	16	27	1.8%	0	0	0
9	Total number	1,459	6,163	400%	18	487	92%

The kinds of TF identified in SMS texts are emoticons, vowel deletion, letter deletion, rebus writing—letter homophone, number homophone, letter-number homophone, and symbols—and phonetic spellings and only emoticons, letter

deletion, and rebus writing of symbol are identified in the WA texts. Emoticons are derived from emotion and icon used to show emotional mood of the texters. In SMS texts emoticons make use of punctuation marks like :) for *smile*; :( for *sadness*; and ( ^\_^ ) for *smile*, while in WA texts, emoticons use images or graphical representations known as emoji derived from *e* for *picture* and *moji* for *letter* or *character*. The emojis identified are 🙏 for *thank you*; 😊 for *smile*; and 👉 for *that*. Emoticons are identified one in every ten SMS texts, but eight in every ten WA texts. It is probably affected by the unavailable menu of emoticons in SMS unlike the WA chats with a menu offering abundant emojis to express emotion.

The feature of deletion is classified into two types, that are vowel deletion and letter deletion. Vowel deletion is separated from letter deletion as vowel deletion systematically omitting the vowels in words that create vowelless words or consonant skeletons. Letter deletion randomly omit any letters in words that might result in both commonly known words and unknown ones. The two features can be seen below.

1. Vowel-deleted words are, for example: **sy** for *saya* (I) and **bpk** for *bapak* (sir);
2. Letter-deleted words are, for instance, **pa** for *Pak* (Sir); **Aslm** for *Assalamualaikum* (Muslim salutation); **sya** for *saya* (I); **bsa** for *bisa* (can); and **smua** for *semua* (all).

Both, vowel and letter deletions can be identified twice in each SMS texts or more that 160 percent density. The deletions are not identified in WA texts and this is probably due to the relatively unlimited characters that can be typed in one WA text.

Rebus writing is the use an object or symbol whose sound resembles the intended words or syllables. The rebus writing can be categorized into letter homophone, number homophone, letter-number homophone, and symbols and the findings are identifiable below.

3. Letter homophone like **u** for *untuk* (for); **n** for *and*; **mw** for *mau* (want); and **qt** for *kita* (we) is identified three times in every three SMS texts;
4. Number homophone, for instance: **4** for *for* and **2** for *to* are used three times in every two hundred SMS texts;
5. Letter-number homophone as shown in **b4** for *before*; **2day** for *today*; and **br5** for *berlima* (the five) is identified three times in every a hundred SMS texts;
6. Symbols using **&** for *and*; **@** for *at*; **Brg x** for *barangkali* (perhaps); and **di(:)** for *dibagi* (divided) are found eleven times in every a hundred SMS texts;
7. Rebus writing of symbols **&** for *and* and **@** for *at* are identified five times in every two hundred WA texts.

In total, there are four cases of rebus writing in SMS in every a hundred texts or 40 percent density, but that of only five cases in WA texts in every two hundreds texts or 2.5 percent density.

Phonetic spelling is the use of certain sounds to replace syllables or words. There are two cases of phonetic spelling in every a hundred SMS texts, but none in WA texts. The examples of the spelling are presented below.

### 8. **Gud for good; cud for could; dat for that; and t'nite for tonight.**

Phonetic spelling can be identified twice in every a hundred SMS texts or with two percent density.

The findings as presented in table 1 confirm the previous studies on the occurrences of words with diverging orthographic changes. The forms of emoticons, vowel deletion, letter deletion, rebus writing—letter homophone, number homophone, letter-number homophone, and symbols—and phonetic spellings are found in words having experienced morphological processes resulting in textisms (Chaka et al., 2015). They use the terms contractions, shortenings, omissions and abbreviations to represent deletions, but use the similar terms of rebus writing and phonetic approximation for phonetic spelling.

The findings also show that typographical features used in both social media, SMS and WhatsApp. The difference is that only three kinds of the eight features are identifiable in the WA texts, they are emoticons, letter deletion, symbols. The use of emoticons in WhatsApp chats is more frequent than that of in SMS, while the uses of letter deletion and symbols are less frequent. This is comprehensible since WhatsApp provide a special menu for emoticons or emojis and can accommodate 1,600 characters while SMS does not have the menu and has maximum capacity of 160 characters per message. This fact confirms that written languages used in communication media adapt to the media as proven by the adaptation of languages in four modes of Computer-Mediated Communication (CMC)—email, web chat, instant messaging, and mobile text messaging/SMS (Segerstad, 2002).

### **The ways typographical forms in the SMS and WhatsApp texts are used**

The occurrences of typographical forms in SMS and WA texts are empirically evident. The further explanations on how the forms are used is required to get thorough insight about the possible emergence of a new language variety in the world of texting which to some is known as textese. Emoticons and emojis are used to communicate positive or negative expressions, particularly the positive one in this study as students might not have enough courage to show the negative expressions.

The emoticons of smileys in SMS texts and folded hands/two hands pressed together in WA texts are the most frequently used ones. They are used when the messages texted by students to the faculty staff are intended to ask a favour and the smileys and folded hands are used for euphemistic purpose of requesting. They are also employed to express gratitude when students respond to faculty staff's texts of doing the favour for them. These emoticons are usually placed at the end of the texts and in WA texts, they are generally used twice in one text.

The most iconic feature of typographical forms is the deletion of the letters or syllables bringing about the shortened or truncated words. There are diverse ways of deleting letters in the words used in SMS and WA texts, they are:

1. the deletion of the vowel in the first syllable of words as in **bgian** for **bagian** (share) and **bgitu** for **begitu** (so);
2. the deletion of the vowel in the last syllable of words as shown in **biarkn** for **biarkan** (let) and **melibatkn** for **melibatkan** (involve);

3. the deletion of the vowel in the syllable of the middle of words for instance **memblas** for **membalas** (return);
4. the deletion of the vowel and consonant in the first syllable of words and replace them with apostrophe s ('s), for example **w'derful** for **wonderful** and **b'damai** for **berdamai** (make peace);
5. the deletion of the letters randomly as in **trimakasi** for **terima kasih** (thank you) and **letakn** for **letakkan** (put);
6. the deletion of the vowels in the first and last syllables of words, for example **trakhr** for **terakhir** (the last);
7. the deletion of the vowels in the first and the mid syllables of words as shown in **ltkkan** for **letakkan** (put) and **kptsan** for **keputusan** (decision);
8. the deletion of all vowels except the vowel in the first syllable as in **semilm** for **semalam** and **mengjr** for **mengajar**;
9. the deletion of the syllable in the mid of words, for instance **kana** for **karena** (because);
10. the deletion of the vowel in the root, except the vowels of prefixes and suffixes as in **menjlnkan** for **menjalankan** (to run).

These ways of shortening words are stereotypical forms of textism, especially identified in SMS messages, as the consequence of limited capacity of characters per message. The fact that the shortened words are frequently employed by students to the faculty staff is intriguing traditionally and scientifically. The words are grammatically incorrect and less formal, thus, traditionally considered inappropriate when used to communicate to faculty staff. However, their frequent use is scientifically interesting as it might indicate the traditional transformation of so-called formality in social media.

### The sociopragmatic perspective on the use of typographical forms in the SMS and WA texts

The plethoric use of typographical forms employed by students to communicate using SMS and WA with their faculty staff is sociopragmatically challenging for investigation. Theoretically, the communication between students and faculty staff could be considered inappropriate. This is explicably analysed on the basis of Holmes's social factors and dimensions as shown in the table below.

**Table 2.** Social Factor of Students' Communication to Their Lecturers

components of social factor	results
1. participants	Students communicate with their lecturers who are generally older.
2. setting	Communication is mediated with cellphones without face-to-face interaction using written mode.
3. topic	academic policies and administration, schedules of consultation and courses, thesis, and sometimes birthday or season's greetings
4. function	informative, not social

The table shows that language to be used by students to communicate with their lecturers should be formal. This is underpinned by the fact that the students communicate with the lecturers who are older (participants), they use cellphones with no face-to-face interaction in written mode (setting). They communicate serious matters such as academic policies and administration, schedules of consultation and courses, thesis, and sometimes birthday or season's greetings (topic). Their communication is mainly informative not social (function). The analysis of social factor is completed with that of social dimension to elaborate the social context of students' communication to their lecturers. The analysis is presented in the following table.

**Table 3.** Social Dimension of Students' Communication to Their Lecturers

components of social dimension	result
1. social distance	Generally, students-lecturers relation is <i>distant</i> with <i>low solidarity</i> mainly due to the age differences
2. status scale	Student status is <i>subordinate</i> and thus <i>low status</i> , while lecturer status is <i>superior</i> and in this way <i>high status</i> . This is affected by Indonesian culture that usually place teachers and lecturers in high social status.
3. formality scale	<i>Formality</i> degree is relatively high as the topics are mostly serious matters.
4. functional scale	Communication function is <i>referential</i> with <i>high information content</i> and thus <i>low affective content</i> .

The table confirms the result of social factor analysis that the language that students should use to communicate with their lecturer using text messages is formal. The result of social dimension analysis underlies this. It shows that students and lecturers are socially distant with low solidarity (social distance), in comparison to lecturers, students are subordinate with low social status, while lecturers are superior with high status (status scale). Due to the serious matters communicated by students to their lecturers, the communication between them is formally high (formality scale) and referential with high information content and low affective content (functional scale).

The social factor and dimension suggest that formal style of language should be employed by students to communicate with their lecturers by using text messages. However, to further examine whether the result of social factor and dimension is empirically proven, respondents of diverse backgrounds were surveyed to find out their attitudes towards the use of textisms by students to the lecturers. The formality degree of students language in their messages could be analyzed in terms of syntactic elements and diction. In this sense, the formality is proven through the use non-formal language in the messages, through the diction. In Joos' view of five styles, the non-formal styles are intimate, casual, and consultative (Joos, 1967). The interface of the three styles is casual which characterized by the use of textisms. It is through the use of them, the

sociopragmatic interpretation of the typographical features of English and Indonesian used in students’ text messages to their lecturers is carried out.

Of two hundred fifty questionnaires distributed to the respondents classified in terms of education and work backgrounds, two hundred twenty three are returned. In average, ninety percent of the respondents believe that emoticons, vowelless words, letter-deleted words, rebus writings, and phonetic-spelling words should be used only when texted to the equally aged or younger textees, whose social status are equally scaled or lower, who are socially non-distant, and in social communication, not professional. This is the common attitudes towards the usage of typographical features based on the survey. The attitudes are shown by the results of the survey below.

**Table 4.** The Percentage of Respondents’ Attitudes Towards the Usage of Typographical Features in Texting (A Respondent May Choose More Than One Sub-Factor And Dimension)

typograph- ical features	the sociopragmatic perspective of social factors and dimensions									
	I. participants			II. status scale			III. social distance	IV. topic-function /formality-functional scales		
	1.1. older	1.2. equally aged	1.3. younger	2.1. higher	2.2. equally scaled	2.3. lower	3.1. non-distant	3.2. distant	4.1. professional	4.2. social
emoticons	6,05	66,24	27,71	6,12	73,47	20,41	90,04	9,96	2,23	97,77
vowelless words	9,39	64,40	26,21	8,87	69,97	21,16	80,58	19,42	13,62	86,38
letter deleted words	6,46	65,16	28,39	5,39	70,37	24,24	83,61	16,39	12,02	87,98
rebus writing	3.56	64.99	31.45	4.17	68.17	26.16	88.94	11.07	5.89	94.11
phonetic-spelling words	4,35	66,56	29,09	4,55	71,33	24,13	89,04	10,97	7,86	92,14

The respondents’ attitudes towards the usage of the features are further classified into the attitudes across the work background or profession and that of education background. The professions are categorized into civil servant (CS), private company employees (PCE), graduate students (GS-1), master degree students (MS-2), teachers (T), and faculty staff/lecturers (FS). The education backgrounds are grouped into high school (HS), bachelor degree (BD), graduate degree (GD), master degree (MD), and doctorate degree (DD). The attitudes towards the usage of the features across the professions and education backgrounds could be seen in the tables below.

**Table 5.** The Percentage of Respondents' Attitudes Towards the Usage of Emoticons and Vowelless Words in Texting Across Professions

social factor and dimension	emoticons across professions						vowelless words across professions					
	CS	PCE	GS1	MS2	T	FS	CS	PCE	GS1	MS2	T	FS
I. participants												
1.1. older	23.8	5.3	7.3	6.3	2.9	13	33.3	10.5	11	0	8.6	21.7
1.2. equally aged	61.	84.2	98.2	100	94.3	100	71.4	89.5	88.9	100	91.4	95.7
1.3. younger	33.3	31.6	41.3	50	22.9	56.5	19.1	26.3	41.3	43.8	17.2	60.9
II. status scale												
2.1. higher	38.1	5.3	8.3	12.5	2.9	4.4	28.6	10.5	8.3	6.25	11.4	17.4
2.2. equally scaled	57.1	94.7	99.1	100	100	100	66.7	94.7	95.4	100	88.6	95.7
2.3. lower	28.6	26.3	30.3	31.3	86	348	28.6	15.8	28.4	25	14.3	56.5
III. social distance												
3.1. non-distant	90.5	89.5	92.7	93.8	97.1	95.7	61.9	68.4	91.7	100	85.7	100
3.2. distant	9.5	15.8	11.9	18.8	2.9	4.45	33.3	31.6	21.1	6.25	14.3	21.7
IV. topic-function/formality-functional scales												
4.1. professional	14.3	0	0.9	0	2.9	0	33.3	36.8	9.2	6.25	8.6	17.4
4.2. social	85.7	100	100	100	97.1	100	66.7	68.4	98.2	100	91.4	91.3

Table 5 shows that in the usage of emoticons, only the civil servants (CS) have noticeably different attitudes (equal to or more than 20 percent) and believe that emoticons can be used to text older textees, textees with higher social status, and to communicate professional matters. Vowelless words, according to CS and the faculty staff (FS), can be used to text older participants, but only CS believe that the vowelless could be used for textees with higher social status. The vowelless, according to CS, PCE, GS1, and FS, could also be used to text the recipients who are socially distant. In general emoticons and vowelless words should be used to text older textees whose social status is equally scaled with no social distance and for social function. CS also show importantly different attitudes towards the usage of letter-deleted words and rebus writings.

Table 6 shows that CS believe that letter-deleted words and rebus could be used to text older recipients, recipients socially higher, recipients socially distant, and for professional function. Master degree students (MS2) share similar attitude with CS in the usage of letter-deleted words to text recipients who are socially distant. CS also show noticeable different attitude towards the usage of phonetic spelling as shown in table 6. CS believe that phonetic spelling words may be used to text older textees, textees socially higher and distant and for professional function. The attitudes of the respondents of other professions; PCE, GS1, MS2, and FS, are relatively similar with the common attitudes previously stated (the explanation of table 5). They believe that the five features should be used to text equally aged or younger recipients and they are, in terms of social status, equal or lower and socially distant and used for social communication.

**Table 6.** The Percentage of Respondents’ Attitudes Towards the Usage of Letter-Deleted Words and Rebus Writings in Texting Across Professions

social factor and dimension	letter-deleted words across professions						rebus writings across professions					
	CS	PCE	GS1	MS2	T	FS	CS	PCE	GS1	MS2	T	FS
I. participants												
1.1. older	33.3	5.3	7.4	0	5.7	8.7	25	5.3	2.5	1.6	1.4	3.3
1.2. equally aged	66.7	84.2	92.7	100	91.4	100	57.1	68.4	89.2	96.9	86.4	96.7
1.3. younger	33.3	36.8	43.1	50	22.7	47.8	46.4	42.1	38.1	51.6	36.4	51.1
II. status scale												
2.1. higher	23.8	10.5	6.4	0	2.7	4.4	25	10.5	3.4	1.6	0.7	1.1
2.2. equally scaled	71.4	84.2	96.3	100	97.2	100	65.5	81.6	88.1	95.3	92.1	97.8
2.3. lower	33.3	15.8	37.6	37.5	14.3	43.5	33.3	13.2	36.7	37.5	21.4	44.6
III. social distance												
3.1. non-distant	66.7	89.5	91.7	87.5	88.6	100	77.4	85.5	90.6	96.9	95	98.9
3.2. distant	28.6	10.5	17.4	25	11.4	17.4	22.6	10.5	12.2	12.5	5	6.5
IV. topic-function/formality-functional scales												
4.1. professional	38.1	15.8	8.3	6.3	11.4	13	27.4	13.2	2.5	0	2.9	5.4
4.2. social	71.4	78.9	95.4	93.8	94.3	100	73.8	84.2	97	100	97.9	100

**Table 7.** The Percentage of Respondents’ Attitudes Towards the Usage of Phonetic-Spelling Words In Texting Across Professions

social factor and dimension	phonetic-spelling words across professions					
	CS	PCE	GS1	MS2	T	FS
I. participants						
1.1. older	23.8	5.3	4.6	0	0	8.7
1.2. equally aged	61.9	78.9	93.6	100	88.6	95.7
1.3. younger	33.3	42.1	33.9	50	42.9	52.2
II. status scale						
2.1. higher	23.8	0	5.5	0	0	8.7
2.2. equally scaled	71.4	94.7	91.7	100	94.3	95.7
2.3. lower	23.8	21.1	33.9	37.5	20	43.5
III. social distance						
3.1. non-distant	76.2	84.2	93.6	93.8	88.6	100
3.2. distant	23.8	15.8	9.2	6.3	11.4	8.7
IV. topic-function/formality-functional scales						
4.1. professional	33.3	10.5	4.6	0	2.9	13
4.2. social	66.8	89.5	97.25	100	100	100

The second part of presenting the respondents’s attitudes towards the usage of typographical features is by education background. The respondents graduating from high school (HS) and doctorate degree (DD) believe that emoticons can be used for older recipients. HS also suppose that emoticons may be used for recipients with higher social status and for professional function. The relatively similar trend of the attitudes is also identified in the usage of vowelless words in which HS and DD think that they could be used for older recipients, HS see

that they are usable for higher status recipients, HS, BD, and GD believe that they could be used for socially distant textees. HS and BD think that the vowelless could be used for social function.

**Table 8.** The Percentage of Respondents' Attitudes Towards The Usage of emoticons and Vowelless Words in Texting Across Education Backgrounds

social factor and dimension	emoticons across education backgrounds					vowelless words across education backgrounds				
	HS	BD	GD	MD	DD	HS	BD	GD	MD	DD
<b>I. participants</b>										
1.1. older	50	0	6.2	7.3	28.6	62.5	0	10.6	12.2	28.6
1.2. equally aged	50	100	95	95.1	100	37.5	100	89.4	95.1	100
1.3. younger	0	25	36.7	48.8	71.4	0	0	34.8	46.3	85.7
<b>II. status scale</b>										
2.1. higher	37.5	0	7.5	4.9	14.3	50	0	9.3	14.6	14.3
2.2. equally scaled	50	100	98.1	100	100	25	100	93.8	95.1	100
2.3. lower	12.5	25	25.5	29.3	57.1	25	0	25.5	34.2	71.4
<b>III. social distance</b>										
3.1. non-distant	87.5	75	93.2	95.1	100	37.5	75	87	97.6	100
3.2. distant	12.5	25	10.6	9.8	0	50	25	21.7	14.6	14.3
<b>IV. topic-function/formality-functional scales</b>										
4.1. professional	37.5	0	1.2	0	0	75	50	11.8	9.8	14.3
4.2. social	62.5	100	99.4	100	100	25	75	93.2	97.6	85.7

The attitudes towards the usage of letter-deleted words and rebus across education are relatively identical to the common attitudes. Only HS in general showing noticeably different attitudes. Study table 9 below.

**Table 9.** The percentage of Respondents' Attitudes Towards the Usage of Letter-Deleted Words and Rebus Writings in Texting Across Education Backgrounds

social factor and dimension	letter-deleted words across education backgrounds					rebus writings across education backgrounds				
	HS	BD	GD	MD	DD	HS	BD	GD	MD	DD
<b>I. participants</b>										
1.1. older	62.5	0	7.5	2.4	28.6	46,9	6,3	2,9	2,4	10,7
1.2. equally aged	25	100	91.9	97.6	100	37,5	75	86	92,1	100
1.3. younger	12.5	25	37.3	46.3	71.4	25	6,3	38,5	50,6	71,4
<b>II. status scale</b>										
2.1. higher	37.5	0	6.2	4.9	14.3	46,9	6,3	3,7	3,7	3,6
2.2. equally scaled	50	100	95	95.1	100	46,9	75	87,9	92,7	100
2.3. lower	12.5	0	31.7	36.6	57.1	15,6	0	32,3	36,6	57,1
<b>III. social distance</b>										
3.1. non-distant	37.5	75	90.1	95.1	100	62,5	68,8	91,2	96,9	100
3.2. distant	37.5	25	16.2	17.1	28.6	37,5	12,5	10,7	10,4	0
<b>IV. topic-function/formality-functional scales</b>										
4.1. professional	62.5	0	9.9	12.2	28.6	50	6,3	3,6	7,3	3,6
4.2. social	37.5	75	94.4	92.7	100	50	75	96,4	96,3	100

According to HS, letter-deleted words could be used to text older recipients and DD share the same attitude, recipients with higher social status, recipients socially distant and DD also agree with this, and the words are usable for professional function and DD affirm this. In terms of the usage of rebus writings, only HS importantly show different attitude from the common one. HS believe that rebus is usable for older textees with higher social status and who are socially distant and for professional function. The identical attitude toward the usage of phonetic spelling words is also shown by HS as presented in table 9.

**Table 10.** The Percentage of Respondents’ Attitudes Towards the Usage of Phonetic-Spelling Words in Texting Across Education Backgrounds

social factor and dimension	phonetic-spelling words across education backgrounds				
	HS	BD	GD	MD	DD
I. participants					
1.1. older	50	0	3.7	4.9	14.3
1.2. equally aged	50	100	90.1	90.2	100
1.3. younger	12.5	25	37.3	46.3	71.4
II. status scale					
2.1. higher	50	0	3.7	4.9	14.3
2.2. equally scaled	62.5	100	91.9	92.7	100
2.3. lower	0	25	30.4	34.2	57.1
III. social distance					
3.1. non-distant	75	75	90.7	95.1	100
3.2. distant	25	25	11.2	7.3	14.3
IV. topic-function/formality-functional scales					
4.1. professional	50	25	4.4	9.8	14.3
4.2. social	50	75	97.5	95.1	100

The respondents’ attitudes (RA) towards the usage of typographical features across professions and education background generally share similarity with the attitudes of social factor and dimension analysis (SFDA). The noticeably different attitudes of the respondents from the result of SFDA are displayed by civil servants (CS by profession) and high school graduates (HS by education). Most respondents suppose that emoticons, vowelless words, letter-deleted words, rebus writings, and phonetic spelling words or textisms should be used when texting recipients who are equally aged, whose social status is equally scaled with no social distance, and texting for social function. The textisms which are sociopragmatically casual in nature as found in the study are inevitably identified in social media communication. Social media context provides a room for casual communication and the language variation employed in the text messages is a conducive ground for students to develop their sociopragmatic competence (Lantz-Andersson, 2018).

**CONCLUSION**

The linguistic features of Indonesian and English languages employed by students to communicate with their lecturers share similarities with the former studies in the sense that they are characterized as the lack of compliance to the conventional usage of typographical forms. The features of emoticons, letter

deletion, rebus writing, and phonetic spelling are more frequently identified in SMS text messages than that of in WhatsApp indicating linguistic adjustment to the media used. These features are used in various ways which are likely to be unsystematic as particularly displayed in the use of letter deletion. In sociopragmatic perspective analysed on the basis of social factor and dimension, the communication through text messages employed by students to the lecturers are formal in nature as also acknowledged by respondents of diverse work and education backgrounds.

## REFERENCES

- Bernicot, J., Volckaert-legrier, O., Goumi, A., & Bert-erboul, A. (2012). SMS Experience and Textisms in Young Adolescents: Presentation of a Longitudinally Collected Corpus. *Linguisticae Investigationes*, 35(2), 181–198.
- Bieswanger, M. (2006). 2 abbrevi8 or not 2 abbrevi8: A contrastive analysis of different shortening strategies in English and German text messages. In *SALSA Symposium about Language and Society Austin*. Retrieved from <http://studentorgs.utexas.edu/salsa/proceedings/2006/Bieswanger.pdf>.
- Bosco., S. L. S., & Sum., S. (2007). *SMS gener@ tion: A study on the language of text messaging in Hong Kong. Unpublished master's thesis*. The University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong.
- Bringinghurst, R. (2004). *The Elements of Typographic Style* (2nd editio). Vancouver: Haertley & Marks.
- Chaka, C., Mphahlele, M. L., & Mann, C. C. (2015). The structure and features of the SMS language used in the written work of Communication English I students at a university in South Africa. *Reading & Writing-Journal of the Reading Association of South Africa*, 6(1), 1–9. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.4102/rw.v6i1.83>
- Delahaie, J. (2015). Sociopragmatic Competence in FFL Language Teaching: towards a Principled Approach to Teaching Discourse Markers in FFL. In *Researching Sociopragmatic Variability* (pp. 253–275). Palgrave Macmillan, London.
- Dorantes, A., Sierra, G., Pérez, T. Y. D., Bel-Enguix, G., & Rosales, M. J. (2018). Sociolinguistic corpus of whatsapp chats in spanish among college students. In *Proceedings of the Sixth International Workshop on Natural Language Processing for Social Media* (pp. 1–6). Retrieved from <https://www.aclweb.org/anthology/W18-3501.pdf>
- Elvis, F. W. (2009). The sociolinguistics of mobile phone SMS usage in Cameroon and Nigeria. *The International Journal of Language Society and Culture*, 28(28), 25–41. Retrieved from <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.540.8674&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
- Fairon, C., & Paumier, S. (2006). A translated corpus of 30,000 french sms. In *LREC* (pp. 351–354). Retrieved from [https://www.academia.edu/download/3454285/A\\_translated\\_corpus.pdf](https://www.academia.edu/download/3454285/A_translated_corpus.pdf)
- Hillebrand, F. et. al. (2010). *Short Message Service (SMS)- The Creation of Personal Global Text Messaging*. New York: Wiley. Retrieved from [https://www.academia.edu/17311526/Friedhelm\\_Hillebrand\\_Short\\_Message\\_Se](https://www.academia.edu/17311526/Friedhelm_Hillebrand_Short_Message_Se)

- rvise\_SMS\_-\_The\_Creation\_of\_Personal\_Global\_Text\_Messaging
- Holmes, J., & Wilson, N. (2017). *An introduction to sociolinguistics*. Routledge.
- Joos, M. (1967). *The five clocks* (Vol. 58). New York: Harcourt, Brace & World.
- Lantz-Andersson, A. (2018). Language play in a second language: Social media as contexts for emerging Sociopragmatic competence. *Education and Information Technologies*, 23(2), 705–724. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-017-9631-0>
- Lauricella, S., & Kay, R. (2013). Exploring the use of text and instant messaging in higher education classrooms. *Research in Learning Technology*, 21, 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.3402/rlt.v21i0.19061>
- Leech, G. N. (2016). *Principles of pragmatics*. Routledge.
- Ling, R. (2005). The sociolinguistics of SMS: An analysis of SMS use by a random sample of Norwegians. In *Mobile communications* (pp. 335–349). Springer.
- Mulyono, H., Amalia, D. R., & Suryoputro, G. (2019). Politeness Strategies in Teacher-Student WhatsApp Communication. ERIC. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1226910.pdf>
- Otemuyiwa, A. A. (2017). A Linguistic Analysis of WhatsApp Conversations among Undergraduate Students of Joseph Ayo Babalola University. *Studies in English Language Teaching*, 5(3), 393–405. Retrieved from [http://www.academia.edu/download/56175213/whstapp\\_pragmatics.pdf](http://www.academia.edu/download/56175213/whstapp_pragmatics.pdf)
- Pérez-Sabater, C. (2015). Discovering language variation in WhatsApp text interactions. *Onomázein: Revista Semestral de Lingüística, Filología y Traducción*, 31(1), 113–126. Retrieved from <https://riunet.upv.es/handle/10251/63093>
- Segerstad, Y. H. af. (2002). *Use and adaptation of written language to the conditions of computer-mediated communication*. Göteborg University, Sweden. Retrieved from [https://gupea.ub.gu.se/bitstream/2077/15738/5/gupea\\_2077\\_15738\\_5.pdf](https://gupea.ub.gu.se/bitstream/2077/15738/5/gupea_2077_15738_5.pdf)
- Stout, D. W. (2020). Social Media Statistics 2020: Top Networks By the Numbers. Retrieved from <https://dustinstout.com/social-media-statistics/#facebook-stats%0A>
- Sumitra, & Pal., S. K. (2009). Analysis of SMS-Based Plain and Encrypted Text Messages. *IJSDIA International Journal of Secure Digital Information Age*, 1(1).
- Tagg, C., & Asprey, E. (2017). *Messaging in the Midlands: Exploring digital literacy repertoires in a superdiverse region*. IRiS Working Paper Series16. Retrieved from <http://www.birmingham.ac.uk/Documents/college-social-sciences/social-policy/iris/2017/IRiS-WP-16-2017.pdf>
- Taiwo, R. (2010). *Handbook of Research on Discourse Behavior and Digital Communication: Language Structures and Social Interaction: Language Structures and Social Interaction*. Hershey: IGI Global.
- Thurlow, C., & Brown, A. (2003). Generation Txt? The sociolinguistics of young people's text-messaging. *Discourse Analysis Online*, 1(1), 30. Retrieved from [https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Crispin\\_Thurlow/publication/259258527\\_Generation Txt\\_The\\_sociolinguistics\\_of\\_young\\_people's\\_text-messaging/links/56c5fc5708ae408dfe4ca641.pdf](https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Crispin_Thurlow/publication/259258527_Generation Txt_The_sociolinguistics_of_young_people's_text-messaging/links/56c5fc5708ae408dfe4ca641.pdf)