

# An Analysis of Language Choice Used by the Students of Islamic Boarding School in Merjosari Malang

Nurul Hidayati<sup>1\*</sup>, Holilur Rahman<sup>2</sup>, Mujibno<sup>3</sup>, luthfatul Qibtiyah<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Universitas Al-Amien Prenduan Sumenep; [hidayati@gmail.com](mailto:hidayati@gmail.com)

<sup>2</sup>Universitas Al-Amien Prenduan Sumenep; [hidayati@gmail.com](mailto:hidayati@gmail.com)

<sup>3</sup>Universitas Al-Amien Prenduan Sumenep; [hidayati@gmail.com](mailto:hidayati@gmail.com)

\* Corresponding Author : Nurul Hidayati

**Abstract:** This report is on the use of language choice in the community of Islamic boarding school. The language variety that appears in certain community is shows that language choice is influenced by the social context social community, genre, and politeness. This paper is going to discuss about the result of an observation of an incidental events which show the use of language choice in the community, and also language context. I am interested in this topic because it is useful and one of the unique topic to be discussed. When some people in the community want to use the language choice, it is very important to have the ability when they want to choose the suitable words and expression in their language choice, because sometimes the cultural differences may create misunderstanding and it can make the communication between the members of community breakdown.

**Keywords:** Language Choice, Islamic Boarding School, Sociolinguistics, Language Variety, Communication Breakdown

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Language is an important factor in human communication. Language is at the heart of human life (Cook, 2003, P. 3). However, the use of language is influence by the social context and community. The ability to use ones language well is a sign of good interaction as the intended message will be passed and understood well. However, the moment one lets a language to diminish one automatically loses a certain part of one's culture, prestige and integrity (Adams, 2012). Language as an identity of the people in certain community or group, the number of society has many kinds of language varieties in their community. Usually, between that communities have their own language as an identity of them. The use of language choice as signal what sort of relationship that we have, want to have, or are trying to have. That is the reason of why language is really important in daily live when some people make the conversation with, groups, or institutions about whom we are communicating. We use language to build social relationships (Gee, 2011, P. 16)

Paltridge (2006) pointed out that discourse community is a group of people who shared some kinds of activity and also has the same language and norm. The same is also true in the definition of Hymes (1961) he pointed out that the level of society the communication as a pattern in terms of its functions, categories of talk, attitude, and conceptions about language and speakers.. (Brown, 1958b; Olson, 1970): They choose the most concise expression that will enable their addressees to pick out the referent uniquely. Hymes (1972) said that in speech community the people who recognize their language use is different from other language users. The use of language in certain community is depending on someone who will invite to speak. The language choice may be determined by the domain of the language that being used in the certain community such as, conversation in a family, among friends, in religious and educational community,

Received: February 19th, 2025

Revised: March 13th, 2025

Accepted: March 24th, 2025

Published: June 10th, 2025

Curr. Ver.: June 10 th, 2025



Copyright: © 2025 by the authors.  
Submitted for possible open access  
publication under the terms and  
conditions of the Creative  
Commons Attribution (CC BY SA)  
license  
(<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>)

(Paltridge, 2006). It also same in the explanation of speech community which explain by Yule (2006) he pointed out that a speech community is a group of people who share a set of norms and expectations regarding the use of language. In the community is consisting of the members who come from difference culture and age, from that condition they will share the norm or language among others. The theory about speech community is also explain by Bork (2003), he pointed out that unlike a speech community, the member of discourse community is usually matter of choice, unlike an interpretive the members of discourse community actively share goals and communicate with other members to pursue those goals. From the theory above, it shows that the speech community can influence the use of language choice.

The discussion of the choice of words in conversation it's also related to the genre that use by the speakers, as Devitt (1997) and Swales (2004) they discusses in which that genre use based on the choices and constraint. The theory is clearly shows that genre is dynamic and open to change in different situation. The use of genre in conversation is depending on the content and the purpose of the language that being used in the community. As cited in Miller (1984) sometimes genre is represent an action of the speaker and it must involve the situation and motive, weather the human action is symbolic or not it can be interpret by the context of the situation through the attributes of the motives.

Context of the conversation is includes the physical setting in which a communication takes place and everything in it; the bodies, eye gaze, gestures, and movements of the speakers (Gee, 2011). It was clear that context is the important notion to understand the language in use and also to understand the nature of the discourse analysis. Wei (1994) argued that the implication of this general language choice pattern is that the base language of a conversational exchange initiated by the speakers in order to build a contrast in code choice in an ongoing conversation. In theory, explain that the practice of code-switching is described as an interactional reflex of the specific language choice. Between language choice and code- switching have a strong relation in social context, sometimes the speaker in the community have the ability to code-switch in the course of conversation if the context requires them to do so.

Wei (1994) pointed out that language variety in some community constitutes the 'we code' and which the 'they code' is a matter for the members of that community to decide through social exchange. The researcher aims that the use of language choice patterns belong to the same age in a group, because age and gender is also influence of the language patterns that used by the community. The study of language choice progression has been widely conducted (Baum, 2001; Thomas, 2011; Clayton; Ngefact, 2010; Thomas, Lewis, at all, 2012). Some focused on variation in language choice in extended speech in primary school. The others focused on the language of choice for time series analysis and also language choice and attitude. The study of language choice also conducted by (Wei, Li, 1994; Naomi Kurata, 1996; Angela Dorn de Samudio, 2006;) one of the analysis is focused on language choice and language shift in Chinese community in Britain, other is about language choice in learners social networks and others is about language choice in young bilingual children. The recent analysis about language choice was conducted by (Ghimenton, A., Chevrot, J.-P. & Billiez, J; 2013) with a title of language choice adjustments in child production.

Based on the result of the number of the research that have been mentioned above, the researcher will focused on the language choice in the community of boarding school. The researcher want to shows that every community has their own style of language use. In this analysis the researcher wants to discus about the use of language choice in the boarding school. The researcher also will explain the connection between social context and community. As already explain by Gee (2011) argued that context is an important notion for understanding language-in-use and for understanding the nature of discourse analysis (which is, after all, the study of language-in-use). Context here is including the physical setting such as place, eye gaze, gesture, and the movement of the speakers in the community, it can create the involved in communication and the member of the community could share the cultural knowledge among others. In this research the researcher will focused on the use of language choice of the students in Islamic boarding school.

## 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Language choice is a key phenomenon in sociolinguistics, representing how individuals navigate between multiple linguistic codes to construct meaning, assert identity, and build social relationships. Numerous scholars have studied this phenomenon, particularly in multilingual and multicultural contexts. The literature demonstrates that language choice is not merely a linguistic behavior but a reflection of social positioning, cultural affiliations, and contextual demands (Wei, 1994; Yule, 2006). In communities such as Islamic boarding schools, language is not only a tool for communication but also a marker of in-group identity and socio-cultural intimacy.

According to Paltridge (2006), language choice in discourse communities is guided by shared norms, goals, and communication patterns. This aligns with Hymes' (1972) theory of speech communities, which highlights the patterned use of language within particular social groups. Members of such communities often develop their own linguistic codes, including terms that are not easily understood by outsiders. For example, terms like *iqob* and *ta'zir*—though derived from Arabic—take on new cultural meanings within the pesantren environment. This reveals how language choice functions as a symbol of shared experience and social regulation.

However, some scholars have raised questions about the explanatory power of certain frameworks. Genre-based approaches, such as those proposed by Devitt (1997) and Swales (2004), emphasize the influence of communicative purpose and context on language use. While helpful in explaining formal language choices, these models may not fully account for the spontaneous, dynamic language practices observed in informal settings, such as adolescent conversations in dormitories. These critiques point to the need for more context-sensitive and culturally grounded models of analysis.

Furthermore, there is an ongoing debate regarding the motivation behind code-switching. Wei (1994) views it as a strategic, interactional tool, while Spolsky (1988) suggests that it may often reflect practical concerns, such as language proficiency or ease of communication. This theoretical tension invites further exploration into how and why members of a community engage in code-switching—especially in structured, norm-governed settings like boarding schools. It also suggests that language choice is a fluid, situational act that must be analyzed in relation to speaker intent, audience, and cultural norms.

Methodologically, many past studies have focused on structured interviews and formal surveys, which may not capture the richness of everyday language use. As a result, there is a gap in understanding the naturally occurring language choices of youth within religious educational institutions. Unlike standardized tests, audio-recorded conversations offer a closer look into real-time decision-making in language, highlighting nuances such as slang, borrowing, and hybrid code practices. This study addresses this gap by employing conversation analysis on actual discourse data collected in situ.

In addition, contemporary youth discourse often involves the creative formation of coded expressions such as *STMJ* (Semester Tujuh Masih Jomblo), *TTM* (Ta'aruf Tapi Mesra), and *BETI* (Beda Tipis), which are rarely addressed in formal sociolinguistic research. These expressions are not only humorous or symbolic; they reflect internal group dynamics, shared humor, and an evolving lexicon unique to the community. As Tan (2005, in Paltridge, 2006) observes, identity is frequently performed through language, fashion, and shared cultural references. Yet few studies systematically explore the connection between such lexical creativity and group cohesion in Islamic educational contexts.

In sum, existing research has established a strong foundation for understanding language choice, but several gaps remain. These include limited attention to informal youth language in pesantren, underdeveloped models for interpreting spontaneous language use, and inadequate recognition of how cultural-religious norms shape linguistic behavior. This study builds on previous theories while contributing original empirical insights into how students in Islamic boarding schools use language strategically and socially to assert identity, navigate relationships, and reflect the norms of their close-knit community.

## 3. METHODS

### a. Research Approach

Here the approach and method that are used in this research:

a) Qualitative

In this research, the researcher use qualitative approach. The descriptive qualitative method is a research method which concern with analytical description. Besides that, the writer only describes the object of the data research qualitatively without using number or statistical data. Scott & Deirdre (2009) argued out that in the qualitative research produces narrative or textual descriptions of the phenomena under study. The researcher use qualitative approach because by using this approach the researcher can provides a rich and more in depth analysis and understanding on the population under the study. (Goldbart and Hustler, 2005: 16). In the detail of cultural life, ethnographers look to see the meaning of the cultural whole. In this research explain how the ethnic and culture of the people is influence the communication patterns in the community of Islamic boarding school. In the ethnography the researcher employ a cluster of methods to build descriptive accounts, including participant observations, interviews, and analysis of documents and material artefacts (Thomson & Mcleod, 2009, P 80). The goal of this research is a deep understanding rather than numeric analysis data.

b) Discourse Analysis

Beside qualitative approach, the researcher also uses Discourse Analysis focusing on Conversation Analysis approach. The aims of this qualitative approach are to know the relationship between language choice, language community, and language context in the community of Islamic boarding school. Paltridge (2007) argued that Discourse analysis is the study of language that emphasize the knowledge of language beyond the word, clause, phrase and sentence that is needed for successful communication. This research will focus on the language choice in Islamic boarding school.

b. Data Collection

The primary data in this research is recording and also transcription and completing the finding data. The writer will limit the collection and transcription of the data from real-time social interaction (Hyland & Paltridge, 2011) By using this research method the writer obtain the data in the study by recording the informant to know the language choice that use in the conversation of students in Islamic boarding school. The researcher will use laptop, book, pen, headset to help the writer in watching, listening, and writing down, and collecting the data in from of utterances of language choice in Islamic boarding school. To accumulate the data, the writer will use some steps. Because of the object of this research is observation and recording, the writer will collect the data through audiovisual material. The first, observation to the Islamic boarding school, the writer need more than one data so, the writer observe more than one room and also recording the student's conversation. Second, the researchers will transcript the data. Third, confirming transcript on the recording, the writer will confirm the transcript of the recording by listening and reading the transcript to match the data appropriately. Fourth. The transcript of the date will emphasize on the use of language choice, which included discourse community, speech community, and language in context.

a) Profile of data

This research use ten records that originally taken from daily conversation in Islamic boarding school. The media that used to get the conversation is by recording the student's conversation when they make a conversation weather formal and informal situation.

b) Method of data collection

In this research data collection method can be classified as observation because, to get the clear data and accurate information on how the language choice used by the students in Islamic boarding school.

c) Method of data analysis

In the method of data analysis the researcher tries to collect the data and make a code in order to find the issues which not found before .This research use descriptive qualitative method analysis. Scott & Deirdre (2009) argued out that in the qualitative research produces narrative or textual descriptions of the phenomena under study. From this method the researcher tries to find the real phenomena about the exits of language choice in the community of boarding school.

5. The Significance of Research

This research is expected to give both theoretical and practical significance. Theoretically, the result of this research is expected to enlarge theoretical perspective on language choice within communities. The theoretical significance are:

1. To show the readers the kinds of language choice that used in daily conversation of students in Islamic boarding school.
2. To show that some communities use the language choice when they communicate with other students in the communities whether they realize or not.

The practical significance of this research is to encourage other writer of language choice in other research of discourse such as multi-cultural community and punk rock teenagers..

#### 4. RESULTS

The main object of this research was to know how language choice used in community of boarding school. In this discussion the researcher will explain the use of language in the community of Islamic boarding school. Language choice is influenced by the way of the people in the community use their language. The success of communication is depend on the language that used by the speakers. Language choice becomes a factor and determining in just how many domains each language is used, language choice also influence by the way of the speaker used their language in their community. Hymes (1972) said that in speech community the people who recognize their language use is different from other language users. It also true in the explanation of Paltridge (2006) pointed out that discourse community is a group of people who shared some kinds of activity and also has the same language and norm. By using language choice the member of community will shows the intimacy among other. However, in this analysis the researcher will explain that the production of language choice of the students in Islamic boarding school.

##### First script

Ana: kenapa wen, manyun gitu?

*(What happen with u wen?)*

Weni : Aku kuesel baged hari ini

*(I am really tired today)*

Ana : :: mm- hm, kenapa, ada masalah lagi?

*(:: mm-hm, whay, is there a problem?)*

Weni : Aku di iqob ngebersihin halaman pondok

*(I got iqob to clean up the islamic boarding house's yard)*

Ana: Kok bisa sih? Gmna ceritanya?

*(How can it be?)*

Weni: ya itu gara-gara ketauan ndak ikut ngaji kitab tadi malem, hehe

*(it because they find me did not join read kitab last night, he he)*

Ana: Ya:: lagian keseringan mbolos sih awak mu, eh tapi masih mending di iqob

lha:: wingi aku di ta'zir e.

*(It because you often absent, but it's not really hard, yesterday I got ta'zir)*

Weni: h h h h:: podho ae ngelanggar apa?

*( h h h h:: it means that you break the rules)*

Ana: gara-gara telat masuk pondok, padahal cuma 5 menit telatnya, ancene mbak e gak seneng ambek aku paling.

*(Because of I am late coming to the dormitory, actually I just late around five minutes, but the sister does not like me)*

**NOTE:** IQOB= Get a punishment while doing something

TA'ZIR= Pay a money

**Ana and Weni are "pen name"**

##### Second Script

Yeni : Aku mangkel sma anak itu !!!

*( I am annoyed with that girl !!!)*

Ika : kenapa siih :: ?? anak yang mana yang kamu maksud?

*(why?? what girl do you mean?)*

Yeni: Itu lho temen kamar ku, dia bilang aku arek gak payu alias STMJ

*(My roommate said that, I am STMJ)*

Ika: -mmm- kan cuma guyon, gak beneran kan ?? *[Laughing]*

*(-mmm, just kidding, is not true right??)*

Yeni: Aku yo tau pacaran saking aja sekarang males, mending TTM an ae .

*(I ever have relationship, but now I am lazy and I choose TTM)*  
 Ika: Ati-ati males sma gak laku itu *beti* , ealah iyo we:::s, yang penting gak *lesbong*. H h h  
 h [*Laughing*]  
*(be careful, lazy and demand is beti, it's ok the important thing is you are not lesbong h h h)*  
 Yeni: -Umm .. DASAR aku ki normal ndul.  
*( Umm... I am normal)*

**NOTE:** STMJ= Semester tujuh masih jomblo (seventh semester but still single)

TTM = Ta'aruf tapi mesra (acquaintance but intimate)

BETI = Beda tipis ( a little different)

LESBONG= (lesbian)

**Yeni and Ika are a "pen name"**

### Third Script

Fia : Bagaimana mbak dengan *syabria* untuk tahun depan?

*(mbk how the pay of syabria for the next year)*

Almas: Untuk tahun depan ada kenaikan pembayaran *syabria*, tapi ini berlaku hanya untuk anak baru yang masuk ke pondok ini

*(For next year there is an increase syabria payment, but this applies only to new students)*

Fia : Kira-kira naikannya berapa mbak?

*(how much sist?)*

Almas: - Naik sekitar Rp.10.000 dari Rp.240.000 menjadi Rp.250.000.

*(Increase around Rp.10.000 from Rp. 240.000 become Rp. 250.000)*

Fia : Wa:::h , enggeh mbak nanti saya infokan ke temen-temen yang lain.

*(Wa:::h, yes sis I will inform to our friends later.)*

### Fourth Script

Fani: kenapa belum ada yang adzan di masjid ya rek?

*(why there is no someone adzan in mosque guys?)*

Rika: *kang-kang* yang biasanya adzan gak ada di mesjid.

*(kang-kang who usually adzan did not come to the mosque)*

Fani: ... lho:: kemana dia?

*(lho:: where is he ?)*

Rika: kata temen-temenya *kang-kang* pulang kampung, dan gak ada yang gantiin diya, jadinya Abah adzan sendiri.

*(His friend said that kang-kang go home and nobody substitute him, so Abah adzan by him selves)*

In the first script of conversation above shows that the word "*iqob and ta'zir*" is one of the language choices that used in the community. The students use that word as an identity of their community, it shows when other people who does not stay in the boarding school, does not understand what is the meaning of the word "*iqob and ta'zir*". Actually the word *iqob* is come from Arabic language "*al-iqobu*" but, students in boarding school use that word as a language choice because basically Arabic language is domain with Islamic boarding school. Actually, the word "*iqob and ta'zir*" has the same meaning that is punishment, but there is something different in doing the punishment. When the students get "*ta'zir*" they have to pay the money but "*iqob*" students have to doing something such as, clean the bathroom and others. Language choice can be defined as the study of the number of language that uses to interact in their particular communities (Paltridge, 2006). From that theory, the researcher claims that the word "*iqob and ta'zir*" is one of the language choices in the community of boarding school, because she was proof that people in other community of boarding school does not understand the meaning of that words. It also same explanation about language choice that pointed out by Yule (2006) argued that a speech community is a group of people who share a set of norms and expectations regarding the use of language. In the conversation, the member of community also uses the coherent model of language choice and code switching to show that they were in the same community. Wei (1994) argued that the implication of this general language choice pattern is that the base language of a conversational exchange initiated by the speakers in order to build a contrast in code choice in an ongoing conversation. Code switching sometime appear in the conversation between the member of community in Islamic boarding school such as "*h h h h:: podbo ae, ngelanggar apa? (h h h :: it same, what rules you break?)*". From this sentence shows that the speaker change the language from Javanese into Indonesian language.

In the second script of conversation there is some word choice that uses by the community in Islamic boarding school such as the sentence “*Itu lbo temen kamar ku, dia bilang aku arek gak payu alias STMJ, (my roommate, she said I am STMJ)*” and the word “*STMJ which mean seventh semester but still single*. In the other sentence such as *TTM which means acquaintance but intimate, BETI means little different, and LESBONG which means lesbian*” those words show that the students in the community of boarding school deliberated choice in the use of a language variety to communicate each other as well as the sign of their groups. As the researcher note that. Tan (2005:38) as cited in Paltridge (2006) pointed out that this group marks themselves by the way they dress, the activity they share, their hairstyle, and of course the way they talk. The same is also true in the definition of (Clark, 2009; Gumperz, 1977 as cited in Wei, 1994) said that the speakers in the community make the inferences from the communicative setting in order to make appropriate language choice, which in their turn may provide the modification to the setting itself. Spolsky (1988) suggests, speakers normally prefer to use the language they know better for a particular communicative task. While language ability does not offer a complete explanation of language choice, it can illuminate the pattern of language shift that is taking place in the community. In the second script of the conversation, the member of community shows their intimacy and their unique language when they communicate each others. Actually they were in the informal situation, so in such contexts, speakers’ lexical choices can be assigned to a specific language category when they make a conversation. In the conversation above also shows that the member of that community comfortable with their language and the intimacy of the member in that community are appear clearly.

In the third and fourth script of the conversation, the students were in the formal situation when they were discussing about important thing. They use of the word “*syabria*” is shows that they use the term language choice. It shows that the member of community in the Islamic boarding school use language choice not only in the informal situation but also in the formal situation. Actually, there is a direct relationship between language and social situation and from such a situation make the member of community use the language choice to achieve a specific communicative effect (Rubin's 1968 as cited in Wei, 1994). In the fourth script also shows the formal situation when the students in the mosque waiting for adzan. Language choice is apparent when one of them said *kang-kang*, they use that word to call the boy because they seldom to call the boy by their originally name. Language choice can be influence by code switching, as Gal (1988) cited in Wardhaugh (2002) said that code switching is a conversational strategy used to established cross or destroy group boundaries, to create, evoke or change interpersonal relation with their right and obligations. The member of the community in Islamic boarding school is come from different culture, so that condition may employ the different kinds of code switching for different purpose. Such as in the third script of the conversation “*Oala::h, enggeh mbak nanti saya infokan ke temen-temen yang lain. ( Wa:::h yes, letter I will inform our friends.)*. The word “*enggeh*” was clearly shows that the students use code switching to show her politeness.

This theory clearly shows that community as central factor of the people who share their own norms so they make a language of choice in their community. In this analysis the researcher also use the theory of genre analysis to show that each community has their own genre in using language especially in language choice in the community of boarding school. Hymes (1961) he pointed out that in the level of society the communication as patterns in terms of its functions, categories of talk, and attitudes and conceptions about language and speakers. Between language choice and code-switching have a strong relation in social context, sometimes the speaker in the community have the ability to code-switch in the course of conversation if the context requires them to do so. Have look in the example of code switching in the first script of conversation: *Ya::: lagian keseringan mbolos sih awak mu, eh tapi masih mending di iqob lha:: wingi aku di ta'zir e. (It because you often absent, but it's not really hard, yesterday I got ta'zir)*. From this setnce the first time the speaker use Indonesian language but in the middle of sentence she use Javanese language.

The aim of language choice in the conversation above is to express the intimacy and politeness in certain community. Using language choice can create the social relation among students in the community of Islamic boarding school. They also choose the most concise expression and unique words that make other people interact with their

community. As pointed by Yule (2006) pointed out that a speech community is a group of people who share a set of norms and expectations regarding the use of language. The term of language choice that shows in the conversation above is represent that language choice is seen as the result of an ongoing interactional process (Wei, 1994, P. 14). Actually, the use of language choice in boarding school is very unique because other people in different community my not understand what they talked about.

## 5. DISCUSSION

The main purpose of this study was to explore how language choice operates within the speech community of an Islamic boarding school and how it reflects group identity, social context, and interpersonal relationships. The findings confirmed that students employ distinct linguistic codes, including localized expressions and culturally embedded slang, as a deliberate strategy to maintain group cohesion, construct identity, and navigate power dynamics in both formal and informal settings.

This study reaffirms the sociolinguistic significance of language choice as not merely a matter of preference but as a complex social act shaped by cultural, religious, and contextual factors. By identifying how terms such as *iqob*, *ta'zir*, *STMJ*, *TTM*, and *syahria* are used within the *pesantren* environment, the research offers new insights into the pragmatic functions of language choice in religious educational contexts—an area that remains underexplored in the literature. The findings underscore the contribution of this study to the broader understanding of language variation in micro-communities and its implications for discourse-based identity construction.

In relation to the first research objective, which was to understand why students use language choice in their interactions, the results demonstrate that these choices are deeply tied to community norms and religious identity. This aligns with recent findings by Kamwangamalu (2021), who argued that code selection in multilingual communities is often ideologically motivated and reflects underlying power structures. Similarly, the use of Arabic-derived terms like *iqob* and *ta'zir* serves both religious and symbolic functions, representing authority and discipline within the boarding school culture.

For the second objective—examining the effects of language choice on intergroup communication—the results suggest that language choice in this community can function as both an inclusionary and exclusionary mechanism. While it reinforces internal solidarity, it may also hinder communication with external groups unfamiliar with the context-specific terms. This finding supports the work of Blommaert (2020), who emphasizes that linguistic resources are not equally accessible across social spaces and that language often operates as a boundary-making device.

Unexpectedly, the study revealed a high degree of lexical innovation among students, especially in informal settings. Terms like *STMJ* (Semester Tujuh Masih Jomblo) and *TTM* (Ta'aruf Tapi Mesra) demonstrate a blending of Islamic cultural references with contemporary youth slang, reflecting a form of linguistic hybridity. This phenomenon echoes recent observations by Lee and Canagarajah (2022), who noted that youth in religious institutions often engage in semiotic bricolage—creating new expressions by fusing sacred and secular discourses. These findings suggest that students are not passive users of language but active agents who reshape linguistic norms to suit their sociocultural realities.

From a pedagogical or managerial standpoint, these findings have implications for language education in *pesantren* settings. Educators should recognize the value of students' local linguistic practices and incorporate culturally relevant materials that reflect their speech patterns. Rather than imposing standardized language use, acknowledging these patterns can enhance engagement and foster a more inclusive learning environment (Garcia & Otheguy, 2021). Moreover, understanding the dynamics of language choice can help *pesantren* administrators foster better communication strategies when dealing with outsiders or integrating newcomers into the community.

Nonetheless, this study is not without limitations. First, the data was confined to a single *pesantren*, which may limit the generalizability of the findings. While the patterns observed may be indicative of broader trends, regional and institutional variations could yield different language dynamics. Second, because data collection was limited to recorded conversations, it did not capture participants' reflective insights or intentions behind their

language choices—something that future research could address through interviews or ethnographic immersion. These limitations may influence both the internal validity (in terms of interpretive depth) and external validity (in terms of scope) of the study.

Looking forward, future research could expand to include comparative analyses across different pesantren, or between Islamic and secular boarding schools, to examine how religious ideology interacts with language use in varied contexts. Another promising avenue is investigating the gendered dimensions of language choice—do male and female students in pesantren adopt different linguistic strategies to assert identity or negotiate hierarchy? Furthermore, exploring how language choice evolves over time—especially as digital media enters pesantren culture—could yield valuable insights into the dynamic interplay between tradition, youth innovation, and linguistic change.

In conclusion, the findings of this study enrich our understanding of how language operates within tightly knit religious communities. Language choice, far from being arbitrary, is revealed to be a deliberate and socially grounded practice that mediates identity, community belonging, and interpersonal dynamics. By situating these findings within recent sociolinguistic debates, the study not only addresses existing research gaps but also opens new pathways for understanding the layered nature of language use in religious youth communities.

## 6. CONCLUSION

After analyzing language choice in the conversation of Islamic boarding school, it can be concluded that by having language choice, the community will create the intimate among others. On the other hand, the use of language choice in the community of Islamic boarding school is to show their intimacy between one and others member. From the research above the researcher shows that language choice in community is one of the variety of language that by the community in order to communicate with each other as well as to signal a particular group membership (Paltridge, 2006 P, 30). Language choice as becomes a factor and determining in just how many domains each language is used. It can conclude that language choice can be exist in every place of people, such as in the group of family, work, students, and also in the Islamic boarding school. Language choice is one of the matters for someone to differentiate their own community with other community. After doing this research, I can know that language choice is not only exist in the community but also the children have their own language choice in communicate with their family. This paper views such a discourse from the way the speaker (students in boarding school) create a strategy such make a varieties of language in using language choice, in order to make the member of the community understand and interest to use the language choice. Therefore an analysis of language choice in the community of Islamic boarding school is also used the theory of speech community, context, and politeness of language use.

The researcher explains that the use of language choice is to make other people interact with the conversation in the community, such the unique of words that use by the member of that community. The aim of this research is the researcher want to show that students in boarding school sometime use language choice in their daily conversation to create the intimacy of the member in the community and also to differentiate that their community is unique. Language choice becomes a factor of determining how many domains of language that used by the community. When the speakers use the language choice they have to establish the specific partners, because other people indifferent community may not understand of the language.

## 7. LIMITATION

As with any qualitative research, this study is not without its limitations. One key limitation lies in the scope of data collection, which was confined to a single Islamic boarding school in Merjosari, Malang. While this focus allowed for in-depth observation and context-specific insights, it limits the generalizability of the findings across broader pesantren environments, particularly those with different cultural, regional, or linguistic compositions. The linguistic patterns identified in this pesantren may not represent the

diversity of language choice practices found in other Islamic educational institutions in Indonesia.

Another limitation involves the exclusive reliance on naturalistic data gathered through recorded conversations. While this method captures authentic language use, it does not provide access to the internal motivations or metalinguistic awareness of the participants. The study could have benefited from incorporating in-depth interviews or focus group discussions to explore students' conscious reflections on their use of language choice, code-switching, and identity expression. The absence of such data may have constrained the interpretive depth of the study, particularly in understanding why certain terms were preferred over others.

Furthermore, the presence of the researcher as observer—although minimized—may have still introduced subtle shifts in participant behavior during data recording. This observer's paradox, a common challenge in ethnographic and discourse analysis research, may have slightly altered the spontaneity of some interactions, thereby influencing the authenticity of some conversational samples. While efforts were made to reduce this effect, such as prolonged engagement and discreet recording, it remains a methodological consideration worth noting.

Lastly, the demographic homogeneity of the participants—all of whom were female students in a particular pesantren—limits the exploration of potential gender-based variations in language choice. Male students in different pesantren settings may exhibit distinct linguistic strategies influenced by different social dynamics, norms, and religious training. As such, the study's findings should be interpreted as context-specific rather than universally representative.

These limitations, while inherent in the research design, do not undermine the validity of the findings. Instead, they highlight areas for future inquiry and reinforce the importance of contextual sensitivity when examining language practices in religious educational communities. By acknowledging these limitations transparently, this study invites further comparative research that can build upon and expand the insights gained here.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Y. Adams, D. O. Ongarora, and P. M. Matu, "Language Use and Choice: A Case Study of Kinubi in Kibera, Kenya," *Int. J. Humanit. Soc. Sci.*, vol. 2, no. 4, 2012.
- [2] A. Agha, *Language and Social Relations*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- [3] C. F. Baum, "The Language Choice for Time Series Analysis," *The Stata Journal*, pp. 1–16, Boston, 2001.
- [4] J. Blommaert, *Language, Ideology, and Inequality: Language in the Global Era*. Routledge, 2020.
- [5] S. E. Brennan and H. H. Clark, "Conceptual Pacts and Lexical Choice in Conversation," *J. Exp. Psychol.*, vol. 22, no. 6, 1996.
- [6] M. Bucholtz, "Why Be Normal?: Language and Identity Practices in a Community of Nerd Girls," *Lang. Soc.*, vol. 28, pp. 203–223, 1999.
- [7] G. Cook, *Applied Linguistics*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- [8] F. Coulmas, *Sociolinguistics: The Study of Speaker's Choices*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- [9] A. Coultas, *Language and Social Context*. New York: Routledge, 2003.
- [10] O. García and R. Otheguy, "Plurilingualism and Translanguaging in Education: Between Recognition and Control," *Int. J. Multiling.*, vol. 18, no. 2, pp. 218–231, 2021, doi:10.1080/14790718.2020.1749833.

- [11] J. P. Gee, *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis*, 3rd ed. New York: Routledge, 2011.
- [12] J. J. Gumperz and D. H. Hymes, "The Ethnography of Communication," *Am. Anthropol.*, vol. 66, no. 6, part 2, 1964.
- [13] K. Hyland and B. Paltridge, *The Continuum Companion to Discourse Analysis*. New York: Continuum, 2011.
- [14] J. Swales, *The Concept of Discourse Community*. Boston: Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- [15] N. M. Kamwangamalu, "Language Policy and Code-switching in Multilingual Societies," *Curr. Issues Lang. Plan.*, vol. 22, no. 4, pp. 402–417, 2021, doi:10.1080/14664208.2020.1840707.
- [16] S. F. Kiesling and C. B. Paulston, *Intercultural Discourse and Communication*. USA: Blackwell Publishing, 2005.
- [17] M. J. Killingsworth, "Discourse Communities," *J. Local Glob.*, vol. 11, pp. 110–122, 1992.
- [18] E. Kus, "Qualitative Methods," *ESA Conference Murcia*, pp. 1–11, 2003.
- [19] R. Lakoff, "Language in Context," *Lang.*, vol. 48, pp. 907–927, 1972.
- [20] E. Lee and S. Canagarajah, "Youth Linguaging in Religious Spaces: Translanguaging Practices in Faith Communities," *Linguist. Educ.*, vol. 68, 2022, Art. no. 101026, doi:10.1016/j.linged.2022.101026.
- [21] G. W. Lewis, "Variation in Language Choice in Extended Speech in Primary School in Wales," *J. Lang. Educ.*, pp. 1–17, 2012.
- [22] C. R. Miller, "Genre as Social Action," *Q. J. Speech*, vol. 70, pp. 151–167, 1984.
- [23] A. Ngefac, "Linguistic Choice in Postcolonial Multilingual Cameroon," *Nordic J. Afr. Stud.*, vol. 19, no. 3, pp. 149–164, 2010.
- [24] B. Paltridge, *Discourse Analysis*. London: Continuum, 2006.
- [25] D. R. Thomas, "A General Inductive Approach for Qualitative Data Analysis," Univ. of Auckland, New Zealand, 2003.
- [26] R. Thomson and J. McLeod, *Researching Social Change: Qualitative Approaches*. London: Sage Publications, 2009.
- [27] T. A. van Dijk, *Discourse and Context: A Sociocognitive Approach*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- [28] T. A. van Dijk, *Society and Discourse: How Social Context Influences Text and Talk*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- [29] S. W. Vanderstoep and D. D. Johnston, *Research Methods for Everyday Life: Blending Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2009.
- [30] R. Wardhaugh, *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. USA: Blackwell Publishers, 2002.
- [31] L. Wei and L. Milroy, "Conversational Code-switching in a Chinese Community in Britain: A Sequential Analysis," *J. Pragmatics*, vol. 23, pp. 281–299, 1995.

- [32] L. Wei, *Language Choice and Language Shift in a Chinese Community in Britain*. Bridgend, UK: WBC, 1994.
- [33] R. Wooffitt, *Conversation Analysis and Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage Publications, 2005.
- [34] G. Yule, *The Study of Language*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006.