

## LINGUISTIC FEATURES OF ENGLISH STUDY PROGRAMS STUDENTS' TEXT MESSAGES TO THEIR LECTURERS

**Ifan Iskandar**

Universitas Negeri Jakarta, Indonesia

ifaniskandan@unj.ac.id

Accepted: 2020-01-31 , Approved: 2020-01-31 , Published: 2020-01-31

### **ABSTRACT**

*This study aims to examine the linguistic features of English and Indonesian languages in students' text messages sent to their lecturers. Content analysis is employed and the data are the linguistic features identified in 1,521 students' text messages delivered to the lecturers. The findings confirm the results of the former studies in that the typographic features of emoticons, letter deletion, rebus writing, and phonetic spelling and morphological features of initialism, abbreviation, reduplication, truncation, and casual style of spoken dictions are employed—the features linguistically creating a special register called textese recognized by non-standard form or textisms. The mechanics of languages are featured by the lack of compliance with the conventional usage of full stops, commas, and capitals; even less than ten percent of spaces considered inevitably used are not conventionally employed. Dominant uses of one-claused sentences feature the syntax of the languages.*

**Keywords:** *linguistic features, text messaging, typography, morphology, and syntax.*

### **INTRODUCTION**

Text messaging or texting, a means of written communication mediated by computers and electronic communication devices known as social media, has been widely spread in the last two decades. The most massively used media is WhatsApp (WA) with 1,500 millions active users

every single month and the texts exchanged every day are 60,000 millions (Stout, 2020). The preceeding social media with equally massive in use is Short Message Service (SMS). The usage of (SMS) among cellphone users compared to email, facebook, or tweeter was contributory to the emergence of electronic-mediated

communication (EMC) subsuming the previously developing way of communication, computer-mediated communication (CMC). Hillebrand, et. al. (2010) report that 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. The ubiquity of SMS and WA usage providing the corpora of languages in text messaging have been the interests of language researchers.

Studies on language in text messages have been carried out by several researchers with different foci. There are those focusing on the linguistic features (Segerstad, 2002; Bosco, 2007; Sumitra & Pal, 2009; Lyddy, et.al., 2012; Thurlow & Poff, 2013; Chaka, 2015; Pérez-Sabater, 2015; Chaka., Mphahlele, & Mann,

2015; Hashim, Soopar, & Hamid, 2017; Tagg & Asprey, 2017; Otemuyiwa, et.al., 2017), the linguistic and discoursal features of languages in text messages (Yusuf, Natsir, & Yusra, 2016), linguistic features in Facebook (Magwaro, et.al., 2018), English as a Lingua Franca in social media (Jimma, 2017) and in video games (Iaia, 2016), diffusion of lexical change in social media (Eisenstein, et.al., 2014), analysis model for the languages in social media (Szurawitzki, 2012), code switching in social media (Al-Qaysi, N., & Al-Emran, M., 2017). Other researchers display interests in the effects and probable relations of languages in text messages in social media like the effect of texting on grammar (Van Dijk, et.al., 2015), on communication (Jazan & Alfaki, 2016), on vocabulary instruction (Li &

Cummins, 2019), the relationship between texting and literacy (Drouin & Driver, 2014), texting and academic English (Thurairaj, et.al., 2015), social media and educational linguistic activities (Lantz-Andersson, 2016), social media and sociopragmatic competence (Lantz-Andersson, 2018), language of social media and gender identity (Bamman, Eisenstein, Schnoebelen, 2014), language in social media and creativity and self-expression (Pimentel & Diniz, 2014), social media posts, linguistic features, and journalistic criteria (Pinto, Oliveira, Figueira, 2017), languages of text messages and sociolinguistics (Ling & Telenor, 2005; Thurlow, 2005; Kahari, 2014; Dorantes, et.al., 2018), linguistic features in social media and childhood sexual abuse (Wan, et.al., 2019). So important the

languages in text messaging are that the messages in SMS (30,000) written in various languages are translated into French in the “*Faites don de vos SMS à la science*” (*Give your SMS to Science*) (Fairon & Paumier, 2006).

This study is different from those mentioned above in the sense that it focuses on linguistic elements hierarchically from sentential and mechanical, syntactical, morphological, and to typographical levels. It is a considerably thorough investigation on the linguistic forms of text messages, unlike the previous studies covering a certain level of linguistic elements. In addition, it explores a specific segment of texters who are university students majoring English communicating with special texters, their lecturers. The study is purposed to explore the linguistic

features of English and Indonesian languages used in students' text messages employed to communicate with their lecturers at English Study Programs of Universitas Negeri Jakarta (ESP-UNJ), and the approaches and circumstances under which the features are used.

## METHOD

Content analysis is employed to carry out the study as it describes and analyse languages in students' text messages to represent their content through enumeration process such as the word frequency calculation and qualitative judgement on the linguistic features used in the texts. The data source is 1,521 text messages in SMS; 1,201 written in Indonesian and 320 in English, employed by students of English Education Study Programs and

English Language and Literature Study Programme of Universitas Negeri Jakarta (State University of Jakarta) to communicate with their lecturers and the data are the linguistic features of English and Indonesian in the students' text messages at typography, morphology, mechanics and syntax levels.

The messages were collected using *Nokia PC Suite* to transfer the messages from lecturers phones to the computer and then they were converted to *Excell* using *ABC Amber Nokia Converter*. The data were collected by the researcher through the identification and presentation of the elements of emoticon, vowel and letter deletion, rebus writing, phonetic spelling, initialism, abbreviation, reduplication, truncation, spoken-casual style diction, full stop, comma,

space, capitals, and number-of-clause-based kinds of sentences. Theoretical sampling or confirming and disconfirming sampling were used to carry out data sampling, the collection of data was ended when new linguistic features were no longer identifiable. Data are valid in terms of their authenticity (original and genuine from the source), credibility (accurate), representativeness (representative), and meaning (purposeful).

The data 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.

### **FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION**

Linguistic features identified in ESP-UNJ students' short messages to their lecturers are classified in the levels of typography, morphology, and mechanics and syntax. The features of typography level found in the short messages are emoticons, vowel deletion, letter deletion, rebus writing, and phonetic spellings. Emoticons in SMS messages are punctuation marks combined in such a way to represent emotions and in WhatsApp are known as emojis. Vowel deletion is the words with no vowel known as vowelless words or consonant skeleton. Letter

deletion are words whose certain vowels or consonants or vowels and consonants are omitted. Rebus writings are words whose certain syllables or the whole syllables are replaced with objects or images or number representing the replaced syllables. Phonetic spellings are words whose syllables are replaced by the symbols representing the sounds of the syllables.

The typographical forms are frequently found in the study. There are 1,459 forms of typography in 6,163 cases identified in the 1,521 messages. The typographical features identified in all SMS messages are 405.3 percent or four words with the features in every message. The number of the features and that of the frequency are shown in the table below.

**Table 1: The features and frequency of typography in 1,521 SMS messages**

| the features of typography |                        |                         |                     |                     |                            |              |                      |
|----------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------------------------|--------------|----------------------|
| emoti-<br>con              | vowel<br>delet-<br>ion | letter<br>delet-<br>ion | rebus writing       |                     |                            |              | phonetic<br>spelling |
|                            |                        |                         | letter<br>homophone | number<br>homophone | letter-number<br>homophone | symbol       |                      |
| 41<br>emots.               | 302<br>words           | 1,003<br>words          | 48<br>letters       | 2<br>numbers        | 26<br>letter-numbers       | 21<br>symls  | 16<br>words          |
| 191 cases                  | 2,825<br>cases         | 2,482<br>cases          | 409<br>cases        | 23<br>cases         | 41<br>cases                | 165<br>cases | 27<br>cases          |
| 12.6%                      | 185.8%                 | 163.2%                  | 26.9%               | 1.5%                | 2.7%                       | 10.8%        | 1.8%                 |
| 41.9%                      |                        |                         |                     |                     |                            |              |                      |

Emoticons are found 13 times in every 100 short messages and the most frequently used emoticon is :) representing *smile*. Vowel and letter deletions are the most frequently used typographical features. Two words in

every short message are with vowel deletion and the most frequently used words with vowel deletion is *sy* for *saya* (I) and *bpk* for *bapak* (sir). Letter deletion is different from vowel deletion in that in vowel deletion,

vowels in words are regularly omitted, but in letter deletion, both vowels and consonant can be deleted. Almost two words with letter deletion are found in each message.

In the feature of letter deletion, letters are deleted in at least ten different ways. The letters deleted are the vowel in the first syllable of words as in *bgian* for *bagian* (share) and *bgitu* for *begitu* (so), the vowel the last syllable of words, for instance, *biarkn* for *biarkan* (let) and *melibatkn* for *melibatkan* (involve), the vowel in the syllable of the middle of words, for example, *memblas* for *membalas* (return), the vowels in the first and last syllables of words as in *trakhr* for *terakhir* (the last). and the vowels in the first and the mid syllables of words shown in *ltkkan* for *letakkan* (put) and *kptsan* for *keputusan* (decision). Other

ways of deletion are carried out by deleting of the vowel and consonant in the first syllable of words and replacing them with apostrophe s ('s) as in *w'derful* for *wonderful* and *b'damai* for *berdamai* (make peace), deleting all vowels except the vowel in the first syllable, for instance, *semlm* for *semalam* and *mengjr* for *mengajar*, deleting the syllable in the mid of words as shown in *kana* for *karena* (because), deleting the vowel in the root, except the vowels of prefixes and suffixes found in *menjlnkan* for *menjalankan* (to run), and deleting the letters randomly as in *trimakasi* for *terima kasih* (thank you) and *letakn* for *letakkan* (put).

Compared to typographical feature, rebus writings are less frequently found. Rebus writing are made up of four kinds, they are letter

homophone or the use letter whose pronunciation is similar to the target words or syllables; number homophone or that of using number; letter-number homophone or that of using letter and number; and symbols or that of using symbols. Four cases of rebus writing is identified in every ten messages. The most frequently used letter-homophone is *u* for *you* and *n* untuk *and*. There are only two number-homophones used and they are only found in English; *4* for *for* and *2* for *to*. Letter-number homophones found in the messages are *4WI* for *Allah* (God), *b4* for *before*, *2day* for *today*, and so on. The most frequently used symbol is *&* for *and* and others are *u/* for *untuk* (for), *@* for *at*, *se(x)* for *sekali* (once), *di(-)* for *dikurangi* (subtracted), and *so on*.

Words with phonetic spelling are also identified the students messages. There are about two words with phonetic spelling in a hundred messages. The examples of these words are *liyat* for *lihat* (see), *tipes* for *typhus*, *Gud morning* for *good morning*, *oke* for *OK*, *cud* for *could*, *Cuz* for *because*, *dat* for *that*, *t'nite* for *tonight*, and *wud* for *would*.

Linguistic features in morphological level found in the messages are initialism, abbreviation, reduplication, truncation, and spoken-casual style diction. Initialism is the use of the first letters of the the words to represent the words; abbreviation is the use of abbreviated forms of words; truncation is the omission of the syllables in the words; and spoken-casual style diction is the use of words which are casually spoken. Of 1,521

messages, 912 forms of words having experienced morphological processes in 3,798 cases are identified. The number of the morphological features and that of the frequency are shown in the table below.

**Table 2: The features and frequency of morphology in 1,521 SMS messages**

| the features of morphology |              |               |            |                             |
|----------------------------|--------------|---------------|------------|-----------------------------|
| initialism                 | abbreviation | reduplication | truncation | spoken-casual style diction |
| 176                        | 247          | 120           | 65         | 304                         |
| initialims                 | abbreviation | reduplication | truncation | words                       |
| 741                        | 1,496        | 238           | 257        | 1,066                       |
| cases                      | cases        | cases         | cases      | cases                       |
| 48.7%                      | 98.4%        | 15.6%         | 16.9%      | 70.1%                       |

It is found that in every message, two or more words are with morphological features. One initialized word is identified in almost every two messages and an abbreviated word is found in almost every message. In addition to the two morphological features, one or two reduplicated words are identified in ten messages, two truncated words in ten messages, and seven words of spoken-casual style dictions are encountered in every ten messages.

Initialism, abbreviation, reduplication, truncation, and spoken-casual style diction are used under diverse approaches or circumstances. The initialism is used in at least nine approaches. It is employed for common initialized words in Indonesian language or ED UNJ contexts, for instance, *a.k.a* for *as known as*, *a.n.* for *atas nama*, *a.m.* for *ante meridiem*, *DPRD* for *Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat Daerah*, and *EPP* for *English Phonetics and Phonology* and *II* for *Ifan Iskandar*; names which are not familiar—known only by the texters as in *Putryca A.T.* and *N. Fitri*: addressing someone, for example, *B* or

*b* for *bu* (*Ibu/Mam*), *P* or *p* for *Pak* (*Sir*), and *k* for *kak* (*kakak/brother*): certain expressions like *gpp* for *gak pa-pa* (*nggak apa-apa/never mind*), *OMG* for *Oh My God*, *GWS* for *Get Well Soon*, and *otw* for *on the way*: and representing function words of prepositions and connectors as in *b* for *before*, *u* for *untuk* (*for*), *d* for *dengan* (*with*), *d* for *dalam* (*in*), *w* for *with*, *s* for *so*, and *k* for *ke* (*to*). Other circumstances under which initialism is used are for certain nouns like *B* for *bahasa* (*language*) and *C* for *choice*; replacing pronouns as in *s* for *saya*; words or terms in certain academic fields, as shown in *RQ* for *research question*; and expressing gratitude like *tk* for *terima kasih*.

There are about ten circumstances under which abbreviation is employed. It is used by

omitting the first two digits of number in writing year like '03 for 2003, '11 for 2011, or 05 for 2005; omitting consonants in consonant skeleton words or vowelless words, e.g. *pndgrn* for *pendengaran*, *plg* for *pulang* (*going home*), and *bny* for *banyak* (*many*); in the form of acronym as in *ponsel* for *telpon seluler*, *curhat* for *curahan hati*, *premium* for *prei makan minum*, and *pulsa* for *puasa lebih sabar*; for salutations especially *assalamu'alaikum*, for example, *ass*, *ass*, *assw*, *asw*, *Asw wb*, and *Aww*; for expressing gratitude as shown in *tkh*, *tks*, *tksh*, *tmks*, *trims*, *mks* for *terima kasih* or *thk* or *tq* for *thank you* and *thx* and *tx* for *thanks*. The other five circumstances are that abbreviation uses common abbreviation forms like *Mr* or *mr* for

*mister*, and *Mrs* or *mrs* for *mistress*; unconventional abbreviation forms as in *mt* for *minta* (*ask*), *angk* or *agk* for *angkatan* (*year*), *smt* for *semester*, *lil* for *little*, and *ull* for *you will*; consonant skeletons of passive verb phrases as in *dblg* for *dibilang* (*wa told*); the common abbreviated words blended with prefixes like *diacc* for *disetujui* (*approved*) or *dttd* for *ditandatangani* (*signed*); and abbreviation forms of certain phrases or expressions as shown in *gbs* for *nggak bisa* (*can not*) and *ydh* for *ya sudah* (*it's done*).

The following feature of morphological level is reduplication which is used in about eleven ways. It is approached by writing number 2 immediately at the end of words to be reduplicated as in *ada2* for *ada-ada*, *lagi2* for *lagi-lagi*, and *anak2* for

*anak-anak*; and number 2 and symbol of multiplication (x) in Indonesian uttered *kali* or *times* like *Amin7x* or *benar2x*; deleting randomly certain letters or vowels of the words and immediately followed by number 2, e.g. *brkas2* for *berkas-berkas*, *brsakit2* for *bersakit-sakit*, and *brtahun2* for *bertahun-tahun*; abbreviating randomly words and directly add number 2 to the words as shown in *msg2* for *masing-masing*, *mgu2* for *minggu-minggu*, and *org2* for *orang-orang*; adding closely number 2 to the consonant skeleton words as seen in *bnr2* for *benar-benar*, *kt2* for *kata-kata*, and *kpn2* for *kapan-kapan*; and adding number 2 and multiplication symbol right after the consonant skeleton as in *tny2x* for *tanya-tanya*.

The other five approaches of expressing reduplication are by

rewriting completely the reduplicated word preceded with a hyphen as in *doa-doa*; rewriting the reduplicated words which are added with affixes found in *dikata-katain* and *cari-carian*; inserting number 2 between the consonant skeleton words and vowel affixes identified in *mdh2n* for *mudah-mudahan* and *sbsr2ny* for *sebesar-besarnya*; inserting number 2 between words and affixes as in *dua2nya* for *dua-duanya*, *jadi2an* for *jadi-jadian*, and *kenang2an* for *kenang-kenangan*; and inserting number 2 after the first syllables and immediately followed by the codas of the reduplicated syllables, for example *ju2r* for *jujur* and *ti2p* for *titip*.

The morphological feature of truncation is identified in at least five circumstances. The first three ways of applying truncation are by deleting the

last two syllables of the words *bid* for *bidang*, *compre* for *comprehensive*, *consul* for *consultation*, *Eng* for *English*, *fak* for *fakultas*, *fam* for *family*, *grad* for *graduate*, and *reg* for *reguler*; deleting the first syllable of words shown in *biz* for *habis*, *coz* for *because*, and *tuk* for *untuk*; and omitting the initial and final syllables of words like *hub* for *menghubungi*. The other two ways of employing truncation are by deleting all syllables except the first one as in *er* for *Erwati* (*a person's name*) and retaining the first syllable and add it with the first consonant of the second syllable so that the syllabification of CVC is identified as shown in *ket* for *keterangan*, *kel* for *keluarga*, *jur* for *jurusan*, and *set* for *setengah*.

The last morphological feature identified in the messages is spoken-

casual style dictions. The feature is recognized through the employment of the complete spelling of the spoken-casual words as found in *abis* for *habis*, *ato* for *atau*, and *ngerasa* for *merasa*; the incomplete spellings through the deletion of vowel /e/ dan consonant /h/ as in *tau* for *tahu*, *taun* for *tahun*, and *bri tau* for *memberitahu*; the omission of the vowels as encountered in *nh* for *nih*; the addition of the unconventional spelling to the words as in *asiik* for *asyik*, *nihh* for *nih*, and *yaach*. The other three means of employing the feature are by replacing the conventional spelling with the unconventional one without changing the pronunciation of the words as identified in *siy* for *sih*; omitting the first syllable as in *langkah* as found in *ma* for *sama*; and using the slang

which is supposed to be used among socially close related speakers only like *waitin* for *waiting*, *wanna* for *want to*, *gonna* for *going to*, and *evrythin* for *everything*.

The features of mechanics and syntax completes the linguistic features in the SMS messages. The features of mechanics—full stop, comma, space, and capital letter—are analyzed in terms of whether: 1) they are used and the usage conforms to the rules of mechanics (used and conforming); 2) they are used, but the usage doesn't conform (used but not conforming); and 3) they are not used when they should be (not used). The feature of syntax is analysed based on the number of clauses used in every sentence of the messages. These sentences are categorized into simple sentence with one main clause,

compound sentence with two or more main clauses, complex sentence with one main clause and more than one sub-clauses, and compound-complex with more than one main clauses and one or more sub-clauses.

cases of comma, 28,678 cases of spaces, and 12,141 cases of capital letters. The findings of the usage of the four elements of mechanics are quantitatively presented in the following tables.

It is found that there are 5,982 cases of the full stop usage, 4,948

**Table 3: The Use of Full Stop, Comma, Space, and Capital Letter**

| The percentage of the use of full stop, comma, space, and capital letter |                          |          |                   |                          |          |                   |                          |          |                   |                          |          |
|--|--------------------------|----------|-------------------|--------------------------|----------|-------------------|--------------------------|----------|-------------------|--------------------------|----------|
| Full Stop  |                          |          | Comma             |                          |          | Space             |                          |          | Capital Letter    |                          |          |
| Used & Conforming  | Used, but Not Conforming | Not Used | Used & Conforming | Used, but Not Conforming | Not Used | Used & Conforming | Used, but Not Conforming | Not Used | Used & Conforming | Used, but Not Conforming | Not Used |
| The amount of each category in each feature                              |                          |          |                   |                          |          |                   |                          |          |                   |                          |          |
| 2.958  | 1.400                    | 1.624    | 1.161             | 731                      | 3.092    | 25.782            | 364                      | 2.532    | 6.381             | 1.259                    | 4.501    |
| The total amount of the three categories in each feature                 |                          |          |                   |                          |          |                   |                          |          |                   |                          |          |
| 5.982  |                          |          | 4.948             |                          |          | 28.678            |                          |          | 12.141            |                          |          |
| The percentage of each category in each feature                          |                          |          |                   |                          |          |                   |                          |          |                   |                          |          |
| 49,45  | 23,4                     | 27,15    | 23,29             | 15,67                    | 62       | 89,9              | 1,27                     | 8,83     | 52,56             | 10,37                    | 37,1     |

Of 2,958 cases of full stops, forty nine percent cases show the correct use with the conformity to the rule of mechanics, twenty three percent cases show incorrect use with no conformity, and twenty seven percent cases show

the absence of full stops when they are supposed to be used. The usage of comma is not so accurate as that of full stops. Sixty two percent cases show the absence of commas when they have to be used, sixteen percent show

inaccurate cases comma usage, and only twenty three percent show the accurate usage of commas. The mechanics element of space is generally used with the conformity to the rules of mechanics, ninety percent cases show this. Only one percent cases show the inaccurate use and nine percent show the absence of spaces when they have to be used. The last element of mechanics, capital letters, is identified in 12,141 cases and fifty three percent cases show the correct use of capital letters, ten percent show incorrect use, and thirty seven percent show the absence of capital letters in the words when they are to be used.

In syntactic level, the analyses to the 5,297 sentences and 6,867 clauses in 1,521 messages display unequal distribution of the four kinds of the sentences. Simple sentences are

identified in 4,112 cases and this proves that seventy eight percent of the sentences used in the messages are simple ones and when compared to the amount of messages analysed, simple sentences are employed almost three times in every one message, about two hundred seventy percent. There are 976 cases of complex sentences or nineteen percent of the whole sentences and there is one complex sentence identified in every two messages, sixty two percent of all messages. Compound sentences are recognized in 115 cases or about two percent of all sentences and one compound sentence is found in ten messages, eight percent of the messages. There are 54 cases of complex-compound sentences or one percent of total sentences and three complex-compound sentences are

identified in a hundred messages, three point six percent.

Discussing the findings of all levels from typographical to syntactic ones requires reflective presentations and comparisons of the previous studies. Emoticons which occurs thirteen times in every a hundred messages are quantitatively infrequent compared to those identified in Ling and Telenor (2005), six percent of emoticons and abbreviation in their study of SMS linguistic features. Both studies share the same fact that emoticon is a linguistic feature usually used in texting among young users—teens and mostly women in Ling and Telenor—or among students and lecturers, unlike the communication between students and lecturers as of this study.

The use of emoticons, the feature that expresses emotion such as happiness using smile-like icons of :), :D, ;-), :-D, ;), =), :p, =D, ( ^\_^ ), (^0^), -) or sadness icons of :(, :'(, (-.-), ,:-( ,, :-l, ;-(, could be the hints that SMS is a non-formal mode of communication. This might affect the students' view of the non-formal context of communication through texting. Shouldn't they be aware of this, they will not use emoticons in the first place. Yet, it is also probable that they are not aware of the sociopragmatic aspect of communicating with their lecturers. In other words, the use of emoticons in the students' messages might indicate their assumption of texting as a non-formal mode of communication or simply their unawareness of

sociopragmatic aspect of the communication.

Vowel and letter deletion of typography are the next features identified in the messages. Vowel deletion is the feature in which the words used are without any vowel, a form called *vowel-less items or words* (Crystal: 2004) or *consonant skeleton words* (Prochasson, et. al. : 2007). Crystal and Prochasson et. al. believe this as one of the most important elements characterizing languages of SMS and this study confirms their argument as two vowelless words are found in every message.

Letter deletion is a term not commonly used by former researchers, but is discussed under the term abbreviation and truncation (Ling and Telenor, 2005; Prochasson, et. al: 2007; and Bosco, 2007). The writer

discusses this feature under the term letter deletion as it doesn't systematically omit certain letters or syllables in words as in the cases of vowel deletion and truncation. Texters tend to randomly delete any letter be it consonant or vowel or both as shown in *smua* (semua: all), *ats* (atas: on), *kmpus* (kampus: campus), *bingksn* (bingkisan: gift), *b'kenan* (berkenan: allow), *Ap* (apa: what), *btmu* (bertemu: meet), *intrnt* (internet: internet), *hve* (have), *absnt* (absent), *w'come* (welcome), and *w'derful* (wonderful).

*Rebus* writing is the use of pictures of objects or symbols the names of which resemble the replaced words or the syllables and is used for the first time in 1605 by William Camden (Crystal: 2008). Rebus is the fourth element featuring the languages of SMS as they occur

twice in every five messages. Three kinds of rebus writing as delineated by Prochasson et. al. (2007) are found in the study. The rebus of letter-homophone are identified in English and Indonesian as in u (you), mw (mau: want), ur (your), bwt (buat: for), qt (kita: we), r (are), tq (thank you), and tw (tahu: know). Two rebus of number-homophones are only found in English; 4 for *for* and 2 for *to*. The rebus of letter-number homophones are identified in both languages as in *b4* (*before*), *2day* (*today*), *ber 5* or *br5* (*berlima: the five of*), *c0miN9* (*coming*), *t0m0rRow* (*tomorrow*), and *y9* (*yang: which-relativizer*).

The last kind of rebus is not compatible with the three previously mentioned kinds of rebus, yet it occurs once in every ten messages. The writer uses the term symbol or image to

accommodate this feature that uses symbol or letters and symbols as in & (and), *u/* (*untuk: for*), *@* (*at*), *se(x)* (*sekali: once*), and *di(-)* (*dikurangi: subtracted*). Basically, rebus is used to save the restricted space of SMS as in *b4*, *2day*, and *ber5*. Yet, there are rebuses used not for this reason as the spellings of the words are retained as they are, only some spellings are replaced with numbers orthographically resembling the letters, number-like letters, as in *c0miN9* (*coming*) and *t0m0rRow* (*tomorrow*); zero (0) for o and nine (9) for g.

The typographical feature of phonetic spelling is marked by the use of words the spelling of which are different from the standard one due to the replacement or omission of certain spelling without changing the pronunciation which Prochasson, et. al.

(2007) call *phonetic style*. This feature occurs twice in a hundred messages and is mostly identified in English as in *tipes* (*typhus*), Gud morning (Good morning), cud (could), Cuz (because), dat (that), liyat (lihat: see), wud (would), and bcoz (because). This non-standard spelling hints the non-formal style of the languages used in SMS.

The frequent usage of vowel and letter deletion, rebus writing, and phonetic spelling as found in the study confirms the universal typographical features of languages in SMS. The features are not only used to save the restricted space as shown in certain cases of letter-number homophone and phonetic spelling. This bolsters the assumption that SMS is a non-formal mode of communication which is antithetical to the sociopragmatically suggested formal context of student-

lecturer communication. This gap of the assumed non-formal mode and the expected formal context probably causes the lecturers find the messages provoking.

The morphological features of initialism, abbreviation, reduplication, truncation, and spoken-casual style diction identified in the study confirm the features commonly found in the languages of SMS. One initialized word is found in almost every two messages, an abbreviated word in almost every message, one until two reduplicated words in ten messages, two truncated words in ten messages, and seven words of spoken-casual style diction are encountered in every ten messages. The features of initialism, abbreviation, truncation, and the spoken-casual diction in SMS are in line with the studies conducted

by Ling and Telenor (2005), Prochasson et. al. (2007), Bosco (2007), and Crystal (2008). This affirms the hypothetically recognized features of languages in SMS as they are used among various groups of users.

Casual style of spoken diction with seven cases out of ten messages highlights the sociopragmatic issue of the study. This generalization of seven out of ten is possibly inaccurate as the diction is not calculated on the basis of its occurrence in every message, but of the total number of the words compared to the total messages. However, the large number of the words in the messages could be the cogent ground to assume that casual style is used by students to communicate with their lecturers through SMS.

The features of mechanics—full stop, comma, space, and capitals—confirm the findings of previous studies in the sense that the punctuation is generally not used. This study proved that only one of the two full stops are used in compliance with the punctuation standard, two out of ten commas, nine out of ten spaces, and one out of the two capitals are used accordingly. Syntactically, the non-standard use of the full stops, commas, spaces, and capitals is unacceptable as it potentially confuses the propositions in the clauses, but in SMS with relatively short or limited propositions communicated, this confusion is naturally reduced.

The issue could be addressed with the phrase meaning over form. If the meanings communicated are intelligible, the unusedness of periods,

commas, or capitals in a 'should-save-space' mode of communication like SMS stands to reason. This is in line with the nature of sentence lengthiness found in the study. The classification of number-of-clause-based sentences shows that seventy eight percent of sentences are one-claused or simple and thus the use of punctuation to mark the propositions in the sentences are not necessarily used.

The identified typographical, morphological, mechanics and syntactic features in the study confirm the universally recognized features of languages in SMS found in other former studies. Those features are known as logogram and pictogram, omitted letters and nonstandard spelling, initialism and shortening, and complex messages (Yusuf, Natsir, & Yusra, 2016); emoticons and spelling

modifications (Hashim, Soopar, & Hamid, 2017); nonstandard spellings, missed capitalization, accent stylization, letter/number homophones, omitted periods, contractions, omitting letters, phonetic/nonconventional spellings, clippings, onomatopoeic/exclamatory, shortenings, misspellings, and initialisms (Lyddy, et.el., 2012); the features categorized as textism (Chaka,2015; Chaka, Mphahlele, & Mann, 2015). . The features identified in this study are covered in the elements of analysis model for the language of online social networking site (Szurawitzki, 2012).

These features could negatively affect language skill in general in Sumitra and Pal's point of view (2009) proving that language used in SMS has significantly deviated

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. The features, on the other hand, could be perceived as linguistic creativity though they may not be considered formal in written mode of no face-to-face interaction. This factors of creativity and self-expression are recognized in text messaging (Pimentel & Diniz, 2014).

## CONCLUSION

The linguistic features of Indonesian and English 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 full stops,

commas, and capital letters.

Typographic features of emoticons, letter deletion, rebus writing, and phonetic spelling are also frequently used in the messages. The features of morphology are shown by the frequent usage of initialism, abbreviation, reduplication, truncation, and casual style of spoken diction. Syntactic features are marked by the common use of one-claused sentences. The findings confirm the emergence of universal features of SMS language or in terms of communication, electronically mediated communication (EMC), and of a language of text messaging, that is textese with non-standard linguistic forms and non-conventional usage called textisms.

**REFERENCE**

- Ahmed, N.A., & Alfaki, I.M. (2016). "The Effect of Text Messaging on the English Language Aspects and Communication". International Journal of Language Vol. 3, No. 2; June 2016
- Al-Qaysi, N., & Al-Emran, M. (2017). "Code-switching Usage in Social Media: A Case Study from Oman". International Journal of Information Technology and Language Studies (IJITLS) Vol. 1, Issue. 1, (2017). pp. 25-38). <http://journals.sfu.ca/ijitls>
- Bosco, Li Sui Sum. (2007). "SMS Gener@tion: A Study on the Language of Text Messaging in Hong Kong" (Thesis, University of Hong Kong: 2007), <http://www.hku.hk/linguist/stu/libosco.pdf> (diunduh 5 November 2010).
- Chaka, C. (2015). "Textisms, Grammatical Features, and Sentence Types in the SMS and IM Paragraphs of EFAL Learners". Per Linguam 2015 31(3):65-85 <http://dx.doi.org/10.5785/31-3-597>
- 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 6(1), Art. #83, 9 pages. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4102/rw.v6i1.83>
- Crystal, David. (2008). *Txtng: The Gr8 Db8*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- David Bamman, Jacob Eisenstein, and Tyler Schnoebelen. (2014). "Gender Identity and Lexical Variation in Social Media. Accessible at: <https://github.com/jacobeisenstein/jos-gender-2014>
- Dorantes,A., Sierra, G. Perez, Y.D.fia (2018). "Sociolinguistic Corpus of WhatsApp Chats in Spanish among College Students". Proceedings of the Sixth International Workshop on Natural Language Processing for Social Media , pages 1–6, Melbourne, Australia, July 20, 2018.
- Drouin, M. & Driver, B. (2014). "Texting, textese and literacy abilities: A naturalistic study". Journal of Research in Reading.
- Eisenstein J, O'Connor B, Smith NA, Xing E.P. (2014). "Diffusion of Lexical Change in Social Media". PLoS ONE 9(11): e113114. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0113114
- Fairon, Cédric and Sébastien Paumier. (2004). "A translated corpus of 30,000 French SMS," <http://www.sms4science.org/user/files/A%20translated%20corpus.pdf> (diunduh 5 November 2010).
- Hashim, F.R., Soopar, A.A., & Hamid, B.A. (2017). "Linguistic Features of Malaysian Students' Online Communicative Language in an Academic Setting: The Case of Universiti

- Kebangsaan Malaysia”.  
Akademika 87(1), April  
2017:231-242.  
<http://doi.org/10.17576/akad-2017-8701-17>
- Hillebrand, Friedhelm, Finn Trosby, Kevin Holley, dan Ian Harris, eds. (2010). *Short Message Service (SMS): The Creation of Personal Global Text Messaging*. West Sussex: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.
- Hoonard, van den Will C. (2008). “Inter-and Intracoder Reliability.” In *The SAGE Encyclopedia of Qualitative Research Methods*, edited by Lisa M. Given. London: SAGE Publications Inc.
- Iaia, P, L. (2016). *Analysing English as a Lingua Franca in Video Games: Linguistic Features, Experiential and Functional Dimensions of Online and Scripted Interactions*. Germany: Peter Lang AG, Internationaler Verlag der Wissenschaften
- Jimma, J.D. (2017). “Language of social media Examination of English as a Lingua Franca in social media”. May 2017. University of Iceland, School of HumanitiesDepartment of English
- Kahari, L. (2014). “Language of Texting, Patterns and Factors of Language Choice in Text Messaging of University of Zimbabwe, Shona-English Bilinguals”. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science* . Vol. 4 No. 1; January 2014.

- Lantz-Andersson, A. (2018). "Language play in a second language: Social media as contexts for emerging Sociopragmatic competence". *Educ Inf Technol* (2018) 23:705–724 DOI 10.1007/s10639-017-9631-0
- Lantz-Andersson, A. (2016). "Embracing social media for educational linguistic activities". *Nordic Journal of Digital Literacy*, 10(01), 51–77. doi: 10.18261/issn.1891-943x-2016-01-03.
- Li, J., & Cummins, J. (2019). "Effect of using texting on vocabulary instruction for English learners". *Language Learning & Technology* ISSN 1094-3501 June 2019, Volume 23, Issue 2 pp. 43–64
- Ling, Rich and Telenor R&D. (2005). "The socio-linguistics of SMS: An analysis of SMS use by a random sample of Norwegians," <http://www.richardling.com/papers/2005SMSsocio-linguistics.pdf> (diunduh 5 November 2010).
- Lyddy, F., Farina, F., Hanney, J., Farrell, L., O'Neill, N.K. (2013). "An Analysis of Language in University Students' Text Messages". *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication* 19 (2014) 546–561 © 2013
- Magwaro, G.R., Rambaya, G., Odhiambo, E., & Owala, S. (2018). "An Analysis of the Linguistic Features Used in Selected Social Interactions on Facebook". *Education and*

- Linguistics Research ISSN 2377-1356 2018, Vol. 4, No. 1.
- Meurant, Robert C. (2007). "Using Cell Phones and SMS in Second Language Pedagogy: A Review, with Implications for their Intentional Use in the L2 Classroom," *Journal of Convergence Information Technology*, Vol. 2, no. 1, 2007, <http://www.aicit.org/jcit/papers/jcit2-1/12.%20Using%20Cell%20Phones.pdf> (diunduh 5 November 2010).
- Otemuyiwa, A.A. (2017). "A Linguistic Analysis of WhatsApp Conversations among Undergraduate Students of Joseph Ayo Babalola University". *Studies in English Language Teaching* ISSN 2372-9740 (Print) ISSN 2329-311X (Online) Vol. 5, No. 3, 2017 [www.scholink.org/ojs/index.php/selt](http://www.scholink.org/ojs/index.php/selt)
- Pinto, A., Gonçalo Oliveira, H., Figueira, Á. et al. (2017). "Predicting the Relevance of Social Media Posts based on Linguistic Features and Journalistic Criteria". *New Gener. Comput.* (2017) 35: 451. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00354-017-0015-1>. Alexandre Pinto · Hugo Gonçalo Oliveira · Ana Oliveira · Alves <http://repositorio.inesctec.pt/handle/123456789/5822>
- Pérez-Sabater, C. (2015). Discovering language variation in WhatsApp text interactions. *ONOMÁZEIN* 31 (junio de 2015): 113-126 DOI: 10.7764/onomazein.31.8

- Pimentel, A.S.G. (2014). "Language Used in Social Networks: Creativity and Self-Expression". *Psychology*, 2014, 5, 2131-2137. Published Online December 2014 in SciRes. <http://www.scirp.org/journal/psych>  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.4236/psych.2014.519215>
- Prochasson, Emmanuel, Christian Viard-Gaudin, dan Emmanuel Morin.(2007). *Language Models for Handwritten Short Message Services*. (2007). <http://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/docs/00/41/77/16/PDF/draft-icdar2007.pdf> (diunduh 5 November 2010).
- Segerstad, Ylfa Hård af. (2002). "Use and Adaptation of Written Language to the Conditions of Computer-Mediated Communication." PhD diss., Department of Linguistics, Göteborg University, Sweden, 2002. [http://www.ling.gu.se/~ylvah/dokument/ylva\\_diss.pdf](http://www.ling.gu.se/~ylvah/dokument/ylva_diss.pdf) (diunduh 5 November 2010).
- Stout, D.W. (2020). Social Media Statistics 2020: Top Networks By the Numbers. Accessible at <https://dustinstout.com/social-media-statistics/#facebook-stats> Retrieved on January, 15, 2020.
- Szurawitzki, M. (2012). "Analyzing the Language of Social Networking Sites - An Analysis Model". Proceedings of the 24th Scandinavian Conference of Linguistics. Conference Paper December 2012

- <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/255723700>
- Tagg, C., Asprey, E. (2017). 'Messaging in the Midlands: Exploring digital literacy repertoires in a superdiverse region', IRiS Working Paper Series, No. 16/2017. Birmingham: Institute for Research into Superdiversity
- Thurairaj S, Hoon E P, Roy S S and Fong P K. (2015). "Reflections of Students' language Usage in Social Networking Sites: Making or Marring Academic English". The Electronic Journal of e-Learning Volume 13 Issue 4 2015, (pp302-316) available online at [www.ejel.org](http://www.ejel.org)
- Thurlow, C. (2003). "Generation Txt? The sociolinguistics of young people's text-messaging". <http://www.shu.ac.uk/daol/articles/v1/n1/a3/thurlow2002003-paper.html>
- Van Dijk, C.N., van Witteloostuijn, M., Vasić, N., Avrutin, S., and Blom, E. (2016). "The Influence of Texting Language on Grammar and Executive Functions in Primary School Children". 2016, Mar 31 doi: [10.1371/journal.pone.0152409](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0152409)
- Wan, W., Sun, J., Liu, J., Yang, S-W., Liu, M., Jiao, D., Liu, X. (2019). "Using social media to explore the linguistic features in female adults with childhood sexual abuse by Linguistic Inquiry and Word Count". Human Behavior and Emerging Technologies. 26 July 2019. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hbe2.162>

Yusuf, Q.Y., Natsir, Y., Yusra, S.R.

(2016). “(. .)/ dont 4get 2 txt me

plz! Linguistic and Discoursal

Features of Short Message

Service by Female Texters”.

3L:Language, Linguistics,

Literature The Southeast Asian

Journal of English Language

Studies. Vol 22, No 1 2016.