

Textese and its Impact on the English Language

Rameshwar Thakur

Abstract

The growing interests of college students towards using Facebook (FB) features have invented newer texts for a faster online communication. Such unique textese and digitalese reside in their minds and hearts. Many scholars, therefore, currently advocate for exploring a new avenue to adapt certain linguistic contents (LCs) of FB in promoting and developing a language. Amidst, the LCs of such social networking sites allow users to entertain better interactions. Nevertheless, their indiscriminate use exerts threats to the existing body of the English Language (EL). In this context, this qualitative study tries to reconnoitre typical characteristics of textese based on purposively selected observation data from FBs of 20 college students and documentary data from published journals or books. It further analyzes how such contents affect phonological, morphological, syntactic and semantic levels of the EL. The study concludes that the LCs impose problems to the EL; however, they require integrations into current form of the EL without causing serious problems because of their influences on netizens.

Keywords: *textese, netizen, self-regulation, lexical, alphanumeric*

Introduction

The emergence of Information and Communication Technology (ICT) has extensively encroached on the time and space of humans' existence with its multiple wings. The increasing invasion of digital inventions deserves praise for their miracle-working power in meeting humans' needs and interests; however, their improper handling and misuse results in contempt. Digital users additionally employ such inventions, as Ratheeswari (2018) says, to 'handle and communicate information for learning purposes' (p. 45). ICT, developed as 'building blocks of modern society' (Sharma, Dahiya, & Verma, 2016, p. 663) in a very short period, has become an indispensable 'part of the core of education, alongside reading, writing and numeracy' (p. 663) in most countries. Besides education, almost every aspect of human life has got invaded and transformed though it is consumer-driven. It highlights the dominating role of humans' institutions and infinite intelligence in directing digital devices for their sake. Thus, the contents should appropriate social and communal cultural norms and values without any fundamental transformations in any aspects of a language. Furthermore, Ratheeswari (2018) accentuates 'High quality, meaningful, and culturally responsive digital content' (p. 46) for teachers and learners for high academic standards. Slim and Hafedh (2020) state that Social Media (SM) like FB has expanded due to 'the human craving for discovery, boundless connection and exchange of information and opinion with other users' (p. 56). Because an SM grips educational arena, academicians and educationalists emphasize its inevitability in teaching learning activities. FB specifically creates a common effective platform for sharing ideas and messages. Out of various features of FB, chat/status or text message is quite popular not only among the youths/adults but also the aged in order to promote resilience and register; and connect for easy

communication and continued attention (as cited in Oseni, Dingley & Hart, 2018, p. 56). In course of time, transformations made to statuses and chats LCs are straying away from preserving orthographic features of English language. Hamzah, Ghorbani and Abdullah (2009) claim that the written language should be creatively adapted, developed, and enhanced to meet the need of electronic communication (p. 75). Does it mean that the beauty, originality, and purity of the EL should be changed? Can't we uphold unalienable features of English even in electronic messages? Certainly, we can if we try. If such traditions continue, the day is not so far when our struggle to preserve and promote a language will confront hurdles. Similarly, Van Dijk, Van Witteloostuijn, Vasić, Avrutin and Blom (2016) argue that textese positively affects children's grammar performance and remains neutral in improving children's executive functions (p. 1). Nevertheless, my question is 'How do erroneous structures of textese preserve grammar system?' Do they not encourage language violation? Yes, language is dynamic but shouldn't be deteriorated because of digital inventions; rather cultural values attached to it should be protected. Thus, this study attempts to pinpoint deviant forms of textism and aware social media users about its effects on different levels of English language so that remedial steps can be exercised to minimize such absurdity. Specifically, the research discovers how textese of FB statuses and comments affects phonological, morphological, syntactic and semantic systems of the English language with the help of observation and document data.

Methodology

The researcher employed qualitative research design throughout the research processes. This study chiefly focuses on practical linguistic expressions of the target groups in natural online settings and has made sense of the observation and documentary data organizing them into different categories. Moreover, the researcher has deeply investigated the reasons behind their occurrences in reference to relationships, feelings and social contexts of the users.

In order to find effects of LCs of FB on the English Language, this study mainly used data collected purposefully from FB statuses and chat contents of 15 BBS and 5 B.ed first year students studying in private and public colleges of Kavrepalanchok district. Each participant's name was collected from the lectures working in the respective colleges and the researcher then searched each one's FB. But their names are not revealed for maintaining ethical issues.

As private chats are not publicly open, the linguistic contents were observed from comments, responses and statuses. Moreover, the deviant forms especially words and phrases were extracted from the full sentences. This study though does not include any primary data collected from such students. Besides, the researcher has used online authentic text messages mentioned and quoted in journals and books. Thus, both observation and documentary texts are basic sources for exploring new dimensions of textese's effects on the English language. The data gathered in such ways have been analyzed and interpreted qualitatively; and the conclusion has been drawn.

Theoretical Framework

A writer uses codes to impart messages through communication channels expecting the receiver will decode and understand what is intended. When interlocutors belong to different linguistic communities, the code so forth created for sharing information may be hybridized. Sometimes, the sender should code-switch basing on the needs of audience. Turner (2009) states that code-switching can take place 'between registers or styles such as from textese to standard English' (as cited in Achuff, 2017, p. 20). Humans love to enjoy what they feel like doing and want to guide their behaviours, thoughts and feelings to attain goals

without any interventions. Bandura (1991) says that the ongoing exercise of self-influence motivates and regulates human behaviours in social cognitive theory (p. 248). It means what a person does depends on the social factors that influence him/her. Likewise, peers and online communities of textese users highly leave traces on the use of LCs to communicate due to which they form a habit of using non-standard English. Bandura further says that self-regulatory function encompasses self-monitoring and self-judgement of an individual's behavior relative to personal standards and environmental circumstances; and affective self-reaction (p. 284). Thus, rapid texting causes weak monitoring resulting in creating erroneous words, phrases and sentences. Moreover, they fail to accurately judge their actions and behaviours because of the newly set standards. This theory claims that such regulatory systems mediate the impacts of external influences and provide grounds for purposeful actions. An individual being regulated by forethought forms beliefs, anticipates possible consequences, sets goals and plans courses of actions. When s/he fails to set the right goals and course of actions, the consequences diverge. Self-regulative capability enables a person to exercise controls over his/her thoughts, motivations and feelings so that s/he can command present behaviours. However, self-regulation needs adequate attention to fidelity, consistency and temporal proximity of self-monitoring (p. 250). Bandura argues that 'systematic self-observation can provide important self-diagnostic information'(p. 250) but faulty self-observation results in ill manners and wrong behaviours. The individual therefore exercises erroneous utterances and flawed writing traditions. Social cognitive theory of self-regulation can help discover why texters use deviant forms of LCs in online textual communications. This study thus uses the theory of self-regulation to guide the researcher throughout the entire process of the research.

Facebook and English Language Teaching

The FB is epidemically widespread among people, mostly youngsters, due to its various utilities in our social and personal life. Many academicians, teachers and students use it to make their opinions, ideas and thoughts open so as to build up a strong online academic community. The ease and brevity in imparting latest information enables us to maximize intimacy, loyalty and self-confidence. Teachers and Students of the EL can highly benefit by using various functions provided in FB. Sirivedin, Soopunyo, Srisuantang and Wongsothorn (2018) note that FB helps improve accuracy, meaningfulness, clarity and relevance in writing; and enhance fluency, confidence, satisfaction, value and self-efficacy belief in teachers (p. 183). Furthermore, Yunus and Salehi (2012) mention the vitality of FB group in promoting writing activities, especially brainstorming, learning new vocabulary from reading the comments of others and reduce spelling errors with the help of spell check features (p. 95). Altakhaineh and Al-Jallad (2018) recommends the need to 'utilize social media to enhance students' L2 writing skills in general, and the mechanics of writing in particular'(p. 12). Similarly, Shih (2013) takes Language learning through FB as a way to effectively improve the grammar skills (tense) and sentence structures; and enhance the learners' desire for learning (p. 58). Proper and careful use of LCs of various features in FB can promote and enhance language development.

Teachers can utilize the FB for creating a vibrant and lively classroom environment; and students can have authentic interactions with English native speakers as well as teachers. Chen and Wang (2013) find the unique functions of FB for teachers to develop activities including communicating, collaborating, and sharing strategies that positively affect student's learning attitude and learning achievement (p. 141). Such strategies help both teachers and students to participate in oral communication, help in finding materials online for assignments/project works and build up intimacy for academic purposes. Bosch (2009) notes a significant contribution of this social site for fostering social connectivity/micro-communities, general communication and teaching and learning activities (p. 193). Kharbach (2014) mentions that FB provides teachers access to different valuable educational apps to uplift their teaching activities; and TeachThought

(2012) recommends ‘Booktag’ to share books in English and ask students to comment on them; ‘Knighthood’ to promote reading skills in English; ‘Language Exchange’ to help students to get connected with foreign language practice and ‘Flashcardlet’ to create flash cards for students to learn vocabulary words in English (as cited in Espinosa, 2015, p. 2207). Blattner and Lomicka (2012) claim that FB ‘helps to provide students with extra L2 practice of interpretative and interpersonal communication skills such as reading, writing, speaking and listening’(p 35). Bayucan (2017) advances the contribution of FB in improving ‘reading, writing, digital literacy, information gathering, and communication with students and parents’(p.13). The aforementioned information strongly suggests an essential role FB plays in language teaching. Furthermore, the LCs used in FB chats seem to help students coming in contact with different genres through which they can enrich their cognitive aspect and improve their writing skills, reading skills, communication skills and interpersonal skills. Different scholars also accentuate the inevitable role of FB in widening the sphere of the EL.

Nevertheless, indiscriminate use of social media features may distract learners’ attention away from study. The intentional or unintentional violations of netiquette create psychological disturbances and social problems. Espinosa (2015) states students, constantly using social media, do not pay attention to the classes, always chat, post pictures, etc. (p. 2206). To save time, they frequently use ill-formed structures, non-existent words/phrases and even irrelevant lexemes that may spring conflicts and misunderstandings among people. Most students, Manan, Alias and Pandian (2012) report, interact using ‘Manglish’ (like Nenglish), or any other combination of languages, but very few use the Standard English to interact with each other (p. 7). As a result, the original quality of English used in such online interactions is eroding. Joshi (2017) argues Short Message Service can have a destructive effect on English language if not checked properly in time and ‘left to accept words, choppy lingo, sloppy spelling and grammatical errors to get a quick and short message’(p. 146). The overall sphere of FB users is rising; however, majority of youngsters/college and university students outdo the older people. Their purposes, time and ways to handle FB features, differ in many respects. Even the characteristics of SMS contents pose variability in promoting the EL.

The LCs of FB chats not only help promote social intimacy but also affect English Language. Moreover, they spoil concentration of students in the classroom; encourage them to use non-standard forms of English both in writing and speaking; and depreciate different aspects of the EL as well.

Characteristics of Chat Languages

Textese is a form of written language by online users in order to communicate with virtual community members. Contents of such written forms carry most features of speech rather than formal writing characteristics. The development in digital world and media universe is pushing its users to adopt newly emerged scripts though different in nature. Thus, young generations expect transformations in the EL to meet needs and demands of existing societies and their current needs. The charismatic uniqueness of ICT has fascinated not only youngsters but also the aged people though in varying degree. In this scenario, the relation between spoken language and written ones especially online/FB has made a comfortable space to enjoy communication easy and reachable to some extent without any proper attention to textese. Consequently, formal and genuine aspects of the EL currently are at risk and this dynamics of increasing violation of formal rules of the EL is posing difficulties to different facets of the EL in pretention of meeting technology lovers’ demands to walk in hands with time and technology. The very situation has forced academicians and linguists to discover pertinent remedies to maintain and promote linguistic originality so that future generations will not have problems in comprehending fundamental phonological, morphological, syntactic and semantic spheres.

The SMS/Chat is the process of communicating, interacting and/or exchanging messages over the Internet that involves two or more people. FB Users can send messages and exchange photos, videos, stickers, audio, etc., and react to other users' messages and interact with bots. These text messages are composed in 'textese' or 'digitalese' or 'CMC language' and such textiquette doesn't follow standard language convention (Lieke, 2019, p. 9). Thus, the linguistic or orthographic contents used to share our ideas in chat need to be studied for finding their significant features, and utility in enhancing the standard and correct use of the EL in formal and informal contexts. Citing Ling (2008), Kahari (2014) says that the language of texting has its own style which involves the use of abbreviations, slang, syntactic reductions, asterisk emoting, deletion of parts of speech especially subject pronouns, prepositions, articles, copula, auxiliary or modal verbs and contractions (p. 156). Besides, users from different geographical, cultural and linguistic identities show their 'increased indulgence in code-switching and code mixing' for texting that leads to 'entirely novel linguistic varieties'(Anjaneyulu & Gabriel, 2009, p. 4). For this purpose, many studies have been conducted to explore stereotypes of chat language. Segerstad (2002) mentions the followings as linguistic features of text messages:

punctuation (omitting punctuation, unconventional punctuation and omitting blank space), spellings (mispredictions, spoken-like spelling split compounds, consonant writing, conventional abbreviations, unconventional abbreviations, either all capitals or all lower-case and exchange long words for shorter), grammar {omission of subject pronoun, omission of vp (copula, auxiliary, or modal verb + preposition}, omission of article, preposition and possessive pronoun) and graphical means(emoticons, asterisks and symbol replacing word). (p. 215)

Randall (2002) argues that the writing style on internet messaging tends to come very close to speech. Punctuation, grammar and other prescriptions of formal writing are lost, capitalization remains unimportant; and slang and abbreviations get priority (p. 12). Similarly, a quick exchange of messages forces the parties to type something without taking time to consider. The users are also free to create the discourse system regarding acronyms (LOL-Laughing out loud, F2F-face to face, CU-see you, L8r-later) and abbreviations (v-very, Vg-Very good, Y-why, Ppl-people, b4-before) they need or simply want (p. 14). Because the writers have little time for thinking, they do not 'compose fully formed, grammatically correct, rhetorically effective sentences and paragraphs complete with transitions, flow, and carefully considered style and tone'(p. 16). Such messages consist of non-conventional uses of spellings, sentences, punctuation, diction, and vocabulary to make the message sound and feel like spoken discourse as possible.

Merchant (2001) takes chat interactions as rapid written conversations having features of face-to-face talk with explorations in interactive writing. Younger people, more adaptable than other sectors of a society and quicker to adapt to new technology, are, to some extent, the innovators, the forces of change in the new communication landscape who experiment and create new forms of writing in their online interactions. Besides, they 'write often with little thought for the accuracy of keystrokes, spelling conventions, traditional punctuation or grammatical completeness'(p. 296). The use of rapid writing reflects the intimacy in the informal, conversational style of the writing that lacks correct capitalization and punctuation except the apostrophe. The creative approach to spelling includes different uses of spellings as speech: 'u', 'av', 'wot' and 'woz', the lower case: 'i' and 'ok'(p. 301), abbreviations and jargons to save typing time and increase the pace of the dialogue. Merchant further claims that abbreviations are common in informal text messaging and roughly categories abbreviations into four types. First, non-alphabetic characters to construct icons relating to emotions (emoticons); second, initial letters as shorthand like 'SWALK' for 'sealed with a loving kiss'; third, combinations of numbers and letters like 'gr8' for 'great' and fourth, phonetic spelling like 'cu' for 'see you' (p. 302). Although writing system in chatrooms help impart messages with less efforts, the erroneous spellings, abbreviations and sentence structures violate

writing system of the EL.

Crystal (2001) examines 'the role of language in the Internet and the effect of the Internet on language' (p. x) and focuses on the 'Netspeak's relationship to written and spoken language' (p. 23). He further says that text 'messages cannot overlap' (p. 33) unlike spoken conversations; and takes the language of asynchronous chat different from that of synchronous, 'which causes most radical linguistic innovation' (p. 130). Crystal notes that word play is ubiquitous in messaging through the use of linguistic strategies which entail repeated letters (hiiiiii, oops), capitalization, smileys, short responses (p. 145), single sentences or sentence fragments, reduced word-length through abbreviations and initialisms (p. 157), use of nicknames (159), rebus-like abbreviations, colloquial elisions (are > r, you > u, and > n), transcription of emotional noises (hehehe, owowowowow), filled pauses (um, er, erm), comic-book style interjections (ugh, euugh, yikes, yipes) (p. 164), perverse spellings (outta, seemz, gonna, dunno, wanna), the omission of a copular verb, prepositions and an auxiliary verb, non-standard concord (165) and abbreviations (BBL, BRB, LOL) (185).

Yunis (2019) argues that the networking texting brings a new type of writing, which includes omitting some letters, adding numbers next to the letters and logograms, deleting mostly vowels, adopting and applying short forms (p. 312). He further says 'Abbreviations and acronyms ground lexical ambiguity while texting' (p. 311). The use of homonymous shortenings like 'LOL' for 'Lots of Love' or 'Laughing out Loud' or 'Little Old Lady', 'BF' for 'best friends' or 'boyfriend', 'FYI' for 'for your information' or 'for your interest' and 'BAC' for 'by any chance' or 'back at computer' (p. 312) etc, and Synonymous abbreviations like 'CU/SU/S you/C you/ See U' for 'See you', 'IG/Insta' to mean 'Instagram', 'TBH/2beh/2bh' for 'To be honest' 'brings highly ambiguous in clinical notes' (p. 313) between the texters. The usage of such textese gives rise to the possibility of a new style of spelling system in the EL.

Stapa and Shaari (2012) identify the linguistic features of online texting. Innovations and modifications in spellings, combinations of letter and number homophone, vowel reduction or omission, replacement of /s/ with /z/, using a letter to represent a word, playful jargons, acronyms, abbreviations and emoticons (p. 817) offer a room for non-native English speakers to communicate without any worries of being judged by others. However, such online 'writing behaviors do not meet requirements of standard writing form and structure' (p. 822) because of limited space and urgency of spontaneity. They further predict for the potential emergence of a new set of language rules and cultures despite the lack of 'specific models in leading the development of online communicative language' (p. 828). The occurrences differ on the basis of cultures, ethnicities, geo-linguistic conditions and people.

The aforementioned researches point out distinctive features of LCs in this electronic communication age. Their results found so far in such researches project both positive and negative effects of such variant textese in practical as well as academic lives. The growing challenges emerged with scientific and technological inventions in language sectors keep forcing experts and academicians to come up with a panacea to belittle possible dangers to the English language because of violation of orthographic and grammatical norms and rules throughout the digitalese.

Presentation, Analysis and Interpretation of Data

The present study uses the social cognitive theory of self-regulation to analyse the data collected from the FB of the intended participants. The participants seem to have used LCs basing on the closeness and intimacy they have with their friends, and the contents have consistency in use. They were found to be using such forms mainly with peer groups rather than with seniors or teachers. Additionally, mood or mental conditions at the time of chatting decide the type of variations in contents. Because of openness

and mutual relationships between friends, they become a bit careless in self-regulating and self-monitoring their online behaviours. Consequently, occurrence of non-standard LCs occupies a greater space in a chat box. Therefore, the researcher has attempted to analyse the collected data embracing self-regulatory qualities of the participants.

The following table shows the appearances of word, phrases and sentences that are picked up from FB statuses and comments/responses; and online reliable sources with their possible intended meanings:

Chatword/s	Real word/s	Chatword/s	Real word/s	Chatword/s	Real word/s
b4	before	l8r	later	tq	Thank you
vfyn	very fine	r8	rate	bt	but
d/da	the	m8	mate	4get	forget
u	you	ic	I see	msg	message
bcoz/coz,	because	gd	good	ppl	people
?4u	question for you	f2f	Face to face	tym	time
121	one two one	ezy	easy	hapi	happy
143	I love you	ef4t	effort	thanx	thanks
1432	I love you too	6y	sexy	tc	Take care
i8u	I hate you	2moro	tomorrow	Str8	straight
2nt	tonight	T+	Think positive	pic	picture
bw	between	wc	welcome	fren	friend
b4u	Before you	rite	Right/write	Wan2tlk	Want to talk

Some text messages beyond word/phrase level(Chaka et al., 2015, pp. 4/5)

Y r u ntfyn- Why are you not fine? Coz nt r8.	U jokn-Are you joking?/You are joking.
Um havin da best I thanx u 2 hv a very gudnyt!-umm having the best, I thank you too. Have a very good night.	Baby I hope u hv a gudnyte. Lv u 4eva-baby I hope you have a good night. Love you forever.
Hi u, I miss u & so hwwsur week. I wl like 2 sy I luv u-hi you! I miss you and so how was your week. I will like to say I love you.	mrngmyluv, irmbrth day we met it ws joy in my hrt and a blssng 2 my lyf-Morning my love. I remember the day we met. It was joy in my heart and a blessing to my life.

Table1: *appearances of word, phrases and sentences on FB*

The above table shows both the data collected from the FB of students and documented source. The

former illustrates that unconventional shortenings/Elision in LCs like ‘vfyn’, ‘bw’, ‘gd’, ‘wc’, ‘tq’, ‘msg’, Alphanumeric including signs writing like ‘b4’, ‘?4u’, ‘2nt’, ‘b4u’, ‘T+’, ‘m8’, ‘l8r’, ‘eft’, Phonetic abbreviations like ‘cu’, ‘d’, ‘u’, ‘ic’, ‘bt’, Numeric homophones like ‘121’ and Numerals to show a word/sentence like ‘2’, ‘143’. Furthermore, deletion of vowels gets importance like in ‘ppl’, ‘msg’. The deviant forms thus seem to run at word, phrase and sentence levels. The patterns of tone or stress or intonation from the textual contents are difficult to decipher but changes in spelling system exert problems to phonemic system of the EL.

Similarly, the latter one includes basically unconventional shortenings of words or deviant spellings or phonetic abbreviations like ‘r’ for ‘are’, ‘u’ for ‘you’, ‘hv’ for ‘have’, ‘luv’ for ‘love’, ‘nyt’ for ‘night’, ‘gud’ for ‘good’, ‘rite’ for ‘write/right’, ‘lyf’ for ‘life’, ‘hrt’ for ‘heart’; alphanumeric like ‘4eva’ for ‘forever’; and numeral homophone like ‘2’ for ‘to’. Moreover, elision of vowel letters, violation of syntactic rules and influence of speech on writing play a pivotal role in isolation and connected speech. Such occurrences are basically influenced by LC features at word and phrase levels; however, a little impact falls on the discourse level.

Phonetic/Phonological Misses

LCs used in statuses and chats seem to be deviating from the correct Pronunciation in isolation or connected speech; and their popularity among users gives a new dimension, which strays from the real course of writing system of the EL. The use of deviant spellings, alphanumeric abbreviations, colloquial elisions, etc., allow the recipients to transform the symbols into speech that can pass from people to people or generations to generations. This phonetic/phonological tendency of SMS contents causes a serious threat to standard oral production. Replacing a word or part of a word with a letter or digit or leaving out vowels changes the whole phoneme i.e. the /ði:/, ðə/- d /di/, should /ʃʊd/-shud /ʃʌd/, Holly /'hɒl.i/-holy /'həʊli/, a short vowel into a long one i.e. tonight/ tə'naɪt/-2nt/tu:nait/, etc. Similarly, the negligence of stress creates non-rhythmic patterns with change in meaning as in thank you /'θæŋkjʊ:/ vs /θæŋk 'ju:/-tq; however, ‘stress assignment does not determine the nature of deletions’ (Kul, 2007, p. 43). Additionally, the use of digits to replace words may not match with its real pronunciation i.e. 1432 (one four three two) to mean ‘I love you too’. Omission of some sounds as well affects the pronunciation, Chaka, Mphahlele and Mann (2015) calls ‘Aphaeresis’(p. 5) ‘, i.e. because/bɪ'kɒz/-/kɒz/ and Friend /frend/-fren/fren/. Moreover, juncture in connected speech as in ‘b4u’ for ‘before you’ is highly undermined leading the EL from stress-timed to syllable-timed language; as a result, it becomes difficult to identify exact sounds. It places obstacles for fluency as well. Thus, erroneous and indiscriminate use of online texting for what so reason places problems to pronunciation of a word in isolation and tone/intonation in connected speech as well. The users, therefore, should pay attention in using contents to avoid grave mistakes that can cause serious phonemic problems.

Morphological leftover

LCs are quick graphical representation of utterances or speech-like utterances; so, they don’t obey formal and standard form of writing a word. The collected observation and documentary data include unconventional shortenings like ‘gd’ for ‘good’, alphanumeric form like ‘m8’ for ‘mate’, phonetic abbreviation like ‘bt’ for ‘but’, digits to replace word/s like ‘121’ for ‘one two one’, deviant spellings like ‘rite’ for ‘right/wright’; and missing out vowel letters like ‘msg’ for ‘message’.

Van Dijk et al. (2015) points out that the use of such textese may ‘leak into their general writing,

ultimately deteriorates language' (p. 1). In this line, lexical reductions and graphical techniques are 'ways to reduce time, effort and keystrokes' during text messages production (Segerstad, 2019, p. 201). The mutual understanding in the netizen subculture allows independent use of special vocabulary and style to differentiate netizens from lay-strangers; and this freedom of introducing novel linguistic elements causes violation of the formal norms of English language.

The freer use of unconventional acronyms as in 'icwum' for 'I see what you mean', 'ptmm' for 'please tell me more' (Crystal, 2004, p. 85), etc., and unconventional or ad-hoc abbreviations (as cited in Segerstad, 2019, p. 72) as in 'cu' for 'see you', 'ic' for 'I see', 'vfyn' for 'very fine', etc., which are generally not accepted in common language and not found in dictionaries, adds difficulties in morphological structures of words. Normally, we can guess the meaning of a word by breaking into different parts but reductions and elisions of texting betray us in predicting meanings in such a way. For example, we cannot guess meanings of 'b4' and 'because', but we can from 'before' (be-fore) and 'because' (bi-cause). Similarly, the negligence of suffixes ('tnx' for 'thanks'), omission of vowel letters ('ppl' for 'people', 'msg' for 'message') and alphanumeric Rebus writing-morpheme, Lotherington (2004) calls 'Hybridised codes' (p. 318) ('2moro' for 'tomorrow', 'l8r' for 'later', 'ef4t' for 'effort', 'str8' for 'straight') still add hurdles to formal rules of word formation. In the same way, alphanumeric phrases i.e. 'b4u' for 'before you', 'me 2' for 'me too', phonetic abbreviations/respellings (Kul, 2007, p. 45) i.e. 'bt' for 'but', 'u' for 'you', 'y' for 'why', 'r' for 'are', 'n' for 'and', 'ur' for 'your', 'plz' for 'please', repeated spellings and punctuations i.e. 'sooooo' for 'so' and numeric homophones for morphemes i.e. '2' for 'to/two/too' impose misunderstanding of spellings as well as the particular words that are intended to be received. Some studies suggest that these shortenings are meant to save time and cost and foster speed in communication; however, they have undermined the destructive nature of such textese on the English language. Rumšienė (2007) argues 'The multiplicity of the original words and symbols, abbreviations and combinations of the graphical signs may lead to the usage mistakes and deviation from the earlier established norms' (as cited in Kardauskienė, 2008, p. 32). This means the new form of morphological creations hinders the existing lexical world of the English language and proposes a novel space for linguistic confluence. Chaka et al. (2015) explored that the distinctive features of morphological structures in textese deviate from those used in formal English (p. 7). The morphological features certainly throw pressures on English language scholars, teachers and experts to find new ways to protect and preserve ornaments of this language. For this, linguists should adopt emerging trends in the LCs of FB without causing fundamental changes in the morphological system of the EL.

Syntactic liberalism

Like morphological attack of text messages, syntactic realm of the English language is also encroached. The phonetic abbreviation like 'Y r u' for 'why are you', unconventional shortenings like 'hv a very gudnyt' for 'have a very good night', combination of phonetic abbreviation and alphanumeric like 'Lv u 4eva' for 'Love you forever', leaving out helping verb like 'U jokn' for 'Are you joking?', use of numerals to replace an entire sentence like '143' for 'I love you'; and missing vowels and spacing between words like 'hwwsur...' for 'how was your...' and 'mrngmyluv, irmbrth...' for 'morning my love, I remember the...' are some fundamental features discovered in the textese. Furthermore, using a lowercase letter even in sentence initial runs through the LCs.

Lotherington (2004) identifies newly emerged grammatical shapes in text messaging; and clarifies sentential acronyms like 'gtg' for 'got to go' or 'ttyl' for 'talk to you later' and diminished grammatical capitalization like 'are you having a happy chanuka?' (p. 322). A formal syntactic structure obeys the rules of spellings, punctuations, capitalization, concord and proper constructions. However, the written

utterances, Nasr, Damnati, Guerraz and Bechet (2016) note, can contain orthographic or grammatical errors or ‘typographic deviations due to high speed typing, poor orthographic skills and inattention’ (p. 178). Thus, the use of unconventional acronyms (awhfy- are we having fun yet?), alphanumeric patterns (2day z gr8-Today is great), phonetic respellings (ic,ltnsdts gr8-I see, listen that’s great), negligence of sentence mechanics (punctuation and capitalization), deletion of auxiliary verbs and vowels and replacement of the entire sentences with digits happen to violate formal rules of syntactic structures. The texting culture does not include proper use of punctuations, and some repeated punctuations make structures look vulgar. Non-traditional punctuation symbols such as #, dots, hyphens, commas and semicolons are also used and repeated in any number. Likewise, irregular patterns like using only lowercase (my sis z ok, cz on a d8 2day) or upper case in message; and omission of helping verbs and replacement of subject pronoun with an object pronoun (Wt u dng?-what are you doing, me goinwl-I am going well) are some areas of violation of syntactic rules. No rules of syntax validate the correctness in ‘u jokn,Um havin da best I thanx u 2 hv a very gudnyt and mrngmyluv, irmbrth day we met it ws joy in my hrt and a blssng 2 my lyf’. Lyddy, Farina, Hanney and O’Neill (2014) regard missed capitalization as the most frequent form of nonstandard spelling in texting (p. 559). Thus, freedom to use grammatically incorrect structures encourages users to continue such uses even in formal writings like exams, applications, etc. Haryono, Leleno and Kholifah (2018) claim ‘Diction, spelling, and sentences that they express tend to violate grammatical rules’(p. 179). As to our astonishment, how does ‘1432’ to mean ‘I love you too’ meet grammar rules? Does prescriptive grammar validate such erroneous constructions? Certainly not, these attack formal system of writing and sentence formations. Though Hamzah et al. (2009) take syntactic reductions as strategies to reduce effort, time and space; they accept the use of ungrammatical sentences in text messaging (p. 75). We cannot stop the growing pace of using new forms of sentence structures especially on social media as it’s the current demand of the present era. That is why; scholars and experts working on language evolution and change should find medieval ways to address novel syntactic phenomena maintaining original qualities of the EL.

Semantic Bizarre

Linguistic features of chat language are thought of a quick representation and expression of speech. With a purpose of imparting required information within limitations, users freely use variant lexical and syntactic constructions that may lead to misunderstanding and misinterpretation of messages. The unconventional short forms like ‘bw’ for ‘between’ and ‘wc’ for ‘welcome’, alphanumeric form like ‘b4’ for ‘before’ and ‘l8r’ for ‘letter’ and digits to replace a sentence like ‘143’ for ‘I love you’ can impose variations in understanding.

Certain features of the LCs can have misleading impacts on the meaning aspect of the English language. On the basis of the discovered data, further meanings can be deduced which place difficulties in getting the intended meanings. Typical texting features of using short forms like ‘Pic’ for ‘Picture’ or ‘Piece’, alphanumeric morphemes like ‘L8r’ for ‘Letter’ or ‘Latter’ or ‘Later’ and ‘B4’ for ‘Before’ or ‘Be number four’, Acronyms like ‘Wc’ for ‘Welcome’ or ‘Water Closet’ or ‘Who Cares’, ‘Rip’ for ‘Rest In Peace’ or ‘Rape In Park’ and ‘Tc’ for ‘Take Care’ or ‘Transfer Certificate’; and digits to replace a full sentence like ‘143’ for ‘I love you’ or ‘I hate you’ or ‘I kiss you’ do not show clear-cut meanings as each may have multiple full forms and meanings. Furthermore, misinterpretation and misunderstanding of such codes may lead to discontinued communication, even physical or mental tortures to both senders and receivers. Despite ill-effects of LCs on semantic aspects of the EL, the burning requirement of new forms of LCs should be adopted to reflect clear meanings.

Conclusion

Textese netizens keep rising in numbers with novel cultures of a writing system. Time and space allow the FB users to communicate in their subcultures efficiently and effectively; however, newer patterns of online textese and digitalese create difficulties for the English language lovers. Such deviant forms don't entirely tally with different systems of the EL. It is also argued that the LCs of FB do not keep standard forms of the EL due to intimacy and freedom of the users, but we can not avoid their emergence.

The interests of netizens towards using the FB encourage them to use the EL frequently in online communications. Consequently, the LCs used on such a platform necessarily receive pivotal importance for researchers working in language sectors. It is to be crystallized that novelty appeared in the LCs of the FB strays away from the existing body of the EL. This sphere thus needs continuous explorations in order to maintain balance between such LCs and the EL.

The FB users take advantages of freedom in importing changed writing systems for statuses and comments to save time and efforts. This study discovers various features of such writing systems and explores the extent of impacts they have on phonological, morphological, syntactic and semantic aspects of the EL so that scholars and netizens can be aware about them and pay attentions towards such an issue. Furthermore, it digs the role of self-regulation in dealing with the issue of the LCs. It also calls for the combined efforts to minimize negative effects of the LCs on the EL. The urgent need advocates for integrations of the newly developed words or phrases into the current arena of the EL. Moreover, the demand for dynamic transformations in the EL to meet current requirements of netizens who use textese for communications is still on route.

The Author

Rameshwar Thakur, MPhil in English, is an assistant lecturer of English in Gyankunj Shaikshik Pratisthan and ABM Banepa, an associate member of IATEFL, the senior-vice president of NELTA Bagmati and coordinator of NELTA Bagmati Journal. He worked as an editor of NELTA ELT Forum and has completed TESOL from ASU.

References:

- Achuff, R.R. (2017). Unregulated space: Text-messaging habits as a predictor of punctuation errors in the academic writing of college students (Doctoral Dissertation, Liberty University, US). Retrieved from <https://digitalcommons.liberty.edu/doctoral/1610/>
- Altakhaineh, A. R.M. & Al-Jallad, M. Z. (2018). The use of twitter and facebook in teaching mechanics of writing to Arabic-Speaking EFL learners. *International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning*, 13(9), 4-14.
- Anjaneyulu, G., & Gabriel, G. S. I. (2019). Phonological factors in short message service (SMS) of Telugu Native Speakers: A pilot study. *Language in India*, 19, 1-10.
- Bandura, A. (1991). Social cognitive theory of self-regulation. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50(2), 248-287.
- Bayucan, R. M. (2017). The influence of facebook in the English language proficiency. *International Journal of Technical Research and Applications*, 5(1), 13-24.

- Blattner, G., & Lomicka, L. (2012). Facebooking and the social generation: A new era of language learning. *Alsic*, 15(1), 1-36.
- Bosch, T. (2009). Using online social networking for teaching and learning: Facebook use at the University of Cape Town. *South African Journal for Communication Theory and Research*, 35(2), 185-200.
- 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), 1-9.
- Crystal, D. (2001). *Language and the Internet*. UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Espinosa, L. F. (2015). The Use of Facebook for Educational Purposes in EFL Classrooms. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 5(11), 2206-2211.
- Hamzah, M. S. G. B., Ghorbani, M. R. & Abdullah, S. K. B. (2009). The impact of electronic communication technology on written language. *US-China Education Review*, 6(11), 75-79.
- Haryono., Lelono, B., & Kholifah, A. N. (2018). Typography, Morphology, and Syntax Characteristics of Texting. *Lingua Cultura*, 12(2), 179-185.
- Joshi, O. P. (2017). The Consequences of Using the Facebook Messages in English Language. *Towards Excellence*, 9(2), 146-151.
- 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*, 4 (1), 156-163.
- Kardauskienė, V. (2008). Language of English chat room messages as a variety of electronic English (MA thesis, Vilnius Pedagogical University, Lithuania). Retrieved from https://www.vdu.lt/cris/bitstream/20.500.12259/116519/1/vilma_kardauske_md.pdf
- Kharbach, M. (2014). *The ultimate guide to the use of Facebook in education*. Retrieved from <http://www.educatorstechnology.com/2012/06/ultimate-guide-to-use-of-facebook-in.html> (accessed 20/06/2014).
- Kul, M. (2007). Phonology in Text Messages. *Poznań Studies in Contemporary Linguistics*, 43(2), 43–57.
- Lotherington, H. (2004). How to chat in English and Chinese: Emerging digital language conventions. *ReCALL*. 16(2), 308–329.
- Lyddy, F., Farina, F., Hanney, L. J. & O'Neill, N. K. (2014). An analysis of language in university students' text messages. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 19, 546–561.
- Manan, N., Alias, A., & Pandian, A. (2012). Utilizing a social networking website as an ESL pedagogical tool in a blended learning environment: An exploratory study. *International Journal of Social Sciences & Education*, 2(1), 1-9.
- Merchant, G. (2001). Teenagers in cyberspace: An investigation of language use and language change in internet chatrooms. *Journal of Research in Reading*, 24(3), 293–306.
- Nasr, A., Damnati, G., Guerraz, A. & Bechet, F. (2016, 13-15 September). Syntactic parsing of chat language in contact center Conversation Corpus. Annual SIGdial Meeting on Discourse and Dialogue. Proceedings of the SIGDIAL Conference, (pp. 175–184). Los Angeles, USA. Retrieved from <https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-01454768/document>

- Oseni, K. O., Dingley, K., & Hart, P. (2018). Instant messaging and social networks: The advantages in online research methodology. *International Journal of Information and Education Technology*, 8(1), 54-61.
- Randall, N. (2002). *Lingo online: A report on the language of the keyboard generation*. Ontario: University of Waterloo. Retrieved from <https://immagic.com/elibrary/archives/general/uwtrloca/w020611r.pdf>
- Ratheeswari, K. (2018). Information Communication Technology in Education. *Journal of Applied and Advanced Research*, 3(1), 45-47.
- Segerstad, Y. H. (2002). *Use and Adaptation of Written Language to the Conditions of Computer-Mediated Communication*. (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Gothenburg, Sweden). Retrieved from <http://nl.ijs.si/janes/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/segerstad02.pdf>.
- Sharma, Y.K., Dahiya, S. & Verma, C. (2016). Importance of ICT in Education. *International Journal of Advance Research in Science and Engineering*, 5(8), 662-669.
- Shih, R. (2013). Effect of using Facebook to assist English for Business Communication Course Instruction. *Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology*, 12(1), 52-59.
- Sirivedin, P., Soopunyo, W., Srisuantang, S. & Wongsothorn, A. (2018). Effects of Facebook usage on English learning behavior of Thai English teachers. *Kasetsart Journal of Social Sciences*, 39(2), 183-189.
- Slim, H. & Hafedh, M. (2020). Social media impact on language learning for specific purposes: A study in English for business administration. *The journal of Teaching English with Technology*, 19(1), 56-71.
- Stapa, S. H. & Shaari, A. H. (2012). Understanding online communicative language features in social networking environment. *Journal of Language Studies*, 12(3), 817-830.
- Tan, K., Ng, M., & Saw, K. (2010). Online activities and writing practices of urban Malaysian adolescents. *Science Direct System*, 38(1), 548-559.
- Van Dijk, CN., Van Witteloostuijn, M., Vasić, N., Avrutin, S. & Blom, E. (2016). The Influence of texting language on grammar and executive functions in Primary School Children. *PLoS ONE*, 11(3), 1-32.
- Wang, Chang-hwa & Chen, Cheng-ping (2013). Effects of Facebook Tutoring on Learning English as a Second Language. *IADIS International Conference e-Learning 2013*(pp 135-142). Taiwan: National Taiwan Normal University. Extracted from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED562299.pdf>
- Yunis, M. A. (2019, May 3-4). Language of Social Media: An Investigation of the Changes that Soft Media has imposed on Language Use. *9th International Research Conference on Education, language and literature* (pp.319-914). Georgia: Khazar University <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/336717574>
- Yunus, M. M. & Salehi, H. (2012). The effectiveness of facebook groups on teaching and improving writing: Students' perceptions. *International Journal of Education and Information Technologies*, 6(1), 87-96.