

A Morphological Study in Group Online Communication: Word - Formation Processes among College Students in a WhatsApp Group

I Putu Yoga Laksana^{1✉} and Gary P. Boyce²

¹ Department of Business Administration, Politeknik Negeri Bali

² Department of English Education, Windesheim University of Applied Sciences, Zwolle, The Netherlands

✉Jl. Kampus Bukit Jimbaran, Kuta Selatan, Badung, Bali-80364 Telp. +62 361 701981, Indonesia

✉yoga.laksana@pnb.ac.id

Article Info

Article History

Received:
April 2020
Accepted:
May 2020
Published:
July 2020

Keywords:

*Word-Formation
Processes, Online
Communication, WhatsApp
Group*

ABSTRACT

The emergence of group online communication provides various patterns in using language, especially in written text. In the process, teenagers and adult learners who frequently use online communication produce new vocabularies, spelling modifications, symbols, and emoticons in their online written communication. This study focusses on the word-formation processes used in written online communication especially during usage of a WhatsApp Group (WAG). The study aims at finding types of word-formation processes that emerged in WAG. Collected data was examined empirically to understand the characteristics of WAG users and their patterns in forming words. A descriptive method and data collected from 30 chats were gathered from WAG consisting of students attending Mahasaraswati University in Bali. The study analyzed 336 words and classified them into the appropriate word-formation processes (Yule, 2010). The study found three predominant types of processes used by WAG users: *borrowing*, *multiple processes*, *clipping*, and three other processes included *acronym*, *blending*, and *miscellaneous* (not stipulated in his theoretical backing (see table 6)), which were used less by WAG users. Changing words into shorter or simpler forms and *borrowing* words from other languages were some strategies used by the users of WAG to accelerate the production of text or chat. These appear to be the reasons why users mainly generated these three most types of word-formation processes in WAG. The investigation has presented a diversity of word-formation processes used in WAG. In turn, this diversity may cast light on the creativity of online group communication language usage.

INTRODUCTION

The use of a WhatsApp Group (WAG) as online communication has been rapidly increasing in recent times. This statement is also in line with Bouhnik & Deshen (2014) who stated that WhatsApp is a smartphone application used for instant messaging which has gained popularity. One of the features of the application is its ability to enhance communication within a group setting which is called a WhatsApp Group (WAG). WAG as an integral part of social media enables access and share information faster and more freely (Giyatmi, Wijayava, & Arumi (2017). It also enables people to communicate in a group chat which can be managed to support any form of organizational communication needs with this online communicative platform, e.g., friends, neighborhoods, schools, colleges, governmental institutions, etc. (Baruah, 2012).

In line with the above-mentioned statement, Montag et al. (2015) also state that WhatsApp represents one of the most important features within the usage of a smartphone, as it enables easy communication via text or voice messaging between two or more people. Bouhnik & Deshen (2014), also explain that there are other benefits through the usage of WAG. These are evident through low cost of the application combined with the ability to send an unlimited number of messages; the desire to feel a part of a trend since acquaintances have already adopted the application; the capacity to conduct an on-going conversation with many friends simultaneously; the knitting together of a community of friends or family, and a sense of privacy relative to other social networks. Thus, users conduct messages or chats quickly to engage in multiple communication with others during a group chat simultaneously and as a result, there are many expressions or words which emerged on WAG with unique forms, including new vocabularies which are inconspicuous and hard to be understood by others outside of the group.

Subsequently, the occurrence of these unique forms and new vocabularies are explained in the study of word-formation processes. According to Yule (2010), word-formation processes are practices that have applied to the language used in daily life. He states that at one time, usage was considered 'barbaric' misuse of the language. The term "barbaric misuses of the language (Yule, 2010, p. 53)" indicates that it is difficult to understand every new expression that appears in our daily conversation. Yule (2010) classifies the word-formation processes into 9 processes; *coinage, borrowing, compounding, blending, clipping, back-formation, conversion, acronyms, and derivation*. Additionally, Akmajian, et.al (2017) stated that new words can be created by the invention of new sound sequences and pairing this/these with meaning, by changing the meaning of an existing word without changing the pronunciation, or by modifying or augmenting the sound sequence of an existing word. To sum-up the above mentioned, the use of word-formation processes in our daily life affected by our intention creates new words or expressions by modifying the words themselves to produce a new way of expressing ideas or feelings.

David (2000) in Mustafa, Kandasamy & Yasin (2015) states that young adult users may use different word formation processes when communicating in online communication. The differences in the language used may lead to misinterpretation and confusion among users from different age groups who are not familiar with such language containing new vocabularies,

spelling modifications, symbols, and emoticons. It may also create a communication gap and some complications such as miscommunication and/or communication breakdown.

Prior studies that are related to this present study have shown only functional differences in the data collected and the type of word formation taken from the context of that prior investigation. Research conducted by Mustafa, Kandasamy & Yasin (2015) illustrates one of these instances. Their study showed that *abbreviation* was found to be the most common word formation process among the three features with 73% representing the result of the above mentioned. There are several reasons for this occurrence identified through an online interview of the participants. Almost all the participants provided similar reasons for employing these features. Mainly, the participants intended to save time, fill the communication gap or barrier among the users, and/or indicate group membership. Also, an eagerness was shown, exemplified through emotions and feelings while communicating during Facebook usage.

Furthermore, the study conducted by Luthfiyati, Kholiq & Zahroh (2017) focussed on the most common type of *derivation* of words that were used in the headlines of ten educational articles in the “Jakarta Post” website from October 2015 to April 2016. The result showed that the most common *derivation* words that were used in these articles were *noun derivations*.

Other word-formation processes’ studies in different media sectors show data collection from Blackberry Messenger, Oxford Online Dictionary, Ghost Fleet Novel, outdoor billboard advertisements, and slang words used by transsexuals. These were also contributing factors in the implementation of this study (Rahayu, 2014; Ratih & Gusdian, 2018; Setiawan, Deliani, & Dewi, 2019; Anggraeni, 2011; Sheryllia, 2019). These studies showed that *affixation*, *compounding*, and *coinage* to be the predominant type of word-formation processes which frequently emerged in the process of forming words.

Thus, this present study focusses on how the use of online group communication-especially during WAG usage conventionalized their written communication with all the challenges that occurred in using this application. The characteristics of the users are related to the patterns of the word’s formations and the existence of online communication that can be interrelated and produce a novelty to be shown in this morphological study. The practice of utilizing WAG remains applicable usage by many educators to share ideas and provide fast communication between teachers or lecturers and their students to prompt an impact on the language used. These phenomena attracted the researcher to conduct a study of word-formation processes in WAG as an online group communication system currently used by many people.

Moreover, the present study attempts to analyze different types of word-formation processes that are often used during WAG and evaluate the characteristics of the students related to the word-formation processes used by them. On the other hand, by doing this research, there is a willingness to show that WAG is often used during online group communication, and is shown to contribute to the creating of new words or expressions which are related to the development of morphological study correlated to the technology used.

METHODS

This research was designed in the descriptive method. Gall, Gall, & Borg (2007) state that descriptive research studies are designed to obtain information concerning the current status of facts. This research investigated the nature of creating new expressions, in this case, the specific situation which dealt with new expressions written in a WhatsApp group. Consequently, this study aims to analyze the varying types of word-formation processes used in this so-called online community group. This research is not testing whether word-formation processes are used during WhatsApp group communication, but it would rather analyze, classify, and describe the expressions into types of word-formation processes being used on it. For this process, the expressions were gathered from WAG user students in the English Education Department (EED) at Mahasaraswati University, Indonesia.

The data was taken from chats written by students who continually studied English up to and including the seventh semester at Mahasaraswati University. The number of students totaled 30 and the data source consisted of thirty chats, via mobile phones taken randomly, which were chosen by considering the highest number of new expressions that appeared in one chat. This was done during the period from September 2019 to January 2020. The researcher who actively collected the data and conducted the research was also a participant-observer. As stated by Kawulich (2005), participant observation is the process enabling researchers to learn about the activities of the people involved in their study under a natural setting. This, by observing and participating in set activities. In addition, the researcher was a member of the students' WAG which enabled him to observe and participate in the above mentioned undertakings.

The data must be new expressions that cannot be found in the Indonesian dictionary, such as *sdh* (*clipped* from *sudah*) translated meaning 'already'. The expression of *sdh* cannot be found in the Indonesian dictionary because the word *sudah* 'already' or the auxiliary verb 'has/have' is written *sudah* in the Indonesian dictionary, not in the expression form *sdh*. Additionally, the expression *sdh* in the WhatsApp group became data material. First, the chats were printed out, and then the new expressions were collected and those expressions that occurred as the data were read, highlighted, and numbered. The data which had the same expression was not included as data for a second time because there was only one new expression considered as data represented in one chat. There were data classifications and data analysis based on the theory used to analyze the expressions. All collected new expressions were taken from the thirty chats and were analyzed to identify the types of word-formation processes.

To reiterate, the classification is based on George Yule's theory of word-formation processes that consist of *compounding*, *derivation*, *conversion*, *coinage*, *borrowing*, *clipping*, *acronym*, *blending*, and *back-formation* (Yule, 2010). Based on that theory, data was analyzed and further classified based on the process of how it was produced, then the process/ processes of each expression were described concisely to show how it was formed. In the analysis, the words which had two or more types of word-formation processes were identified and named as multiple processes. Moreover, there was also a process that was not included in George Yule's model concerning the type of word-formation processes. Here it is identified as a 'miscellaneous' type. To recap, 'miscellaneous' is considered a special process in which certain numbers, symbols, and letters are used to show forms of new expressions.

The tables below were made to make the analysis easier to assess. To decide which was the most distinctive word-formation process frequently used, based on George Yule's theory, proportional measurements were applied. The frequency of word-formation processes was calculated by formulating ratios mentioned above (see Yule, 2010), then the percentage was calculated to know the word-formation processes which were mainly used in the WhatsApp group (See table 1).

In the following sections, results and discussions were presented related to the word-formation processes used in WAG. Based on comprehensive careful analysis, the research question was answered. It is assumed that *clipping* and *borrowing* types of word-formation processes would show larger numbers of expressions in the data. This hypothesis was assumed based on user inclination to use shorter and simpler expressions or words in WAG, resulting in user tendency to clip words into shorter and simpler forms. Furthermore, the participants in this study, who are predominantly Balinese students of EED at Mahasaraswati University reflect another reason why users tend to primarily borrow expressions/words from the Balinese language or English words considered as EFL secondary language skills. From this point of view, the researcher predicted these two types would show the prevalent varieties of word-formation processes.

RESULTS

The predominant used word-formation processes (*borrowing, multiple processes & clipping*) and other processes as mentioned above (*acronyms, blending & miscellaneous*) have been found and these classifications of word-formation processes are shown in Table 1.

Type of word-formation processes	Examples	Number of Data	Percentage
Borrowing	Web, in, aura	114	34.92%
Multiple processes	Brow, N, SD'ne	113	33.63%
Clipping	Bis, Ad, Uda	91	27.08%
Acronyms	SMP, SD, RPP	7	2.08%
Blending	Ultah, Aq, Qta	7	2.08%
Miscellaneous	X, +, M	4	1.19%
TOTAL		336	100%

Table 1: general findings of word-formation process usage.

Based on the table above, the principal type used by the users is *borrowing*. Here, proportionally represented by the highest percentage point. We can see borrowing has 34.92 % of all types of word-formation processes. In second place we find *multiple processes*. And here, we see this as 33.63% of WAG expressions. In third place, clipping took 27.08% of the representative type during word-formation processing. *Acronym* and *blending* appear in fourth and fifth place consecutively, here representing 2.08 % of the entire word-formation processing. The last type is miscellaneous and it took the minimal proportion, represented here by 1.19 %.

To discuss the findings above, the group was divided into 6 sections. These six types of word-formation processes that appear in the thirty WAG chats are discussed below (*borrowing, blending, clipping, acronyms, derivation, miscellaneous and multiple processes*).

Borrowing

Borrowing is the appropriation and usage of *loan-words* from other languages without translation from the donor language (Yule, 2010). Throughout its history, the English language has adopted a vast number of *loan-words* from other languages, for example; *alcohol* (Arabic), *dope* (Dutch), and many more. Loan-translation or *calque* (Tahaineh, 2012), is a particular type of borrowing related to word or phrase borrowed from other languages through word-for-word translation. In this process, there is a direct translation of the elements into the borrowed language.

No	Origin of Borrowing	Example of words in Data	Lexical meaning	Number of expressions	Percentage in data
1	English Language	Keep, smiling, friends, dream, have, etc	Keep, smiling, friends, dream, have, etc	85	75.30 %
2	Balinese Dialect	Timpal, suksma, jegeg, mangkin, suud, etc	friend, thank you, beautiful, now, finish, etc	23	20.18 %
3	Jakarta Dialect	Loe, gue, kasi & diem	You, I, give & be quiet	4	3.50 %
4	Javanese Dialect	Blibet & tak	Complicated & will	2	1.02 %
Total				114	100 %

Table 2: The Borrowing Type

One hundred and fourteen expressions of borrowing were found, 85 are borrowed from English, 23 are borrowed from the Balinese language, 4 are borrowed from colloquial Jakarta dialect, and 2 are borrowed from the Javanese language. The users of WAG mainly borrowed English words in their written communication because as students they have been studying English and ultimately will attain the TOEFL (Test of English as a Foreign Language) examination to prove their level of skill. The use of the Balinese language in WAG also dominates the users in using written communication. The fact that most users mainly come from Bali may affect their oral and written language skills. Based on observation, students often use the Balinese language to strengthen solidarity amongst themselves and associate this affiliation with each other to affect written communication. Furthermore, as seen in the data, users also borrowed several words from the colloquial Jakarta dialect and Javanese language. These language varieties were used in WAG because some students come from Java and Jakarta. Even though these students remain or stay in Bali, the use of their original dialect was exposed while they communicated through WAG and they could not avoid usage of this vernacular. Cumulatively, such issues have a direct effect on WAG.

Blending

Blending is a combination of two or more separate parts from other words. The occurrence could also happen at the morpheme level, used to form or produce a single new word or term. In short, *blending* is accomplished by taking only the beginning of one word and joining it to the end of another word or by combining two or more letters into a single letter. This is in line with

Giyatmi, Wijayava, & Arumi (2017), who state that *blending* is one way to create a new lexeme involving the process of mixing or *blending* of two shortened forms.

No	Examples Expressions from data	Intended Expressions	Meaning in English
1	Ultah	Ulang Tahun	Birthday
2	Aq	Aku	Me, I
3	Qta	Kita	We, Us
4	Ato	Atau	Or
5	Kw	Kau	You
6	Dy	Dia	He/she
7	Mw	Mau	Want
	TOTAL		7

Table 3: The Blending Type

There are 7 expressions found which can be classified into a *blending* process. The users blend the words to produce the simpler or the shorter form of expression to communicate with other members in the WhatsApp group. This characteristic drove users to simplify the use of more words thereby reducing the number of words used in WAG by executing the *blending* process.

Let us consider the process of *blending* that occurred with some of the above expressions. The words *ulang tahun* (birthday) are blended into the word *ultah*. The process of *blending* is shown here through the first part of the word *ulang* being blended with the first part of the word *tahun* to form *Ultah*. Another example would be, the word *kita* 'we' being *blended* into the word *qta*. The process of *blending* occurs when the letters 'k' 'i' to form 'q' of *qta*, which would be pronounced as *kita* = /qta/. In this process, we can see that the users use this word-formation type to reduce the usage of keying words or letters in WAG.

Clipping

The notion of *Clipping* is theorized as a word consisting of one or more syllables which are reduced to a shortened form, often in casual speech (Yule, 2010). The *clipping* process encompasses various forms to establish new expressions. Below, one can see an explanation of the most frequent forms of *clipping* generally encountered. These types are exemplified here: premier, middle, and final. Some expressions are clipped only at the end syllable, as shown in the word *kuliah* = study (English translation) which is used specifically at a higher educational level. Here, for instance, *kul* is clipped. *Clipping* of *konsul* from *konsultasi* 'consultation' is also another example. For clarity, one can also see *clipping* in the following. We see that clipping occurs with the first syllable. Here *ma* is taken from *sama* 'with' and *bis* from *habis* translated as 'finish' or 'after' to show a clear example of the premier *clipping* process. Additionally, middle *clipping* which is not as frequent as the other types of word-formation is seen to involve the omission of the middle part of expressions. In the table below, we encounter the six types of *clipping* theorized by Yule.

No	Type of Clipping	Example of words in Data	Intended Meaning	Lexical meaning	Number of expressions	Percentage in data
1	CL 01: Clipping of the first syllable/s	Tu Dah Ni (etc)	Itu Sudah Ini (etc)	That Already This (etc)	11	12.09 %
2	CL 02: Clipping of the end syllable/s	Ad Kul Bimb (etc)	Ada Kuliah Bimbingan (etc)	Exist, be College Consultation (etc)	6	6.60 %
3	CL 03: Clipping the first syllable and the end syllable	Uda Aj	Sudah Saja	Already Just	2	2.20 %
4	CL 04: Clipping the middle part of the word	Tmpat Bru Wlaupn (etc)	Tempat Baru Walaupun (etc)	Place New Although (etc)	32	35.16 %
5	CL 05: Omitting the middle of the syllable and the vowel representation	Obsvasi Hitg Lsg (etc)	Observasi Hitung Langsung (etc)	Observe Count Direct (etc)	6	2.73 %
6	CL 06: Omitting the vowel representation	Sktr Kls Klh (etc)	Sekitar Kelas Kuliah (etc)	Around Class College (etc)	34	41.22 %
Total					91	100 %

Table 4: The Clipping Type

The most popular type of *clipping* shown in the table above is the omission of the vowel shown in number 6. Here, it occurred in 34 expressions during the WhatsApp group discourse. The second type took 32 examples from all *clipping* expressions which occurred through middle *clipping* omission. To follow in the order of frequency, we see that the third type of *clipping* is a clipping of the first syllable or syllables. At this point, we see representation through 11 expressions in total. There were two types of *clipping*, which took 6 expressions for each type. As stated above, *clipping* off the end syllable/s and omission of the middle syllable and vowel of the word represented are projected. The last type of *clipping* was clipping the first and the end syllable/s.

The type of *clipping* in omitting the vowels of the words became the most typically used by subjects in forming expressions. This can be seen through user effort to minimize typing input of words by focussing only on the consonants. And could explain why users tend to avoid the use of vowels in making words simpler or shorter. Similarly, the user also tended to use the type of *clipping*, omitting the middle part of the words and omitting the first syllable of the words, as mentioned above. This trend showed a tendency for users to express these alterations fluently as a part of normal speech. To emphasize, users tried to shorten and simplify the words by omitting the existing vowels or tried to omit the first, last, and both first and last syllable of the words. Key to note is user preference to form new expressions that could be pronounced authentically as if already part of original or first language practice. This process of *clipping* would be the leading choice for users in producing new expressions in online written communication.

Acronym

The *acronym* is the process in which new words are formed from the initial letters or components from a set of other words. Izura & Playfoot (2011) state that *acronyms* represent a significant and idiosyncratic part of our everyday vocabulary. The demands of a highly technical society have dramatically increased the proportion of *acronyms* encountered in everyday language.

No	Examples Expressions from data	Intended Expressions	Meaning in English
1	SPP	Subsidi Pembayaran Pembangunan	School tax
2	TK	Taman Kanak-kanak	Kindergarten
3	S	Sakit	Sick
4	SMP	Sekolah Menengah Pertama	Junior High School
5	SD	Sekolah Dasar	Elementary School
6	RPP	Rencana Pelaksanaan Pembelajaran	Lesson Plan
7	DR	Di Ruang	At Chamber
	TOTAL		7

Table 5: The Acronym Type

As suggested earlier, users often make words simpler, suggesting that users of online communication frequently abbreviate some words which are already known by the receiver. At this juncture, we see in the table above that there are 7 expressions identified as the type *acronym*. Thangaraj & Maniam (2015) explain that one of the characteristics of young learners in using written communication is using colloquial abbreviations and trendy acronyms. Based on this statement, trendy acronyms imply that students tend to use this type of word formation to show their level of prestige in using language. Moreover, students regularly used the *acronym* to shorten the form of words in their processing and writing of simpler and faster versions. They also developed an efficient way of having multiple chats with others through this process. This is in line with Ross (2006) in Mustafa, Kandasamy & Yasin (2015), who states that people are becoming more obsessed with the value of time. Also, students' tendency to use trendy acronym and an obsession regarding time as an invaluable short-coming during communication, became the main reasons for creating and using an *acronym* in their written communication during WAG usage.

Miscellaneous

According to George Yule's theory in his book *Study of Language* (2010), another process of new word-formation besides the above-mentioned processes is forming new expressions by using certain numbers, symbols, and letters to represent words, which are pronounced respectively.

No	Examples Expressions from data	Intended Expressions	Meaning in English
1	X	Sekali	Very, so
2	Q	Aku	I
3	M	Sama	with
4	+	Tambah	Plus
TOTAL			4

Table 6: The Miscellaneous Type

A *miscellaneous* type is another representation of word-formation found in WAG or other online social-media communication applications. To make the expressions simpler, the user of WAG creates and uses a new way of forming new text expressions. It is by using certain numbers and letters to exemplify expressions that sound similar that users detail their intended meaning. The data here shows four expressions that are included in this type. As stated previously, it is customary for students while writing in WAG communication to shorten the form of the words and use some symbols to express words into their simplest forms. This is the reason for using *miscellaneous* in this present study. Students tended to use symbols and letters to represent words that they were replacing.

As shown here, the use of 'X' to represent *sekali* 'once' and the (+) symbol to represent *tambah* 'addition' or 'extra' in the Indonesian language are examples of this *miscellaneous* type. This reveals students' intention to use the shortest form to represent their intended expression or proposed meaning.

Multiple Processes

George Yule (2010), justifies the possibility of tracing the operation of more than one process at work in the creation of a particular word to be a form of word-formation processing.

No	Example of Expressions in Data	Intended Expressions	Meaning in English	Type of Multiple Processes	Number of Expressions in Data	Percentage in Data
1	Met Gen Dmgi Alwys Ur (etc)	Selamat (selamat) Dogen (hanya) Dumogi (semoga) Always (Selalu) Your (Possessive adjective)/(kata ganti orang ketiga)	Safe, Good Just Hope Always Your	Multiple Processes (Borrowing and Clipping)	39	34.51 %
2	Mskn Ttplah	Masukkan Tetaplah	Insert Keep	Multiple Processes	31	27.43 %

	Trsnyum Trsmprn Mmbuat (etc)	Tersenyum Tersimpan Membuat	Smiling Saved Make	(Derivation and clipping)		
8	TEFL BTW FB Hdd PTG (etc)	Teaching English as a Foreign Language By the Way Facebook Hard disk Pray to God	Teaching English as a Foreign Language By the Way Facebook Hard disk Pray to God	Multiple Processes (Borrowing and Acronym)	13	11.50 %
3	Brow Nite Hawaya Bluetuth Coz (etc)	Brother Night How are you? (Apa kabar) Bluetooth Cause	Brother Night How are you? Bluetooth Cause	Multiple Processes (Borrowing and Blending)	9	7.96 %
4	N B4 CU U R (etc)	And Before (sebelum) See You (Sampai nant) You Are	And Before See you You Are	Multiple Processes (Borrowing and Miscellaneous)	8	7.08 %
6	GBU TQ XP C	God Bless You Thank You Experience See	God Bless You Thank You Experience See	Multiple Processes (Borrowing, Acronym, and Miscellaneous)	4	3.54 %
7	Tw Klo Pke Lse	Tahu Kalau Pakai Selesai	Know If Use Finish	Multiple Processes (Clipping and Blending)	4	3.54 %
11	Centreny Syllbsny	Centrenya Syllabusnya	That Centre That Syllabus	Multiple Processes (Borrowing, Derivation, and Clipping)	2	1.8 %
5	SD'ne	Sekolah Dasarnya	The elementary school	Multiple Processes (Derivation, Acronym, and Borrowing)	1	0.88 %
9	U/	Untuk	For	Multiple Processes (Acronym and Miscellaneous)	1	0.88 %
10	Thx	Thanks	Thanks	Multiple Processes (Borrowing, Clipping and Blending)	1	0.88 %

Table 7: Multiple Processes

From the table above, 11 multiple processes occurred in WAG. Seven multiple processes combined 2 types of word-formation processes and 4 multiple processes combined with 3 types of word-formation processes. This shows the significant character of users when forming words in written communication practice. Theorized by Ross, 2006 as cited in Mustafa, Kandasamy & Yasin, 2015, we see that because of our hectic and obsessive nature due to time/lifestyle restraints, we are more likely to involve shortened forms in a reduction of spelling. WAG users follow this directive and show no difference in this approach. This is why we see the domination of the *clipping* and *borrowing* form in the 11 multiple processes which occur in WAG.

In line with that, the frequency of *multiple processes* that occurred the most was the combination of *borrowing* and *clipping*. The expressions *met*, *gen*, and *ur* were the result of the combination between *borrowing* and *clipping*. To make this clear, the first process in forming these expressions was borrowing from other languages or dialects. Examples of this are *selamet*, translated as 'safe' (borrowed from Javanese), *dogen* 'only' (borrowed from Balinese), and *your* (borrowed from English) which are further clipped by omitting some letters of the words to finally produce three new words *met*, *gen*, and *ur*. Additionally, we also see three combinations of word-formation processes, through the usage of expressions like *GBU* (God Bless You), *TQ* (Thank you), *XP* (experience), and *C* (see- as in 'I see you'). These expressions formed by the process of borrowing happen utilizing the *acronym* and were influenced by the process of *miscellaneous*, becoming *GBU*, *TQ*, *XP*, and *C*. The impact of *miscellaneous* on this process created new expressions that were similar to encryptions or codings. In conclusion, *multiple processes* that occur in WAG are the result of the creativity and a tendency for users to form newer and shorter forms of words. Moreover, the users used online communication as a reservoir to generate more words or expressions which could later lead to coded language. The researcher feels that this is an ultimate generational adaptation found amongst students and is directly linked to technology improvement, especially in this digital communication platform.

DISCUSSION

After analyzing the word-formation processes in WAG, generally, it was found that the predominant type of word-formation method used was *borrowing*. These results showed a contrary result to previous studies. The use of this type of word-formation process used by students was due to the impact of their daily communication and the course major that they study. Moreover, the students who are predominantly from Bali and several students from Java tended to alter how they used online written communication, as mentioned above. It is the view of the researcher that this is due to mother-tongue or first language (L1) influence in their daily communication. Supplementary to this, their course study in English Education also played some role in them borrowing words from English, which in turn was used in their written communication. In line with this, Karūrū (2013) states that prestige and foreign social media greatly influence students to use English in their daily communication, especially during their written communication.

Multiple processes were the second predominant type of word-formation processes that were used by users of this application. The impact of technology and also the result of their creativity drove them to use modifications in writing. This means that participants tried to create

words/expressions that they saw as 'stylish' and modern, by generating short, quick to input patterns to form the words by a combination of two or three processes. As highlighted by Liu & Liu 's (2014) word-formation processing research, which states that with the fast developing changes found in today's technology, adaptations to language, change quickly and if an online communication user fails to follow these new developments, he/ she will undoubtedly face issues in online communication with others, thereby finding it difficult to understand online information with cohorts and friends. We can assume then, that characteristics of online communication brought about an increased expansion of new expressions or words as the result of user creativity in modifying these words or expressions.

The above-mentioned benefits of WAG which can help users in sending and receiving messaging were the reasons why students used this application regularly in online communication. The eagerness of students to create meaning in typing messages during WAG may be one of the reasons why users used *clipping* more often in written communication as a method of strategy through simplification. In line with Ross (2006) in Mustafa, Kandasamy & Yasin (2015), people are becoming more obsessed with 'time'. They use various short forms and reduction of spelling to reduce outcomes due to a hectic and hurried lifestyle (Takayoshi, 2015). To clarify, Rose (2006) in Mustafa, Kandasamy & Yasin (2015) also state that speedy communication allows less time for careful, organized thought. Thangaraj & Maniam (2015) also explain that the convention for young learners in using written communication is to use the most informal skill-set from all four language macro skills (reading, listening, writing, and speaking). We see this, for example in writing skills where an informal manner using various contractions, loose sentence structure, colloquial abbreviations, trendy acronyms, and emoticons are used. In short, reducing letters or changing the words into shorter or simpler words are some strategies used by the users of WAG to accelerate the production of text or chat in group online communication applications as expressed in a WhatsApp group.

The next types of word-formation processes that occurred in the thirty chats were an *acronym*, *blending*, and *miscellaneous* types. The use of these three categories in word-formation processes was less used than the other three predominant types of word-formation processes, which were discussed earlier. If combined *Acronym, blending and miscellaneous* only attributed 5.35% of occurrence from the total 100%. Even though these three types only accounted for a small number of expressions, the fact that the users used these types needs to be taken into account. This reflects in students also showing an eagerness to abbreviate words into new expressions to make new words shorter and simpler forms. The same occurred when the students formed words by using *blending* and *miscellaneous*. They executed *blending* because the existence of longer words is transcribed into a single word or expression, for example, *Ulang Tahun* meaning 'birthday' becomes *Ultah*. Students also used certain numbers, symbols, and letters to represent words, which are phonologically pronounced alike comparable to the original. The reasons for this phenomenon type is categorized above as *miscellaneous*.

To emphasize, the characteristics of the students who wanted to use shorter forms to accelerate the production of words or expressions in online communication (Mustafa, Kandasamy & Yasin, 2015) was the main reason why students used these three types of word-formation processes.

CONCLUSION

The result of this study reflects how technology, especially during online-based messaging could affect language usage in written online communication. New forms of words or expressions emerged as a result of this practice during WAG sharing. This study also showed that online group communication affected particular sets of user-friendly characteristics to produce words or expressions in chats.

The analysis of 336 words or expressions in thirty chats appeared during WAG, resulted in three predominant types of word-formation processes: *borrowing*, *multiple processes*, and *clipping*. Out of 336 words, 318 words or expressions, representing 94.64 % of all data collected is an indication of the word-formation process. There was a general tendency to combine two and three types of word formation in producing new expressions or words. In turn, this general tendency produced a new type of word formation process termed *multiple processes*.

Acronym, *blending*, and *miscellaneous* word-formation types were found to be less commonly used. These three word-formation types only contributed to a negligible amount of expressions, representing only a combined percentage of 5.35% from the total number of word-formation processes identified in this study. This interpretation of the material means that students in this study also showed an eagerness to abbreviate (some) words into new expressions by shortening and/or simplifying them. This also happened when students formed words through *blending* and *miscellaneous* word-formation. Students used *blending* to make longer words convert to single words or expressions to meet their needs. An example of this is *Ulang tahun* which became *Utah*. Students also used certain numbers, symbols, and letters to represent words, which are phonetically pronounced similar to the original corresponding to *miscellaneous* types. The above results indicated the general tendency for the students to use simpler, shorter, and more unique forms of words or expressions in their WAG conversations.

This study is expected to be used as a reference for subsequent studies in word-formation processing, especially the word-formation processes that are used during WAG or other online group communication formats. It invites discourse of analysis from other researchers and can be used as a comparative study among word-formation processes that emerged in other fields, additionally to further broaden the field. The expectation is that this study can be continued by other researchers and more deeply developed.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to thank the Centre for Research and Community Services of the Bali State Polytechnic for their support in providing journals for this article. Moreover, the author would like to thank the students from the English Education Department at Mahasaraswati University, Indonesia for their kind support in allowing the gathering of data for this study.

REFERENCES

Akmajian, A., et. al. (2017). *Linguistics: an Introduction to Language and Communication. (seventh edition)*. Cambridge: Massachusetts.

- Anggraeni, D. (2011). Word Formation Process in Outdoor Advertisement (a case study of billboard installed in Semarang). *Diponegoro University, Institutional Repository (UNDIP-IR)*. Retrieved from: http://eprints.undip.ac.id/33894/1/Desita_Anggraeni-A2B007034.pdf
- Baruah, T.D. (2012). Effectiveness of Social Media as a Tool of Communication and Its Potential for Technology-enabled Connections: A Micro-Level Study. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications*, 2 (5), 1-10. ISSN 2250-3153: http://www.ijsrp.org/research_paper_may2012/ijsrp-may-2012-24.pdf
- Bouhnik, D., & Deshen, M. (2014). WhatsApp goes to school: Mobile instant messaging between teachers and students. *Journal of Information Technology Education: Research*, 13, 217-231. Retrieved from: <http://www.jite.org/documents/Vol13/JITEv13ResearchP217-231Bouhnik0601.pdf>
- Gall, M.D., Gall, J.P., & Borg, W.R. (2007). *Educational research: An introduction* (8th ed.). Boston: Pearson.
- Giyatmi., Wijayava, R., & Arumi, S. (2017). English Blends Found in Social Media. *Jurnal Arbitrer – 4* (2), 65 – 75. <https://doi.org/10.25077/ar.4.2.65-75.2017>
- Izura, C., & Playfoot, D. (2011). A normative study of acronyms and acronym naming. *Behavior Research Methods* 44(3): 862-889. [10.3758/s13428-011-0175-8](https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-011-0175-8)
- Karūrū, D.W. (2015). Borrowing and Communication in Language: The Impact of Morphological Adaptation Processes. *International Journal of Education and Research*, 1 (9), 1-14. ISSN: 2201-6740. Retrieved from: <https://www.ijern.com/journal/September-2013/33.pdf>
- Kawulich, Barbara B. (2005). Participant Observation as a Data Collection Method [81 paragraphs]. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 6(2), Art. 43, <http://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:0114-fqs0502430>
- Liu, W & Liu, W. (2014). Analysis on the Word-formation of English Netspeak Neologism. *Journal of Arts & Humanities* 3(12), 22-30. <http://dx.doi.org/10.18533/journal.v3i12.624>
- Luthfiyati, D., Kholiq, A., & Ni'matus Zahroh, I. (2017). The Analysis of Word Formation Processes in the Jakarta Post Website. *Journal of Linguistics, English Education and Art (LEEAA)* 1(1), 30 – 36. <https://doi.org/10.31539/leea.v1i1.30>
- Montag, C., et.al. (2015). Smartphone Usage in the 21st Century: Who is Active on WhatsApp?. *BMC Res Notes* 8, 31. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13104-015-1280-z>
- Mustafa, S.Z.B, Kandasamy, M., & Yasin, M.S.H. (2015). An Analysis of Word Formation Process in Everyday Communication on Facebook. *International Journal of Education and Research* 3 (6), 261 – 274. Retrieved from: <https://www.ijern.com/journal/2015/June-2015/21.pdf>
- Rahayu, P. (2014). Word formation Processes of the Terms used by Clothes Online Shops in Blackberry Messenger. *Jurnal Ilmiah Mahasiswa FIB* 3(3). Retrieved from: <http://jimbastra.fib.studentjournal.uib.ac.id/index.php/jimbastra.fib/article/view/264>
- Ratih, E., & Gusdian, R.I. (2018). Word Formation Processes in English New Words of Oxford English Dictionary (OED) online. *CELTIC: A Journal of Culture, English Language Teaching, Literature & Linguistics* 5(2), 24 – 35. <https://doi.org/10.22219/celtic.v5i2.7617>
- Setiawan, B., Deliani, S., & Dewi, R.S. (2019). An Analysis of Word Formation Process in the Novel Ghost Fleet in Morphological Perspective. *Prosiding Seminar Nasional & Expo II Hasil Penelitian dan Pengabdian Masyarakat* 2(2), 1232 – 1235. Retrieved from: <https://www.e-prosiding.umnaw.ac.id/index.php/penelitian/article/view/347>
- Sheryllia, E. (2019). Word Formation in Slang Word Meanings in Caption On@Lambe_Turah Instagram Account. *Digital Library of UIN Sunan Ampel*. Retrieved from <http://digilib.uinsby.ac.id/29317/2/Elvina%20Sheryllia%20-%20A93214120.pdf>
- Tahaineh, Y. (2012). The Awareness of the English Word-formation Mechanisms is a Necessity to Make an Autonomous L2 Learner in EFL Context. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 3 (6), 1105-1113. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4304/jltr.3.6.1105-1113>
- Takayoshi, P. (2015). Short form writing: Studying Process in the Context of Contemporary Composing Technologies. *Computers and Composition* 37(2015), 1–13. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.compcom.2015.04.006>
- Thangaraj, S., & Maniam, M. (2015). The Influence of Netspeak on Students' Writing. *Journal of Education and Learning*, 9(1), 45-52. [10.11591/edulearn.v9i1.963](https://doi.org/10.11591/edulearn.v9i1.963)
- Yule, G. (2010). *The Study of Language*, 4th ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.