

ENGLISH INTERFERENCE IN BAHASA INDONESIA: A PHONOLOGY-TO-ORTHOGRAPHY CASE IN *INSTAGRAM* CAPTION

Laila Ulsi Qodriani

Universitas Teknokrat Indonesia
Indonesia

ani@teknokrat.ac.id

Abstract

In January 2019, We Are Social Institutes has claimed that 150 million of Indonesian people use social media actively and excessively. This also proves that computer-mediated-communication (CMC) become an alternative way to interact in nowadays society. Instagram, as one of social media users' favorite, shows a unique language phenomenon upon its '*caption*'. The language used by the users indicates the English interference toward Bahasa Indonesia has manifested from phonologically to orthographically since social media communication transforms the face-to-face interaction into written form. Based on the study in one of Instagram gossip account named *@Lambe_Turah*, it can be seen that the trend of inserting English influence in Instagram caption represented in some phonological rules, they are omission, assimilation, substitution, and epenthesis.

Keyword: English interference, orthography, phonological rules, instagram.

Introduction

Nowadays, social media plays an important role in our life. Access to this media has become one of the primary needs of everyone today. This can possibly happens because there is a bunch need of information, entertainment, education and access to knowledge from different parts of the world. Advancement in technology and information recently seems like presenting "the world in our hand". One of them is social media. The platform such as *Facebook, Twitter, Snap Chat, Pinterest, Path, Ask.FM, Tumblr, Twitter, Flickr, Instagram* and others has made it easy to us to find friends, make a contact, share photo or video, news, even it extend into business promotion. Here, social media defines as "networked information services designed to support in-depth social interaction, community formation, collaborative opportunities and collaborative work" [1:p.38] and social media represents "the technologies or applications that people use in developing and maintaining their social networking sites. This involves the posting of multimedia information (e.g., text, images, audio, video), location-based services (e.g., Foursquare), gaming (e.g. Farmville, Mafia

Wars)" [1]. The evolution of social media begins with how everyone stays connected in this 'virtual communities' where we can interconnect, inform, interact, and share at the same time.

In January 2019, We Are Social Institutes from <http://wearesocial.org>[2] has claimed that 150 million of Indonesian people use social media actively and excessively. This number show that the mode of communication and interaction gradually has moved. The changing of the behavior from offline to online, from face-to-face to mediated communication in fact interplay with the meaning of 'social' itself as the way in cognition, communicate and co-operation, so then, by doing interaction through media people still can maintain the form of social system within their society. Thus, the connection between the social media users in internet creates a kind of network forming an interconnection like society in the 'real world' complete with order, values, structure, up to social reality; this concept is explained as techno-social system [3:p.10]. However, the condition may be different from Karl Max theory about structural class in society but it could be more likely to the accidental

‘sameness’ of the desire and need of the community, and in the other hand it also impact to the way of interaction and communication through the media.

The massive of global growth of computer-mediated communication (CMC) from then to now on, in fact has led to changes on how language is used, diffusion of oral discourse features into written language [4]; [5]. The phenomenon of writing systems influences the linguistic features of CMC, as the characteristics of this interaction employ the use of written language than spoken. The tendency of language play in online language used becomes the trend to the practice of this media. Therefore, by seeing the chance of linguistics diversity occurrence, this paper tries to investigate on how phonological patterns and orthographic convention linked into the interference of English language toward the use of *Bahasa Indonesia* exposed in Instagram caption. Hence, this discussion can be used to explore on how English language has contacted and borrowed by Indonesia users of social media.

Writing System and Language Play in Internet

Numbers of studies stated that writing system employ convention which links the sounds of spoken language with written symbols. It goes hand in hand with the primary principle of the notion of phonological similarity to a sound in language. Over the last decade some researcher in English-based interest indicates that CMC interaction tends to display both speech like and written language features as well as in digital form [5]; [6]; [7]; [8]; [9]; [10]. The characteristics of it usually tend to be artful, playful and stylized performance [11]; [12]; [13]. The term “playful” defines as “a mood of frolicsomeness, lightheartedness, and wit” [14, p. 147]. At least, there are basically three components of playfulness; spontaneity, manifest joy, and a sense of humor [15] and many findings has stated that many genres of CMC in English perform a playful performance toward language [16]; [17]; [18]; [19]; [4]. Besides, the play with orthographical is evident in many other

languages; in Greeklish [20], Swedish [21]; [22], German [23] and French [24];.

The discussion of certain norms in orthography also can be seen from its micro level. One of the features of CMC discourse that has been done by some researchers is phonological representation of spoken features in online text, for example, the written use of English contractions such as “gonna” and “wanna”. Werry [4, p.48] states that “the conventions that are emerging are a direct reflection of the physical constraints on the medium combined with a desire to create a language that is as ‘speech-like’ as possible”. In accordance, research shows that accents and other aspects of language act--in-group and out-group identity--as markers [25]; [26]. In addition, Stevenson [27] suggests that phonological simulation in Internet Relay Chat (IRC), “is a result of social pressure to break conventional spelling rules and comply with IRC’s nonconformist, hacker image” rather than being motivated simply by individual desire to mirror spoken features. It is therefore important to dig further into sociolinguistic norms that users embrace or distance themselves from as they make decisions about writing online as in their ‘virtual community’. The freedom of the written expression in this media at the end can be stimulated as an ‘ad hoc improvisation’ then change into mode of communication when it meet the understandable between the users.

Sociolinguistics Perspective

The interconnection between social media users usually called as social network. Our perspective in the phenomenon of phonetic-to-orthographic case in Instagram focus on microlevel patterns of use in a variety of languages and language combinations in the social network of digital media. The interference of the use of English categorized merely as a lingua franca in non-English-dominant contexts. The term interference which focuses in this study is occurring in the situation where non-native level command of language influence by linguistics features of other language. The language used by the

users indicates the English interference toward *Bahasa Indonesia* has manifested from phonologically to orthographically. However, drawing on ethnography of communication conceptualization [28]; [29]; and sociolinguistics [30]; [31]; [32]; here Internet users seen as members of one or more speech communities who shared knowledge, values, and expectations for linguistic interaction through online connection using vary of languages. The community in this study is a virtual audience of social media users who interact with mediated information. The characteristics of the social media community are (i) individuals who share experiences in social relations, (ii) heterogeneous in nature, which can come from various class categories; (iii) spread in several target areas [3].

Methodology

This study involved one source of data: a corpus of Instagram caption of an account named @Lambe_Turah. This account categorized into non-individual where the content of information created by administrators. In managing their account @Lambe_Turah successfully create their own community (read: follower) up to more than 6,1 million users. The corpus was analyzed initially by counting instances of particular key symbols known to be used as phonemes (sounds used to distinguish meaning in a particular language) are shown as International Phonetic Alphabet (IPA) symbols between slashes (e.g., /s/), while written symbols (e.g., letters) are shown as follows: <s>, checking that each instance did indeed represent that sound then read through the *caption* to locate instances where sounds or words were represented in unexpected ways. The interaction between English and *Bahasa Indonesia* involves a combination of transcription of spoken language and

mediation from the properties in writing systems.

Finding and Discussion

In the present study, social media user employ English language in order to represent the sounds/phonemes, while in the visual/orthographic pattern, they conform to the orthographic conventions of *Bahasa Indonesia* by visually representing Indonesian writing system. The finding sees the phonetic or the orthographic transliteration of their spelling system is the way to integrate foreign words and to express the feeling which transform into their writing. Neography analysis used to analyze in data finding. The term “neography” is used here as shorthand to designate unconventional spelling. Neography is a commonly observed feature of CMC in English, including rebus writing (*b4for* “before”), Internet-specific acronyms (*lol*, “laughing out loud”), reduplication of letters (“sooooo”), exuberant repetitive punctuation (“wow!!!!!!”), and comics-like marking of words within asterisks (“*grins*”) Besides, it also include in some phonological transliteration like omission, assimilation, dissimilation, elision and epenthesis which transform into written form. According to previous research, motivations for use of neography include to save time and typing effort through abbreviation, to make the message more expressive, to exhibit the user’s ego, to play with language and communication, to contest standards, to express solidarity with the group, or to manifest adherence to a counterculture [7]; [8]; [10]; [33].

The language use in this corpus share some features with English CMC. The style used is generally informal; letters are almost exclusively in lowercase.

Table 1.
 Some data sample for phonology-to-orthography transliteration in @Lambe_Turah Instagram Caption

| English Form | Transliteration in Writing (Bahasa Indonesia) | Phonological Processes | Sound Change |
|---------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|--|
| (1) Update /ʌp'dert/ | <apdet>/ʌp'det/ | vocalization | /ei/ diphthong to /e/ |
| (2) Handphone /hændfəʊn/ | <hengpon>/heŋpon/ | velar assimilation, stopping | /æ/ to /e/ /nd/ to /ŋ/ /f/ to /p/ |
| (3) Please /pli:z/ | <peliss>/pɛlɪs/ | epenthesis | add an unstressed vowel between two consonant |
| (4) Download /daʊn'ləʊd/ | <donlot>/donlot/ | vocalization | /aʊ/ to /o/ |
| (5) Cash /kæʃ/ | <kes>/kes/ | depalatalization | /ʃ/ to /s/ |
| (6) Something /'sʌm.θɪŋ/ | <samting>/sʌmtɪŋ/ | stopping | /θ/ to /t/ |
| (7) Quote /kwot/ | <kuot>/kʊwot/ | gliding | add the glide sound |
| (8) Youtube /'ju:ˌtju:b/ | <yutup>/jʊtʊp/ | omission, labial assimilation | /b/ to /p/ |
| (9) Strong /strɒŋ/ | <seteronggg>/sɛtɛrɒŋ/ | epenthesis | Add an unstressed vowel between two consonant |
| (10) View /vju:/ | <piuw>/pijʊw/ | stopping, gliding | /v/ to /p/ add an unstressed vowel between two consonant |
| (11) Amazing /ə'meɪ.zɪŋ/ | <emejinggg>/emedʒɪŋ/ | prevocalic voicing | /z/ to /dʒ/ |
| (12) Gossip /'gɒsɪp/ | <hosyip>/hoʃɪp/ | glottal assimilation deaffrication | /g/ to /h/ /s/ to /ʃ/ |
| (13) Valentine /'væl.ən.tam/ | <palenten>/pʌlɛnten/ | stopping, vocalization | /v/ to /p/ /aɪ/ to /e/ |
| (14) Unboxing /ʌn'bɒksɪŋ/ | <anboksing>/ʌn'bɒksɪŋ/ | - | - |
| (15) I know /aɪ no/ | <ai no>/aɪ no/ | - | - |

It is interesting to see the variety of language used in social media as the art of language play in internet. Several expressions in Bahasa Indonesia written form apparently describe how English forms are represented in the visual modality of Indonesian users. As the social media user, @Lambe_Turah tries to combine two languages (English & Bahasa Indonesia) in delivering the message through Instagram caption and there can presumably be a certain intention in choosing the language which represents in its post. However, the motives along with the language used are not being part of this further analysis.

In this study it shows that vocalization exist in English diphthong sound replace to vowel sound; from /ei/ to /e/, from /aʊ/ to /o/, and /aɪ/ to /e/. By this finding we can see *Indonesian tend* to pronounce English

diphthongs in a lax manner but these may seem natural and inevitable to native speakers of Indonesian. Seeing the variety of Indonesian vernacular, the user wish to represent words with this sound by using letter that is in some sense close to this sound, therefore they change it into vowel sound. Indonesia is a multilingual country consists of some tribes with its unique language where Bahasa Indonesia placed as standard language, vernacular as well as the lingua franca. If we compare to the frequent used of sound in local language and Bahasa Indonesia, we can see that actually diphthong or gliding sounds is occasionally used. As a result, Indonesian people tend to produce the error when they learn English. This error probably can be caused by the linguistics interference of their own language (include

mother tongue) or can also be the orthographical form within English language which totally different from Indonesian sound system. So then, in expressing this gliding sound they seems adapt it to the closest sound in Bahasa Indonesia.

The substitution of fricative sound replaced with a stop has been mostly documented in this corpus. The change /n/ to /ŋ/, /θ/ to /t/, and /v/ to /p/ occur within the data sample. The word <handphone> to <hengpon>, <view> to <piuw> shown as the expressive use on the word play. For this context the user transform the language use orthographically into ‘speech-like’ form. This typical pattern of error usually used by the children when they try to imitate adult in their developing speech. In the other side, the absence of dental sound /θ/ in Indonesian sound system caused the change of sound /θ/ to /t/ and this also happen in velar assimilation where /æ/ sound substitute by /e/ in Bahasa Indonesia since there is no /æ/ sound in Bahasa Indonesia. In some number of finding, Indonesian ‘speech-like’ form actually arises in the practice of another online expression. Stopping sound from fricative /f/ replace with a stop /p/ sound, as a fronting activity. Hence it can be caused by some local language in Indonesia also have no /f/ sound in their sound system like in Sundanese and Lampungnese language, so this could probably be the interference of the English practice in Indonesia. Depalatzation of palatal fricative /j/ to alveolar fricative /s/ happens because the speech sound in Bahasa Indonesia has no /j/ sound at the final. Omission or deletion of /j/ in middle sound occur especially when it meet to the stop sound since it is hardly found in Bahasa Indonesia the use of sound /j/ in medial. Labial assimilation from /b/ to /p/ usually presence when another labial sound also use in the word, and prevocalic voicing in voiced sound /z/ to voiceless sound /dʒ/ is also part of the representations of English interference transformed into Indonesian speech formation in this writing system. By this analysis, we can predictably conclude that although the contact and borrowing of English language occur in this way of

communication, but the sense and meaning negotiating in this interaction still be more like Bahasa Indonesia.

Addition of sound in some cases also found in data sample analysis. The epenthesis of unstressed vowel between two consonant and gliding addition in the transliteration of Indonesian form are based on the vernacular language in spoken form which characterized by having vowel sound inside the syllable. Concerning the use of Bahasa Indonesia vis-à-vis English orthographically in social media, the presumption can be drawn as the affective expression of the user so the message is more expressive like in the expression of <seteronggg> from and <peliss> from <please> also the gliding movement in <kuot> and <piuw>. There is a widely accepted and fairly consistent spelling for this sound as the meaning making of the transfer message. Data show that mostly instagram users are young people, whose messages tend to be social in purpose and informal in style. So it is not surprising if nonstandard orthography becomes the choice of their language.

Beside some phonological processes, the literal translation of the English sound also found in the data. The word <unboxing> in English represents into <anboksing> and <I know> represents into <ai no> in Bahasa Indonesia in which is the literal form of the preceding word in Indonesian writing system. Both English phonetics spelling and Indonesian writing system has no differences. So we can say that the Indonesian form orthographically representing the actual sound system of English. The literal transcription form into orthography in this way seems to produce competing alternate representations of English written form as a lingua franca for the language variation and used in internet.

Conclusion

The presence of social media is one of the symbol of determination of technological and internet developments. This medium has transformed our real life into virtual activity. In accordance, English language is often used

as a lingua franca in public online contexts since the presence of technology in form of internet is accelerating the global use of English. The practice of spoken linguistics varieties which associated into orthographic systems manifested as the meaning negotiation. The wider context of interaction between language and technology in this Instagram caption constitutes an example of the ability to display linguistic creativity of global and local networks of communication. As Warschauer [34] explains, “while the Internet has strengthened the need for an international lingua franca—and that lingua franca is most frequently English—there are present other online dynamics that contribute to new forms of language pluralism”(p. 62). The notion to a distinctive function of hybrid form of writing and a culture-specific code spelling creativity and innovation also become the new phenomenon in online communication nowadays.

As the heterogeneous society, where the main components of social typology be more individuals that linked by networks, social media has successfully bring the ‘glocal’ community into virtual and diverse. This notion of course can be seen from the result of these studies where internet and social media now become the medium for its user to express their thought, opinion, idea and information. The existence of English language as global influence meets the local features. At the end, the borrowing and influence within both languages has contacted coincidentally. But, part from being free to construct themselves on social media, users as a community are free to choose what networks- include the flow of information in it - which they want to form.

References

- [1] Fuchs, C. *Social Media: a Critical Introduction*. Los Angeles: SAGE Publications, Ltd. p.38, 2014.
- [2] <http://wearesocial.org>
- [3] Nasrullah, Rulli. *Media Sosial: Perspektif Komunikasi, Budaya dan Siositeknologi*. Bandung: Simbiosis Rekatama Media. p.10, 2018.
- [4] Werry, C. Linguistic and interactional features of Internet Relay Chat. In S. C. Herring (Ed.), *Computer-mediated communication: Linguistic, social and cross-cultural perspectives*(pp. 47–63), 1996.
- [5] Yates, S. J. Oral and written linguistic aspects of computer conferencing. In S. C. Herring (Ed.), *Computer-mediated communication: Linguistic, social and cross-cultural perspectives*(pp. 9–46). Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 1996.
- [6] Baron, N. S. *Alphabet to email: How written English evolved and where it's heading*. London: Routledge. 2000.
- [7] Crystal, D. *Language and the Internet*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2001.
- [8] Danet, B. *Cyberpl@y: Communicating online*. Oxford: Berg. Companion website: <http://pluto.mscc.huji.ac.il/~msdanet/cyberpl@y/>. 2001.
- [9] Herring, S. C. (Ed.). *Computer-mediated communication: Linguistic, social and cross-cultural perspectives*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 1996.
- [10] Herring, S. C. Computer-mediated discourse. In D. Tannen, D. Schiffrin, & H. Hamilton (Eds.), *Handbook of discourse analysis*(pp. 612–634). Oxford: Blackwell. 2001.
- [11] Bauman, R. Performance. In R. Bauman (Ed.), *Folklore, cultural performances, and popular entertainments*(pp.41–49). New York: Oxford University Press. 1992.
- [12] Edwards, V., & Sienkewicz, T. J. *Oral cultures past and present: Rappin'and Homer*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell. 1990.
- [13] Finnegan, R. *Oral traditions and the verbal arts*. London: Routledge Chapman Hall. 1992.
- [14] Sutton-Smith, B. *The ambiguity of play*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. 1997.
- [15] Lieberman, J. N. *Playfulness: Its relation to imagination and creativity*. New York: Academic Press. 1977.

- [16] Baron, N. S. (with L. Squires, S. Tench, & M. Thompson). Tethered or mobile? Use of away messages in instant messaging by American college students. In R. Ling & P. Pedersen (Eds.), *Mobile communications: Renegotiation of the social sphere* (pp. 293–311). London: Springer. 2005.
- [17] Cherny, L. *Conversation and community: Chat in a virtual world*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications. 1999.
- [18] Danet, B., Ruedenberg, L., & Rosenbaum-Tamari, Y. “Hmmm...Where’s that smoke coming from?” Writing, play and performance on Internet Relay Chat. In F. Sudweeks, M. McLaughlin, & S. Rafaeli (Eds.), *Network and net play: Virtual groups on the Internet* (pp. 47–85). Cambridge, MA: AAAI/MIT Press. 1998).
- [19] Meyer, G., & Thomas, J. “The bawdy world of the byte bandit: A postmodernist interpretation of the computer underground”. In F. Schmallegger (Ed.), *Computers in criminal justice* (pp. 31–67). Bristol, IN: Wyndham Hall. 1990.
- [20] Georgakopoulou, A. “Self-presentation and interactional alliances in e-mail discourse: The style- and code-switches of Greek messages”. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 7, 141–164. 1997.
- [21] Hård af Segerstad, Y. “Swedish chat rooms. M/C: A Journal of Media and Culture, 3(4). Retrieved April 5, 2019, from <http://journal.media-culture.org.au/0008/swedish.php>. 2000.
- [22] Hård af Segerstad, Y. “Language use in Swedish mobile text messaging”. In R. Ling & P. Pedersen (Eds.), *Mobile communications: Renegotiation of the social sphere* (pp. 313–334). London: Springer. 2005.
- [23] Durscheid, C. “Spelling of electronic texts”. *Muttersprache*, 110(1), 52–62. 2000.
- [24] Anis, J. “Chat et usages graphiques”. In J. Anis (Ed.), *Internet, communication et langue française* (pp. 71–90). Paris: Hermes. 1999.
- [25] Abrams, D., & Hogg, M. A. “Language attitudes, frames of reference, and social identity: A Scottish dimension”. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 5, 202–213. 1987.
- [26] Cargile, A. C., & Giles, H. “Understanding language attitudes: Exploring listener affect and identity”. *Language and Communication*, 17, 195–217. 1997.
- [27] Stevenson, J. The language of Internet Relay Chat. Retrieved March 25, 2019, from <http://www.demo.inty.net/Units/Internet%20Relay%20Chat.htm>. 2000.
- [28] Bauman, R., & Sherzer, J. (Eds.). *Explorations in the ethnography of speaking* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1989.
- [29] Gumperz, J. The speech community. In A. Duranti (Ed.), *Linguistic anthropology: A reader* (pp. 43–52). Malden, MA: Blackwell. 2001.
- [30] Hymes, D. H. *Foundations of sociolinguistics*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. 1974.
- [31] Labov, W. The exact description of the speech community. Short-a in Philadelphia. In R. W. Fasold & D. Schiffrin (Eds.), *Language change and variation* (pp. 1–57). Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 1989.
- [32] Romaine, S. *Sociolinguistic variation in speech communities*. London: Arnold. 1982.
- [33] Raymond, E. S. *The new hackers’ dictionary* (3rd ed.). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. 1996.
- [34] Warschauer, M. “Languages.com: The Internet and linguistic pluralism”. In I. Snyder (Ed.), *Silicon literacies: Communication, innovation and education in the electronic age* pp. 62–74, 2002.