

## Texting Slang: Misinterpretation in Communication

Suriyati Ujang, Norhidayah Md Yusof and Hanani Mohamed Hamdan

Received: 20 Dec 2017. Accepted: 19 Apr 2018/Published online: 30 May 2018  
© CPLT 2018

### ABSTRACT

*Texting slang is defined as a language that is commonly used in messaging as a medium of an interaction among people. However, this language does not include emoticons. The examples of texting slang are LOL, ROFL, TTYL, etc. Texting slang is highly recognized as a language that is used by users on social media. However, miscommunication and misunderstanding are bounded to be happened to those who are new to the culture or certain groups. The objectives for this research are to check the proportion of users' current knowledge in texting slang and to identify the relationship between knowledge of texting slang and misinterpretation. The study was conducted in a public university in the east coast of Malaysia, to see if texting slang is widely used among students and staff in this institution. During the survey, questionnaire was distributed in the campus in order to collect the data. The data collected using stratified sampling with the total of 335 respondents out of 2765 total population. Based on the findings, in terms of the users' knowledge in texting slang, the results for the interpretation of the abbreviations and acronyms show that not all respondents know what the actual meaning of each abbreviation and acronym that were used. Next, it can be seen that there is a significant relationship between the knowledge of texting slang creates the misinterpretation of the text content among users. Thus, further research in terms of the users' knowledge and misinterpretation regarding texting slang and how these two elements affect in users' communication whether written and spoken, could be carried out in order to understand texting slang better and thoroughly.*

**Keywords:** texting slang; abbreviation; acronyms; understanding; misinterpretation

---

Suriyati Ujang (✉):  
Faculty of Computer and Mathematical Sciences  
UiTM Pahang Branch, Raub Campus, MALAYSIA  
E-mail: [suriyatiujang@pahang.uitm.edu.my](mailto:suriyatiujang@pahang.uitm.edu.my)

Norhidayah MdYusof. Hanani Mohamed Hamdan  
Academy of Language Studies  
UiTM Pahang Branch, Raub Campus, MALAYSIA  
E-mail: [norhidayahmy@pahang.uitm.edu.my](mailto:norhidayahmy@pahang.uitm.edu.my)  
Hanani Mohamed Hamdan  
E-mail: [hananihamdan@pahang.uitm.edu.my](mailto:hananihamdan@pahang.uitm.edu.my)

## INTRODUCTION

Language is important as it is one of the medium of communication among people. People use language to express themselves especially their communicative needs (Widyanto, 2013). As language is a very broad topic, thus, it has many other elements. One of these elements is slang. Slang is where an expression, word of special use of language often in the usage of particular group mainly found in an informal situation instead of a formal one (Swan, 2009). In addition, according to Zhou and Fan (2013), slang is highly informal and often used in colloquial speech. Slang is somehow used by everyone, but nobody can define it precisely. There are three aspects in describing about slang which are; it is more playful, metaphorical and has shorter live than the ordinary language (Fromkin, Rodman and Hymms (2011). In addition, according to Fromkin, Rodman and Hymms (2011), they also mentioned that slang exists in most language and varies from region to region and also between past and present.

Eventually, slang starts from giving old word to new meaning (Fromkin & et al.2011) For instance the word 'lit' which is the past tense of 'light'. The word 'lit' gives some different meanings such as it means a subject is being dope, cool or intoxicated where he or she lights up like a bulb. Surprisingly, nowadays, it can be seen that there are many situations where ordinary words or even numbers become slang at certain places and times.

As the technology is evolving, so does the slang (Dixon, 2011). A new term called texting slang has emerged since the creation of messages. Texting slang is defined as a language that is commonly used in messaging as a medium of an interaction among people. In addition, according to Baron (2008), the use of texting slang reveals creative use of letters, punctuation and numbers. Thus, it can be seen that different people have their own unique style of texting styles which based on its communicative function. However, this language does not include emoticons. They tend to use abbreviation and acronym in their texts, tweets or their chats. One of the benefits of texting slang is the users find it easier and faster way to communicating compared to enunciating word by word.

Although, texting slang is an emerging slang but eventually it had already existed around the 1980s when people are using telegraph. The operators are the only one that can decipher the meaning for each abbreviation that had been created (Brasier, 2015). They had created the abbreviations and slang terms to keep it short, thus, lower the price. This actually have the same reason on why people shorten their text messages (SMS) at the very first place. Nowadays, the reasons why people choose to use slang are because of time, trend and secrecy. For example, ones can save their money and time especially when they are out of credit and cannot make call. Thus, by using texting slang, it can save their money and solve their problems ( Ochonogor, Alakpodia & Achugbue, 2012).

However, it cannot be denied that there are flaws in using texting slang. One of the flaws is texting slang lacks of emotion as it is short, brief and to the point (Cullington, n.d). Thus, it might affect ones in becoming less emotional through writing when they get used with texting slang. In addition, as texting slang is believed a language that can only be perceived by same group of people, thus, it cannot be read or easily understood by some people who are outside the

circle or those who are not fluent in the language where slang is used. As an example, for some Malaysians who are mostly fluent in Malay and English, they can easily understand both texting slangs, but differently to some Malaysians who are fluent in Chinese and English, they might have difficulties in understanding texting slang in Malay.

In this research, the main focus is on the texting slang among Malaysians, where most of the respondents are Malays. The objectives of this research are to check the proportion of users' current knowledge in texting slang and to identify the relationship between knowledge of texting slang and misinterpretation.

## **LITERATURE REVIEW**

Texting slang is definitely a vast topic and contains several elements. One of the elements in texting slang is abbreviation. Abbreviation is where the word is shortened, for example, from doctor to doc. This is also where clipping take place as it involves the deletion of some part of a long word took place (Fromkin & et al., 2011). Meanwhile, another element is acronym. Acronym refers to a word that is composed by the initial alphabet of each word such as GTG which mean 'got to go' or AFAICT 'as far as I can tell' or BRB 'be right back' (Dixon, 2011). In addition, according to Fromkin& et al. (2011), acronym also is said as part of abbreviation; alphabetic abbreviation, where the word is pronounce letter-by-letter such as MRI from magnetic resonance imaging.

It cannot be denied that users eventually gain advantages from using slang and one of them is, it is convenient for the users to create a wall to conceal secrecy and privacy (Justich, 2017). Thus, the users could use the texting slang whenever they want to share any secrets among their group members. Besides, it is believed that texting slang is said that to be related to brain development. This is because when the brain becomes more alert and aware of changes that happen in languages, there is a need which to connect the context and the 'real' word to the 'new' word namely slang. Hence, it stimulated individuals or the groups that are using slang are becoming more creative and expressive. This is in terms of choosing the shorter version of the word or the slang itself (Crystal, 2008). As for Walsh (2007), he stated that the personalities of a person becoming more obvious and this leads to ones become more opened and confident in showing and expressing their point of view.

On the other hand, there are some concerns towards youngsters as they becoming obsessed with Internet which as a result this can make them secluded themselves in their own space. These however, can be overcome by the usage of slang, especially texting slang where the youngsters can feel that they belong to a certain group by having their own way of speaking (Crystal, 2008). On the other hand, another positive effect of slang and to be specified texting slang is, it is good for those who are bilingual as it fastens the brain function in switching between the languages. At the end, these processes lead to higher cognitive performance since an individual mind had been extra stimulated (Woollaston, 2016).

As far as in local perspective, Malaysians can be generalized as bilingual citizens since the formal language of Malaysia is Bahasa Malaysia and the second language that is widely used

is English or mother tongue of an individual. Some of Malaysians are even multilingual speakers as Malaysia has a lot of races and ethnicities (Malaysia, 2014). These lead to having lots of slang depending on groups of speakers. For instance, Malaysian-Malay tends to use texting slang to communicate by using both English and Malay in the text (Iqbal, 2010), but it might differ to other races and ethnicities. Thus, it can be said that the factor of being bilingual or multilingual can influence a person's way of communication namely slang; texting slang.

### **Slang Affects Comprehension**

The Internet users are all exposed to texting slang but not all users can really understand every abbreviations and acronyms of the texting slang that is used by a specific group. Not everyone prefers in using texts, chats or tweets to communicate as they believe that there might be misunderstanding or miscommunication will be occurred during communication (Kleen & Heinrichs, 2008). For example, parents who tried to peek on their teenagers tweets might have big difficulties to understand the texting slang was used (Pullen & Citizen, 2016). Meanwhile, texting slang even changes faster than usual slang. Hence, it can be understood that those who are not belong to the group might not be able to comprehend some texting slang (Racco, 2017).

An example to illustrate the gap between two groups of people in understanding an abbreviation is between parents and their children who are youngsters. For example, an abbreviation like 'POS' which is used by the youngsters when they have their parents around in order to show that parents are there so they cannot actually talk. However, many probably do not understand this abbreviation. Another example is 'P-ZA', a clear abbreviation, but not many can actually translate this as 'pizza'. The other two examples have been done by the researchers from Huffington Post UK (2013) are "WTG 4 A %/ N A P-ZA?" or "llldef B der A3 but CTN POS XXX", showed that these two texts might be quite impossible for those who are new to texting or tweeting or those who are their first language is not English. Based on their research, the meaning of the first text is "Want to go for a drink and a pizza?" and the second text is "I'll definitely be there anytime, anyplace, anywhere but can't talk now, my parents are standing over my shoulder." This shows that texting slang is not easy as it seems.

Thus, it can be said that different abbreviations and acronyms are used can cause confusion and could lead to misunderstanding due to several factors as these are rarely used by the users (Gorney, 2012). Meanwhile, Green (2007) stated that the misunderstandings can be occurred due to the users who are eventually interpreting the texting slang by using their own context, which simultaneously lead to miscommunication. Moreover, Green also believed that this situation can be the result of three factors namely, receiver, context and the tone as in this case the way the texting slang is written. This can be supported by Shazia Aziz, Maria, Muhammad and Priya (2013) who agreed that context helps when interpreting texting slang.

Thus, misunderstanding and misinterpretation are bound to be happened when the users are new to the culture or certain groups. Texting slang somehow affects the understanding of certain group of people regarding the intended meaning as it is believed that different region carries different slang. Hence, in this research both texting slang in English and Malay are being closely observed by the researchers.

Therefore, this exploratory study focuses on to know the proportion of users' current knowledge in texting slang. Next, this study is done in order to check if any relationship exists between and misinterpretation and factors such as knowledge of texting slang, gender, language used and also age group.

## **METHOD**

### **Participants**

The target population for this study is the undergraduate students, lecturers, academic and non-academic staff in the public university. The undergraduate students are taken from students in Diploma of Statistic (CS111), Diploma of Public Administration (AM110), Diploma of Business Management (BM119), Diploma of Banking (BM111) and Diploma of Computer Science (CS110). Using stratified sampling techniques, about 335 respondents were selected out of 2765 of total population in which represents all different courses and staffs. The total of population is 2765 people including both students and staffs. The total 2420 students can be divided into 349 Statistics students, 838 Public Administration, 435 Business Management, 473 Banking Program and 331 Computer Science students. On the other hand, the staffs consist of 74 people from academic staffs and 75 people from non-academic staffs.

### **Measuring Instrument**

This study used cross sectional design. During this research, all data were collected at one point at one time. Through this current study, a questionnaire has been used to collect the data about the knowledge of texting slang among users. Among the questions were asked was about knowledge of the respondent about texting slang. It has several questions including "do you know what is texting slang", "What did you think about texting slang ?", "Have you been bothered about the effect of texting slang on your language in both spoken and written in terms of formal writing?" and "Which language that you often use in texting?" This study also asked abbreviations and acronyms commonly used in texting slang to know if there is any misinterpretation by the users. The questions were divided into two parts; defining the meaning of the abbreviation and acronym in English and Malay.

### **Data Analysis Procedure**

In this study, descriptive statistical analysis which is the Statistical Package for Social Science versus 24 (SPSS 24) was used in analyzing the data. The Chi-square correlation coefficient was used to examine about the relationship between the usage of texting slang and the misinterpretation of the text content and the relationship between the knowledge of texting slang, language used, gender and age group. Meanwhile, the proportion was reported in form of percentage in order to check the proportion of users' current knowledge in texting slang. The Chi-Square test was chosen because the relationship test is involving categorical data. After several amendments involving several pilot studies, the self – developed questionnaire was used to collect the data and the result of the actual study Cronbach's alpha in measuring the reliability is 0.844.

## **RESULTS**

In order to collect the opinion and status of texting slang usage and knowledge among users, about 12% of the total population in one of the public university in Malaysia involved in this study. There is 65.07% of the respondents are female while 34.93% of the respondents are male. Out of 335 respondents, there are 218 female respondents and 117 male respondents which responded to this questionnaire. As reported in Table 1, the result has shown that the percentage of the respondents range 18 to 25 years old is 93.13% with frequency 312. Meanwhile, the respondent age of 26 and above consist of 6.87% with a total of 23.

**Table 1.**  
Demographic criteria of the respondents in percentage

	Female	Male
<b>Gender</b>	65.07	34.93
	18-25 years old	26 years old and above
<b>Age Group</b>	93.13	6.87

From Table 2, about 84.48% of the respondents had shown that they know what is texting slang meanwhile the remaining which is 15.52% stated they did not know what is texting slang. The result also showed that the majority of the respondents, 53% of them are bothered about the effect of texting slang on language and while 47% of the respondent did not bother about the effect of texting slang on language. Thus, this implies that texting slang does affect ones' language used in many situations. One of situations is in terms of the existence of texting slang in formal writing such as test and also formal speaking such as group discussion (Ochonogor, Alakpodia and Achugbue, 2012). In addition, they also believed that texting slang violates the standard rules of the English language. One of the reasons why this situation occurred due to the inability for the texting slang users to differentiate the context and situation for them to use the texting slang ( Shazia et al, 2013).

**Table 2.**  
General knowledge about texting slang

No	Question	Yes	No
1	Do you know what texting slang is?	84.48%	15.52%
2	Have you been bothered about the effect of texting slang on your language?	52.54%	47.46%

Based on Table 3, the result has shown that the majority of the respondents used both language English and Malay which is 66.00% when they are texting compared to the respondents who use Malay or English only as the medium of interaction are 26.57% and 7% respectively. The users preferred to use mixture of English and Malay due to a factor which the users are familiar with English and Malay since there are bilingual individuals. Thus, they tend to use both languages during texting slang. According to Deumert and Masinyaya (2008), bilingual users have two different sets of communicative norms, first, when they use English, the users can use for three purposes which are achieving brevity of expression, optimizing speed of

communication and indicating emotional states as English provide range of global non-standard features. Meanwhile, second, when the users use Malay, the range of brevity and speed are quite limited and emotional verbally and texts close to the standard norm are produced. Thus, there are more users opt to use English and Malay at the same time as they believed they can practice both communicative norms.

**Table 3.**  
 The language that is often used in texting

Language Preferred	Percentages
English	7.16
Malay	26.57
English and Malay	66.27

In order to check the actual knowledge of the users in the usage, the analysis about the common abbreviations and acronyms also sentences were done as discussed as in Table 4 and 5.

**Table 4**  
 The list of commonly abbreviation and acronym

No	Texting Slang	Definition	Percentage (%)	
			Correct	False
1	LOL	Laughing Out Loud	81.49	18.51
2	NOOB	Newbie	56.12	43.88
3	YOLO	You Only Live Once	75.82	24.18
4	PAW	Parents Are Watching	70.15	29.85
5	OOTD	Outfit Of The Day	79.40	20.60
6	TTYL	Talk To You Later	71.34	28.66
7	XOXO	Hugs And Kisses	36.72	63.28
8	TBH	To Be Honest	77.61	22.39

The result has shown that the majority of the respondents understands what is meant by ‘LOL’ which is 81.49% compared to the ones who do not understand which is 18.51%. Meanwhile, 56.12% of the respondents understand what is meant by ‘NOOB’ compared to 43.88% of the respondents who do not understand this word. Next, there is 75.82% of the respondents understand what is meant by ‘YOLO’ compared to 24.18% of the respondents who do not understand this word. Besides, the result has shown that the majority of the respondents understands what is meant by ‘PAW’ which is 70.15% as compared to the ones who do not understand which is 29.85%. One the other hand, 79.40% of the respondents understands what is meant by ‘OOTD’ compare to 20.60% of the respondents who do not understand this word. Then, the result has shown that the majority of the respondents understands what is meant by

‘TTYL’(71.34%) as compared to the ones who do not understand which is 28.66%. Next, 63.26% of the respondents do not understand what is meant by ‘XOXO’ compare to 36.72% of the respondents who understand this abbreviation. Lastly, the result has shown that the majority of the respondents understands what is meant by ‘TBH’(77.61%) compared to the ones who do not understand which is 22.39%.

**Table 5**  
The list of commonly used texting slang

No	Question	Actual Meaning	Percentage (%)	
			Understand	Not understand
1	“yow where r u, lets play volley ball as the weather is so gr8” “Imbz I gottago,tyl”	“Yo, where are you, let’s play volleyball as the weather is so great” “I am busy, I got to go, talk to you later”	78.81	21.19
2	Sgt	Sangat <i>Very</i>	90.15	9.85
3	pggl	Panggil <i>Call</i>	91.34	8.66
4	kipidap	Keep it up	97.91	2.09
5	Gado	Gaduh <i>Fight</i>	97.01	2.99
6	K	Okay	97.61	2.39
7	Dongibap	Don’t give up	89.55	10.45
8	Yukenduit	You can do it	91.04	8.96
9	Ainoyuken	I know you can	89.25	10.75
10	Skunk	Sekarang <i>Now</i>	87.46	12.54
11	“Awuckkskt mane 2?” “titeww at umhnie”	“Awakdekatmanaitu?” “Kita at rumahini” <i>Where are you? We are at home.</i>	88.06	11.94

In Table 5, about 78.81% of the respondents understand the meaning of the sentence compared to 21.19% of the respondents who do not understand the sentence. Meanwhile, the result has shown that the majority of the respondents understands what is meant by ‘Sgt’ (77.61%) compared to the ones who do not understand (22.39%). Next, the result has shown that the majority of the respondents understand what is meant by ‘Pggl’ which is 91.34% compared to the ones who do not understand which is 8.66%. Besides, 97.91% of the respondents understand what is meant by ‘Kipidap’ in comparison to 2.09% of the respondents who do not understand this word. Meanwhile, 97.01% of the respondents understand what is meant by



‘Gado’ compared to 2.99% of the respondents who do not understand this word. On the other hand, the result has shown that the majority of the respondents understands what is meant by ‘K’(97.61%) compared to the ones who do not understand (2.39%). Next, 89.55% of the respondents understand what is meant by ‘Dongibap’ compared to 10.45% of the respondents who do not understand this word. Besides, the result has shown that the majority of the respondents understands what is meant by ‘Yukenduit’(91.04%) compared to the ones who do not understand (8.96%). Meanwhile, 89.25% of the respondents understand what is meant by ‘Ainoyuken’ compared to 10.75% of the respondents who do not understand this word. Next, the result has shown that the majority of the respondents understands what is meant by ‘Skunk’(87.46 %) with 293 respondents compared to the ones who do not understand (12.54%) with frequency 42 respondents. Lastly, for the sentence “Awuckkskt mane 2?”“titeww at umhnie.” 88.06% of the respondents understand the meaning the sentence compared to 11.94% of the respondents who do not understand the sentence.

Based on the previous discussion about texting slang, most of the respondents claimed to know what it is all about. However, there are cases where some common terms as in Table 4 and 5 being incorrectly interpreted among the users. The Spearman correlation coefficient to check whether there is no relationship between the knowledge of texting slang creates the misinterpretation of the text content between the users are, as stated in Table 6.

**Table 6**  
 Spearman correlation coefficient for “Misinterpretation”

<b>Misinterpretation</b>		
<b>Do you know what texting slang is?</b>	Correlation Coefficient	0.201
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000
	N	335

The result shows that the Spearman correlation coefficient with the value of 0.201. The two tailed significant value is 0.000 which is less than 0.05. Therefore, there is a significant relationship between the knowledge of texting slang creates the misinterpretation of the text content among users. It appeared that the relationship between the knowledge of texting slang and misinterpretation is rather quite weak. This is due to several factors which lead to misinterpretation occurred. According to Gorney (2012), one of the factors that users tend to misinterpret abbreviations and acronyms is because some of abbreviations and acronyms are not used frequently, thus, some users face difficulty to interpret them. Meanwhile, Green (2007) believed that the way users interpret the texting slang is different according to their discretion. It cannot be denied that majority of the users uses some combination of abbreviations and acronyms; however, there are some users who use the combination of abbreviations and acronyms differently as users are people who tend to express themselves especially their way of thinking differently. In addition, Green (2007) also mentioned that there are three factors which lead to this situation which are depending on the receiver of the text, the context of the text and the tone that the users wish is being conveyed. Thus, all this could possibly cause misinterpretation in texting slang simultaneously in communication.

**Table 7**  
 Spearman correlation coefficient for “Misinterpretation”

		Misinterpretation
<b>Gender</b>	Correlation Coefficient	-0.038
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.488
<b>Language used</b>	Correlation Coefficient	-0.030
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.585
<b>Age group</b>	Correlation Coefficient	0.421**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000

\*\*significant at 0.01

In Table 7, the Spearman Rank correlation value between gender and misinterpretation shows that there is no significant relationship exists. The result for the language used also shows that there is no significant relationship exists between the language used and misinterpretation. Hence, regardless whether Malay or English was used in the texting slang, no statistically proven relationship exists in this study. However, the result for the spearman correlation coefficient between age group (below or above 25 years old) shows significant relationships exist between misinterpretation and age group. This can be supported by Reham (2015) who has found that the usage of texting slang might be different from one age group to another as each age group might be using different social networks simultaneously different styles of texting slang. Therefore, the knowledge of ones regarding texting slang might be different as well. As a result, misinterpretation might be occurred due to the difference which they have.

## DISCUSSION

This study is conducted to investigate the knowledge of texting slang between users using the sample from a public university in Malaysia. Most of the users which is 52% have been bothered about the impact of texting slang towards their language skill. The findings also suggested that most preferred medium of communication in texting is the mixture of both Malay and English. Although most of the respondents know about texting slang, there are about 15.52% stated otherwise. This means that the users might not know what is texting slang or subconsciously not knowing that the shortened spelling, abbreviation and acronym used in texting are considered as texting slang.

The results for the interpretation of the texting slang shows that not all respondents know what the actual meaning of these two, namely abbreviations and acronyms. As discussed in the finding, the percentage of the respondents that answer correctly for acronym and abbreviation are only 36.72% and 56.12% respectively for the commonly used and heard texting slang which are ‘XOXO’ and ‘NOOB’. This actually proved that further investigation is needed in the future to check the reason why instead of being commonly used among users, why most of users fail to give the actual meaning behind those slangs. Besides, it can be seen that the users commonly used texting slang in the mixture of English and Malay, followed by Malay only and lastly English only. This can be supported by Deumert and Masinyana (2008) which believed the

mixture of languages among bilingual users can be said due to the communicative norms were English is believed comprehended by more users as it covers quite range of global non-standard features while another language is more to the suitability of the users' norms. Thus, by mixing both languages, the users believed it could help them to relay their message better.

On the other hand, the Spearman correlation showed there is significant relationship between misinterpretation and the knowledge of texting slang. This shows that misinterpretation is directly influenced by the knowledge of texting slang among users. However as stated in the finding, there are several occasions where the users fail to give the correct meaning of the slang used. Hence, the misinterpretation can exist whenever a texting slang was used. From the 8 chosen acronyms and abbreviations tested, the average correct meaning given was only 69% of the time. Further research needs to be done to check this gap in depth. Meanwhile for the findings where the improvised way of spelling certain words used in texting slang, indicates that an average of 90.74% of the time the users understand what was the actual meaning of each word.

This also shows that, not all texting slang is understood by the users due to the factors have been mentioned by Gorney (2012) who believed the different frequency of certain abbreviations are used, lead to unfamiliarity which can lead to misinterpretation. In addition, Green (2007) mentioned users' way of interpretation on the texting slang differs according to their discretion as they are human beings who have different ways of thinking, depending on the receiver of the text, the context of the text and the tone that the users wish is being conveyed. Thus, the result from this study which shows that there is a significant relationship between the knowledge of texting slang creates the misinterpretation of the text content among users from the value of the Spearman correlation coefficient which is 0.201 can be used in order to support Gorney (2012) and Green (2007).

Although, there are applications where parents who cannot comprehend their kids' texting slang can use to help them monitor their kids' texting slang (Bark, 2017) but there are still some flaws to it. This can only be used by parents but not others to comprehend texting slang. Thus, further research in terms of the users' knowledge and misinterpretation regarding texting slang and how these two elements affect in ones' communication whether written and spoken, could be carried out in order to understand texting slang better and thoroughly. This is due to this type of communication namely, texting slang is expanding and influencing ones' everyday life (Kedidimetse, 2009). Thus, understanding this matter is needed in order to minimize any misunderstanding from occurring which simultaneously could improve ones' communication and its quality when communicating.

## **IMPLICATION OF STUDY**

The idea of communicating is being taken for granted as the usage of texting slang was assumed to be widely understood across generation. In fact, when it comes to the texting slang users which most of them are youngsters, mostly parents who face problem in understanding this texting slang (Jones, 2016). This might be influenced by the factors had been said by Green (2007) which believed that there is a difference between one and another in interpreting the

texting slang based on three reasons which are the receiver of the text, the context of the text and the tone that the users wish is being conveyed.

Besides that, according to Certiport (n.d), one of the characteristics of the youngsters nowadays is they are practiced users for digital technology which exposed them to texting slang. This is also can be the result of auto typing where when they use gadget, they just need to spell few words and the suggestion will pop-up, resulting them to be unaware how to actually spell it. Hence, during the 'real world' especially in examination, they are unsure whether how the word should be spelled. They tend to misspell it although they did well with their assignment where they have the computer to auto correct the spelling.

It can be said that texting slang has affected these youngsters not only in their daily conversation but also in their studies which related to these youngsters' language learning especially English, in a formal language learning setting like in English as second language classroom. According to Jones (2016), texting slang does affect the youngsters in terms of their formal writing as the usage of texting slang would affect their knowledge regarding the actual spelling and definition.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

We are grateful to the staffs and students for willingly helped us establish the data for our study. Special thanks to Nur Farah Eleeda binti Azmi, Nursyafarwani binti Azeem Azamin, Nor Nazuin binti Nazarail, Nur Aqilah Liyana binti Hanafi and Noor Aisyah binti Rashif for their contribution in collecting the data in which giving us the insight to study more about texting slang.

## REFERENCES

- Bark. (2017). Why Bark? Retrieved August 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2017 from <https://www.bark.us/why>
- Baron, N., S. (2008). Always on: Language in an online and mobile world. *Oxford University Press*.
- Brasier, Z. (2015). Text Messages Slang Goes Back to Telegraph Operators. Retrieved August 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2017 from <http://knowledgenuts.com/2015/10/10/text-message-slang-goes-back-to-telegraph-operators/>
- Certiport (n.d). Learning in the 21<sup>st</sup> century; Teaching Today's Students on Their Terms International. Education Advisory Board. Retrieved October 24<sup>th</sup>, 2017 from [https://www.certiport.com/Portal/Common/DocumentLibrary/IEAB\\_Whitepaper040808.pdf](https://www.certiport.com/Portal/Common/DocumentLibrary/IEAB_Whitepaper040808.pdf)
- Crystal, D. (2008). Texting. *ELT Journal*. 62(1).77–83
- Cullington, M. (n.d). Texting and Writing. Spotlight on First year Writing: *Young Scholars in Writing*. Marrywood University.
- Deumert, A., & Masinyana, S. O. (2008). Mobile language choices-the use of English and siXhosa in text messages (SMS) evidence from a bilingual South African sample. *English Worldwide* 20, 2 (117-147)

- Dixon, H.B. Jr. (2011). Texting, Tweeting and Other Internet Abbreviations. *The Judges Journal*, American Bar Association.50(4).
- Fromkin. V., Rodman R., &Hyams N. (2011). *An Introduction to Language: International 9<sup>th</sup> Edition* . Canada: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
- Gorney, E. (2012). The language of texting: altering English or a language of its own? The review: *A journal of Undergraduate Student Research* 13.
- Green, J. (2007). Language: Intrtxtlty: Critical Quarterly. EBSCOHOST. 49 (3).
- Huffington Post UK. *Texting Slang: The Next Generation*. Retrieved February 21<sup>st</sup>, 2018 from [www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/08/09/text-slang-2013\\_n\\_3732432.html](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/08/09/text-slang-2013_n_3732432.html)
- Iqbal, N. A. (2010). Style Bahasa SMS. *Metalingua* (v.8:2). ISSN1693-685X. Akred 293/Akred-LIPI/P2MBI/2010
- Johes, G. (2016). How Does Social Media Slang Affect Learning. Retrieved October 24<sup>th</sup>, 2017 from <http://www.edudemic.com/social-media-slang/>
- Justin, K. (2017). The Dangerous Texting Slang All Parents Should Know. Retrieved August 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2017 from <https://www.yahoo.com/beauty/dangerous-texting-slang-parents-know-000958393.html>
- Kedidimetse, M.(2009). Be care about abbreviating when texting. *Sunday Standard*. Online edition.
- Kleen, B. A. & Heinrichs, L. (2008). A Comparison of Student Use and Understanding of Text Messaging Shorthand at Two Universities. *Information Systems*. 9(2).
- Malaysia. (2013/2014). Bahasa Rasmi. Retrieved June 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2017 from <http://pmr.penerangan.gov.my/index.php/profil-malaysia/7961-bahasa-rasmi.html>
- Ochonogor, W., C., Alakpodia, N., O. & Achugbue, I., E. (2012). The impact of text message slang (Tms) or chatroom slang on students' academic performance. *International Journal of Internet of Things*, 1(2). 1-4.
- Patoko, N. & Yazdanifard, R. (2014). The Impact of Using Many Jargon Words, while Communicating with the Organization Employees. *American Journal of Industrial and Business Management*. 4. 567-572. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4236/ajibm.2014.410061>
- Pullen, J. P. & Citizen, J. (2016). 116 Teen Text Terms Decoded for Confused Parents. Retrieved August 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2017 from <http://time.com/4373616/text-abbreviations-acronyms/>
- Racco, M. (2017). This is The Text Slang All Parents Should Know. Retrieved August 2<sup>nd</sup>. 2017 from <http://globalnews.ca/news/3515939/this-is-the-text-slang-all-parents-should-know/>
- Reham, M. K. (2015). Pragmatic functions of social networks' acronyms. *International Journal of English Language and Linguistics Research*.3(4). 37-49.
- Shazia, A., Maria, S., Muhammad, F., A. & Priya, A. (2013). The impact of texting/sms language on academic writing of students-what do we need to panic about?. *Elixir Linguistics and Translation*. 55. 12884-12890.
- Swan M. (2009). *Practical English Usage: New International Student's Edition (3<sup>rd</sup> Ed.)*. Oxford University Press.
- Walsh, J. (2007) "Txt Msgs Creep in2 class; Some Say That's gr8." *Star Tribune*. Academic Search Elite. EBSCO.
- Wood, C. , Kemp, N. , Waldron, S. and Hart, L. (2014) Grammatical understanding, literacy and text messaging in school children and undergraduate students: A concurrent analysis. *Computers and Education*, 70.281-290. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2013.09.003>

Widyanto, C.,A. (2013). An analysis on slang the script of 8-MILE film, a sociolinguistics approach. *Journal School of teacher training and education Muhammadiyah University of Surakarta*.

Woollaston, V. (2016). Speeding Slang is good for your brain as being bilingual and speeding just a week using a new language boosts attention span. Retrieved June 2<sup>nd</sup>. 2017 from <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/sciencetech/article-3561902/Speaking-SLANG-good-brain-bilingual-spending-just-week-using-new-language-boosts-attention-span.html#ixzz4j65nhA8o>

Zhou, Y & Fan. Y (2013). A Sociolinguistic Study of American Slang. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 3(12). 2209-2213. doi: 10.4304/tpls.3.12.2209-2213.

### **About the Authors**

**Suriyati Ujang** is currently teaching the undergraduates at Universiti Teknologi MARA Cawangan Pahang Kampus Raub . Her research interests include behavioural science, social science and statistical modelling. She obtained her bachelor and master degree in Applied Statistics from Universiti Teknologi MARA Shah Alam, Malaysia.

**Norhidayah Md Yusof** is a lecturer at Universiti Teknologi MARA Cawangan Pahang Kampus Raub. Her research interests include applied linguistics, politeness, teaching and learning mainly on teacher talk in English as Second Language classroom.

**Hanani Mohamed Hamdan** is a lecturer at Universiti Teknologi MARA Cawangan Pahang Kampus Raub. Her research interests include applied linguistics; sociolinguistics and psycholinguistics, and in discourse analysis.