

English Borrowing on Internet Lexicon Used by University Students in Medan Indonesia

Nuzwaty^a, Rizki Amalia^b, ^aFaculty of Arts, Universitas Islam Sumatera Utara, Medan, Indonesia, ^bUniversitas Pembangunan Nasional “Veteran” Jakarta, Email: nuzwaty@fisip.uisu.ac.id, rizkiamalia@upnvj.ac.id

This study conducts on the pattern of English borrowing on the internet lexicon as the internet code used by university students in Medan, Indonesia. The data collection is purposely done during one semester (four months in every Monday and Thursday). The amount of the data is 53 lexicons. To recheck the reliability and validity of the data, 100 of first-year students of Political and Social Science Faculty, University of Islamic Sumatera Utara participated. The result shows that sounds of English borrowing lexicon convert into the typical Indonesian sounds. Consonant [t] at the end position of the stem in a cluster [nt] automatically dropped, like print > prin. Sound [v] replaced by [f] in all of the distribution. The passive form of the borrowing follows the Indonesian passive pattern, indicated by prefix di-. The borrowing ones adapt the Indonesian prefix me- to convey transitive verb forms, with the allomorph /mem-, men, meŋ/, like mem-prin ‘to print’. The nasal sounds emerge in allomorphs influenced by the initial sounds of the stems based on the point of articulation of the sounds confronted.

Key words: *Borrowing, internet, lexicon, sound, student*

Introduction

Languages regularly change over time. One of the most critical sources of language change is contact between speakers of different languages. This condition will support the adoption of elements from another language or dialect known as linguistic borrowing (Shaligram & Linton, 2006; Calvin, 1983; Mufwene, 2003; Hudson, 1996) expressed different languages may become mixed up with each other is through the process of borrowing. This process involves mixing the systems the languages themselves because an item is borrowed from one language to become part of the other language. Further Hudson (1996) marked, it is important to recognise that borrowing can keep their foreign associations for a long time, whether or not the language community recognises them as loans.

In a study of linguistic borrowing, two terms that commonly used are recipient and donor languages. The recipient one is a term to convey the borrowing language while the donor one is the one which element borrowed (Finegan, 2015; R.A.Hudson, 2005; Shaligram & Linton, 2006). When speakers adopt elements that have already existed in their languages or vernaculars for the objects and concepts belonging to the donor language, the process is known as loan ship or loan translation. The prominent elements that more undergo changing in linguistic borrowing are lexicons of the languages in contact by these lexicons commonly leads to further changes in the recipient language. Borrowed items are often changing to conform to the recipient linguistic rules, a process recognised as adaptation. The adaptation in which the donor sounds occurred in the borrowing lexicons replaced by their variant phonological feature of the borrowing language. An example English sounds that Fought (2006) gave such as [θ] in *teeth* becomes [f] in AAVE (African American Vernacular English), the English sounds [aj] in *climbing* become [a] in AAVE simply because the vowels [i] and [u] realised with no glides in AAVE.

An alternative conception of phonological similarity in the borrowing or loanwords from English to Thai was based on shared features and natural. Kenstowicz and Atiwong (2006) examined loanwords adaptation on the Thai language used in the Central Thai pointing out that the adaptation of consonants directly correspondent in the Thai phonemic inventory and an optional structure of similarity of phonemes concentrate on shared features and natural. Here are some of the loanwords of the English phoneme /g/ > /k/ like in *goal* > *koo* in Thai, and /dʒ/ in English to be /c/ In Thai like *to jam* > *cεem*, and the phoneme /z/ > /s/ like *zip* > *sip*. Such correspondences are because of the entire aspects of loan phonology since there is no specific procedure to conduct the process of adaptation in which the phoneme taken from the recipient stocks. Admittedly some pattern of similarity is at play that the domain of such proportion in feature geometry and prosodic constructions are the pertinent factors. The adapter will seek the minimal alteration in the place assigned by the feature. These loans cited without tone relationships are, certainly, one of the most captivate aspects of borrowing phonology since there are no preferences to carry out the adjudgment process as to which phoneme to choose from the recipient inventory. Other investigations into phonological impacts on the selection of concepts are more about lexical access, therefore it does not necessarily make any predictions about the selection of construction type of phonological effects on the specific manifestation of subject-verb agreement (Cleland & Pickering, 2003). To examine the effects of phonological encountering on syntactic priming, one must define how prime and target nouns might be phonologically related.

Language borrowing, according to Hoffer (2006), has been prominent in the fields of linguistics for some time since the study of language borrowing and loanwords is the only type of investigation that occurs across language boundaries. The speakers of a language have various options when acquiring new terms or words in another language that could be imported or

substituted for the sound confronted. An approach to language adaptability study is borrowing vocabulary from another language. First of all, the investigation has to run on the phonological systems of the two languages. Language borrowing investigation is much harder for a language that has a lack of consonants and vowels in its phonological inventory or towards the language, which has a straightforward syllable structure. Another difficulty may arise if the language has a much different intonation system in general, like Chinese, Japanese, English, and French.

Linguistic borrowing is a growing area of sociolinguistic research since the interrelationship between language, including the borrowing lexicons, and social life can be inherently in all aspect of human life. Therefore this field study is more about language in the social life of the bilingual and multilingual community (Plaza-Pust, 2016). Consideration of this area of research reveals a number of issues which could be examined, among others code-switching and code-mixing, pidgin and creole, loanword and borrowing. Lexical borrowing will consider inherently in the science and the non-science domain of human life. Terms in computer science, for example, employ plenty of variation of borrowing lexicons within the science domain with a considerably higher proportion of loans than physics and chemistry (Hultgren, 2013). In a case study of loanwords from Māori into (New Zealand) English, Calude et al., (2017) propose a model of loan-use and demonstrate its benefits. The model contributes a rich range of linguistic characteristics of the loanwords such as loan length and word class, as well as a similarly detailed group of sociolinguistic characteristics of the speakers using them such as gender, age and ethnicity of both, the speakers and the addressee. This model is sophisticated in carrying out together of all these factors at the same time. The findings illustrated the benefit of a quantitatively balanced approach to modelling loanword use with the complex interaction between linguistic and sociolinguistic factors in such language contact (Karūrū, 2013).

On processing of all borrowing by one language from another, Haugen (1950) adequately assumed that it is an attempted reproduction done by the language users in the process of adopting another language (the donor) into their languages (recipients) which might employ the original pattern towards its imitation to be more similar or less to it. Hence, lexicon adoption has been recognised as a process of conveying reproduction and providing innovation in those languages. Haugen pointed out an appropriate definition for the term *borrowing* as the process of reproducing a pattern from one language in another done by bilingual communities which involve two kinds of activity of borrowing known as *substitution* and *importation* in which these activities convey forms of a comparison between the donors and the recipients. The type of *substitution* refers to distinguishing morphemic and phonemic substitution by which to be possible to set up classes of the borrowing words with complete morphemic substitution. The type of *importation* is commonly found in phonology; however, the structural effect of borrowing seems to be largely in certain instability in the categories because, in phonology, it may produce extensive phonemic redistribution.

The analysis of borrowing frequently interprets as a procedure of reproduction the donor's as the original pattern with its imitation in the recipient (Haugen 1950; Cleland & Pickering, 2003; Karūrū, 2013; Andersen, 2014). Like other forms of borrowing as what Andersen (2014) noted about which pragmatic borrowing should be separately regarded from code-switching since this term refers to synchronic or diachronic contact in the item of language change. While code-switching deals with the synchronic variation of the bilingual language speakers' competence, *however*, as is well known, it could be a bit complicated to distinguish single-word switches from cases of borrowing, and the relationship between them regarded as a continuum (Carol W. Pfaff, 1979; Onysko, 2008). Borrowed items, according to Andersen (2014) often occur initially, that serve to demonstrate speakers' capability doing the code-switching.

An argument from Goss and Salmons (2000) is that any original single-word switching and other types of language change are potentially an incipient borrowing. It could capture on a speaker or a language community groups, scatter to neighbouring groups by which it finally becomes a well-manufactured borrowing in the entire recipient language, like English discourse markers first entered German speech as emblematic code-switches, but in some period the markers regarded as German.

A study on comparisons of two L1 groups done by Shi (2004) showed that the Chinese students borrowed prominently more words from the source texts than the native English-speaking students did in which the Chinese students did not use references for lexicons those were neither copied nor modified. They denied syntactically designed lexicon from the source texts. In doing summary assignments, the Chinese students commonly used the borrowed ones not more than ten words for a long summary task. On the other hand, the native English-speaking students mostly used a lot of borrowing citation words in every single summary of assignments from the documented sources. The findings of this study proved that the Chinese students are more convenient and capable of using their own original words in doing a summary assignment.

Gatsalova et al. (2018) stated that the borrowing process done by the bilingual community depends on the quality of interpreting the concept borrowed not only on the stage of the linguacultural competence but on the encouragement to acquire some new information from the other language as well since the speaker of different language might sometimes use a different pattern of others. This situation could be related to the process of conceptualisation and categorisation stored and fossilised in the cognitive of the language users. Like Gatsalova et al. and Francis (2007) said that the discussion of lexical borrowing research focuses on the cognitive aspects of bilingualism. Therefore, borrowing is never equal that depends on a reflection of social inequalities that are in both core and cultural borrowings. The lexical borrowing items and grammatical structures depend on different processes and within the former category, such as the differences between phonological and morphological integration,

as well as the differences in how nouns and discourse markers integrated as opposed to verbs. Other investigations into phonological impacts on borrowing lexicon have commonly focused on the lexical construction type of phonological effect on morphological priming lexicons. Therefore, it is not common to predict the phonological impact on the specific terms of subject-verb agreement in morphological construction (Peperkamp, 2004).

Indonesian is a national language used by all of the Indonesian people, and it serves and plays prominent rules as a medium of communication, especially in every formal situation and in official domains. In the unformal area, however, the language communities are encouraged to use their tribal languages in their daily activities, and the Government supports foreign language (English, Japanese, Arabic, and Chinese) for a particular purpose. Therefore, Indonesian people are not only bilingual but also tend to be multilingual. Indonesian Government releases rule used for foreign language lexicons to adopt. The way of lexicon adoption and the rule must be compatible. By doing this, the Government expects to enrich the Indonesian inventory of vocabulary in KBBI (Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia Language Dictionary).

Meysitta (2018) argued that the development vocabulary of foreign-language in KBBI acquired the addition of 1,140 words from foreign languages such as Latin, Arabic, English, and French. The vocabulary is arrayed in the fields of law, science, religion, fashion, music, sports, and culinary in Indonesia. English borrowing words in Indonesian daily conversation, as Ilinawaty and Yokie Prasetya Darma (2018) noted that there are two kinds of the reason for the borrowing; culture borrowing and core borrowings. The core borrowing conveys words stored in the recipient language inventory, and the cultural borrowing is new words that promote the new artistic concept in the recipient language inventory.

The Government has displayed Indonesian internet lexicons to use; conversely, the language community commonly use the English ones. The internet users are more accustomed to using the English internet lexicons it is because, for the first time, the internet code used is entirely English. Moreover, people of the world as the internet user will recognise those lexicons. Therefore the Indonesian internet lexicons are less well known compared to the English ones among those communities in colloquial code. The Indonesian internet lexicons, however, are compulsorily functioned in the official and the formal chambers.

This paper will discuss English borrowing on internet lexicon those specifically conducted on internet lexicon used by university students of the Indonesian language community. The donor language is the English and the recipient, the Indonesian, which deals with the internet terms. The discussions in this paper are about:



- a. The manifestation of the borrowing lexicons phonemic system closely related to sound changing on phonetic interpretation?
- b. The elaboration of the morphological design of the borrowings on the morphological systems, which might exist in those lexical items, insofar Indonesian and English, are structurally not identical.

Research Methods

The data of this study is internet lexicons which commonly used by university students in Medan in interpersonal communication. Medan is the capital city of North Sumatera Province, Indonesia. The collecting data is purposely done during one semester (four months in every Monday and Thursday). To check the reliability and validity of the data, 100 of first-year semester students of Political and Social Science Faculty, University of Islamic Sumatera Utara (UISU) participated. The data is 53 words on the table below:

List of the data: 53 words those the most commonly used in the following table.

Table 1:

No.	English Internet lexicons	Borrowing Internet Lexicons	Indonesian Internet lexicons
1	Accept	Asep [asɛp]	<i>Terima, menerima</i>
2	Account	Akun [akun]	<i>Akun</i>
3	Add	Et [ɛt]	<i>Tambah</i>
4	Block	Blok [blɔk]	<i>Kunci</i>
5	Blog	Blok [blɔʔ]	<i>Blok</i>
6	Bookmark	Bukmak [bukmaʔ]	<i>Penanda</i>
7	Browsing	Brosing [brɔsɪŋ]	<i>Penelusuran</i>
8	Click	Klik [kliʔ]	<i>Tekan</i>
9	Cloud	Klot [klɔt]	<i>Awan</i>
10	Comment	Komen [kɔmɛn]	<i>Komentar</i>
11	Content	Konten [kɔntɛn]	<i>Isi</i>
12	Delete	Delet [dɛlɛt], [dɪlɛt]	<i>Hapus</i>
13	Download	Donlot [dɔnlɔt]	<i>Unduh</i>
14	Email	Imel [imɛl]	<i>Surel (surat elektronik)</i>
15	Feedback	Fitbek [fitbɛk], [pitbɛk]	<i>Umpan balik</i>
16	Follow	Folo [fɔlɔ]	<i>Ikuti</i>
17	Forward	Fowat [fɔwat]	<i>Teruskan</i>
18	Log in	Lojin [lɔdʒɪn], [lɔɡɪn]	<i>Masuk</i>
19	Log out	Logot [lɔɡɔt]	<i>Keluar</i>
20	Highlight	Hailait [hailait]	<i>Sorotan</i>
21	Hack	Hek [hɛk]	<i>Bajak</i>
22	History	Histori [histɔri]	<i>Riwayat</i>
23	Hoax	Hoak [hɔak]	<i>Palsu, bohong</i>
24	Insert	Inset [insɛt]	<i>Sisip</i>
25	Invite	Infait [infait]	<i>Undang</i>
26	Like	Laik [laik]	<i>Suka</i>
27	Loading	Loding [lɔdɪŋ]	<i>Memuat</i>
28	Notification	Notifikasi [nɔtɪfɪkasi]	<i>Notifikasi</i>
29	Online	Onlain [ɔnlain]	<i>Tayang</i>
30	Offline	Oflain [ɔflain]	<i>Mati</i>
31	Posting	Posting [pɔstɪŋ]	<i>Tampilan</i>
32	Power	Pawer [pɔwɛr]	<i>Arus</i>
33	Print	Prin [prin]	<i>Cetak</i>
34	Profile	Profil [prɔfil], [prɔfɪl]	<i>Profile</i>
35	Provider	Profider [prɔfɪdɛr]	<i>Penyedia</i>
36	Publish	Publis [publis]	<i>Terbit</i>
37	Register	Rejister [rɛdʒɪstɛr], [rɛdʒɪstɔr]	<i>Daftar</i>
38	recent update	Risen apdet [risɛn apdɛt]	<i>Terbaru</i>
39	Save	Sef [sɛf]	<i>Simpan</i>
40	Scan	Sken [skɛn]	<i>Pindai</i>
41	Selfie	Selfi	<i>Swafoto</i>
42	Share	Ser [sɛr]	<i>Membagikan</i>
43	Signal	Sinyal [sɪnal]	<i>Sinyal</i>

No.	English Internet lexicons	Borrowing Internet Lexicons	Indonesian Internet lexicons
44	Spam	Spam [spam]	<i>Spam</i>
45	Subscribe	Supskrip [supskrip]	<i>Berlangganan</i>
46	Tag	Tek [tɛʔ]	<i>Tandai</i>
47	Undo	Undo [undɔ]	<i>Balik</i>
48	Update	Apdet [apdet]	<i>Perbaharui</i>
49	Upload	Aplot [aplot]	<i>Unggah</i>
50	Viral	Firal	<i>Firal</i>
51	Virus	Firus	<i>Firus</i>
52	Window	Windo [windɔ]	<i>Jendela</i>
53	Website	Websait	<i>Laman</i>

Result and Discussion

Phonological Feature Interference

An account of interference phonological feature is the most common investigation of lexical borrowing in the recipient as well as in the donor. There is relatively little tolerance in the concept of the smallest unit changing. The process of phonological feature interference on loanwords from the donor (English) internet words to the recipient (Indonesian) discussed next. The English phonemes of internet borrowing lexicons used by the Indonesian students generally go changing adjusted to the construction of the phonological feature of Indonesian.

The consonant of English phoneme /t/ will automatically drop if it exists in the consonant cluster of English phonemes /nt/ in the final position of the distribution, like; *account* > *akun*; *content* > *konten*; *comment* > *komen*, and *print* > *prin*. It also happens towards the consonant cluster phoneme /pt/ in word *accept* > *Asep*.

The voiced alveolar dental phoneme /d/ substituted by the voiceless alveolar dental /t/ in the final position of the distribution, such as; *add* > *et*, *cloud* > *klot*, *download* > *donlot*, *forward* > *fowat*, and *upload* > *aplot*. It is not always possible to judge, however, whether the English phoneme /d/ spontaneously substituted by the Indonesian phoneme /t/ in all of their distributions. It happens merely in the final position. The glottal /ʔ/ phoneme substitutes velar /k/ and /g/ in the final position distribution of lexicons *block* > *bloʔ*, *bog* > *bloʔ*, *click* > *kliʔ*, and *feedback* > *fitbeʔ*. Flap English phoneme /r/ substituted into trill /r/, *provider* > *profider*, *register* > *register*, and *power* > *power*. The /v/ phonemes substituted to /f/ in all distribution position. In an initial position like *viral* > *firal*, and *virus* > *firus*. In middle positions is *provider* > *profider*, and *invite* > *infait* and in the final position; *save* > *seif*.

Like the consonants, the vowel phonemes have also gone changing in terms of vowel

harmony. The vowel [o] will become [ɔ] such as posting > /pɔstɪŋ/, loading > /lədɪŋ/, and profile > /prɔfɪl/ and the gliding vowel [au] will occur in vowel [ɔ], such as download > /dɔnlət/, and power > pɔwer.

Morphological Manifestation Interference

The borrowing process not only covers phonological interference but carries out the morphological process in the borrowing language as well. The speakers conventionally manufacture the structure of the recipient items encountering with Indonesian structure circumstance. In compliance with the essential facet of construction used, the speakers do not accede the donor's inherent structure manifestation. Neither English nor Indonesian share identical structural shapes not only reflect differences within the languages, but they shape and reinforce those differences as well.

The language users of Indonesian on the internet lexicons, merely adapt the lexicons which spontaneously modify the structure following or fixing it up the Indonesian morphological process. The most common process of the terms, among others, is passive forms of the lexicons.

Indonesian passive form exists by jointing a passive morpheme indicator with the verb stems. The passive indicator is a bound morpheme stands as prefix *di-*, example, stem *makan* 'to eat' > *dimakan* 'is/was eaten', *tidak dimakan* 'is/was not eaten', *sudah dimakan* 'has/have been eaten', and *apa sudah dimakan?* 'has it already been eaten?'

Some examples of the passive borrowing lexicons which commonly used by the students:

(1) *di-donlot*, 'be downloaded'

<i>bahannya</i>	<i>sudah</i>	<i>di</i>	<i>donlot</i>
the material	has	been	downloaded

(2) *di- imel* 'be emailed'

<i>makalahnya</i>	<i>di imel</i>	<i>ke</i>	<i>aku.</i>
The paper	was emailed to	me	

(3) *di- dilet* 'be deleted'

<i>pasti</i>	<i>tugas</i>	<i>tidak</i>	<i>di dilet</i>
of course	the work	was not	deleted

(4) *di- forwat* 'be forwarded'

<i>apa</i>	<i>imel</i>	<i>saya</i>	<i>belum</i>	<i>diforwat?</i>
Was	email	my	not yet	forwarded?

(5) *di-infait* 'be invaded'

<i>bu Lina</i>	<i>sudah</i>	<i>diinfait</i>	<i>ke grup</i>	<i>kita.</i>
Miss Lina	has	been invaded	to group	our

(6) *di-posting* 'be posted'

<i>fotonya</i>	<i>sudah</i>	<i>banyak</i>	<i>diposting.</i>
The photos	have	many	been posted

(7) *di-publis* 'is published'

<i>makalah</i>	<i>saya</i>	<i>sudah</i>	<i>di publis</i>
paper	my	has	been published

(8) *di- sef* 'be saved'

<i>apa</i>	<i>ini</i>	<i>sudah</i>	<i>disef?</i>
Was	this	already	saved?

(9) *di- sken* 'be scanned'

<i>Apa</i>	<i>KTP</i>	<i>kamu</i>	<i>sudah</i>	<i>disken?</i>
Was	ID Card	your	already	scanned?

(10) *di- register* 'be registered'

<i>apa</i>	<i>akun</i>	<i>kamu</i>	<i>sudah</i>	<i>diregister?</i>
Has	account	your	already	been registered?

Assimilation Proseses of the Borrowing Lexicon

Indonesian has a verb prefix *me-* as a bound morpheme with constituting some allomorphs, /*me-*, *mem-*, *men-*, *meŋ-*, and *men-*/. The function of prefix *me-* is to modify stems to transitive verbs. The allomorphs will appear in the assimilation process by inserting nasal sounds [m,n,ŋ, and ŋ] in the combination of the prefix *me-* with the stems, that depends on the influencing of stems' initial sounds. The inserted nasal sounds adapt to the stems' initial sounds by the phonological process of assimilation, which conform to the point of articulation of the two sounds, such as the stem *baca* 'read' > *membaca* 'to read', (*adik membaca buku* 'brother read a book). The point of articulation of [b] is bilabial so the suitable nasal should be bilabial feature [m]. All of the stems which initiated by vowel will exhibit [meng-] to represent the transitive verb, for example, *ambil* 'take' > *meng-ambil* 'to take', *ingat* 'remember' > *mengingat* 'to remember', and *undang* 'invite' > *meng-undang* 'to invite'.

The phonological process of assimilation also occurs in borrowing internet lexicons. As has been told before that the students prefer to use English internet lexicons to the Indonesian ones during conversation time in daily activities. The user, however, never try to maintain the

original pattern or construction of the lexicons. The construction of the lexicons would manifestly evolve following the patterns of Indonesian structure which are admitted conventionally by the internet user. The phonological assimilation process upon the stem will be employed in other, to capture a clear framing procedure to produce the new design of the borrowing lexicons,

(11) *powat* > *mem-powat* 'to forward'

Budi tidak mem-powat bahan itu
Budi did not forward the material

(12) *polo* > *mem-polo* 'to follow'

saya sudah mem-polo dia
I have followed him

(13) *prin* > *memprin* 'to print'

apa kamu memprin tugas kelompok kita?
Did you print assignment group our

(14) *publis* > *mem-publis* 'to publish'

jurnal itu belum mem-publis makalah saya
journal the has not published paper my

(15) *donlot* > *men-donlot* 'to download'

si Rini tidak men-donlot tulisan kamu
Rini did not download writing our

(16) *sken* > *men-sken* 'to scan'

apa kamu sudah men-sken KTP mu
did you already scan ID card you

(17) *seif* > *men-seif* 'to save'

sebelum mematikan laptop, saya menseifnya dulu.
Before turn off laptop I save it first

(18) *ser* > *men-ser* 'to share'

bu Lina sudah mensernya di grup
Miss Lina has shared it in group.

(19) *imel* > *meng-imel* 'to email'

<i>mereka</i>	<i>belum</i>	<i>meng-imel</i>	<i>aku</i>
They	not yet	email	me

(20) *edit* > *mengedit* 'to edit'

<i>Rina</i>	<i>sudah</i>	<i>men-edit</i>	<i>tugasnya</i>
Rina	has	edited	her assignment

The assimilation process in (11), (12), (13), and (14) produced is in the terms sharing similar point of articulation between [p] as the initial sound in each stem (*powad*, *polo*, *prin* and *publis*) and the nasal sound [m]. Both of them are bilabial sounds. The assimilation process in (15), (16), (17), and (18) happened since [d] and [s] as the initial sounds of the stem (*donlot*, *sken*, *seif* and *ser*) and the nasal sound [n] share identical phonemic feature, all of them are alveolar sounds. While in *imel* and *edit*, the initial sounds of those stems are vowels; therefore, the suitable prefix allomorph is [ŋ].

Conclusion

The English borrowing on internet lexicons done by university students as the internet users much depends on their need growing on the subject material. Even the Indonesian government has launched internet lexicon items, but generally, plenty of students prefer to use the English ones. The borrowed lexicons are not automatically imported and used without having any changing in the parts of the original sound and patterns. The pattern and sound change and fitted to Indonesian phonological and morphological procedures chosen by internet users. Generally, this process is dominated by the substitution process, which merely runs fitting to Indonesian substitution rules performs simple creation. The findings are as follows:

- Every single borrowing lexicon mutually changes through the substitution process, and this changing influenced by identical features or environment of the sounds, such as the alveolar voiced sound [d] substituted to the alveolar voiceless sound [t] in the final position of the distribution. Both of the two sounds share identical manner and place of articulation (alveolar and plosive).
- Indonesian word pattern acknowledges prefix *di-* as a bound morpheme to convey passive indicator which pinned directly to the stems, like in *di-makan*, *di-minum*, *di-pukul*, and so forth. Therefore, the borrowing internet lexicons of English face similar construction in passive structure, like *di-donlot*, *di-ser*, *di-edit*, *di-aplot*, and so forth

Indonesian designate prefixes *me-* to account for transitive verb forms. It supports some allomorphs in which the appearance depends on the phonological process of assimilation. The assimilation process is applicable concerning the initial sounds of the stems, which pin down



to the morpheme indicator verb-transitive forms. The assimilation process emerges nasal sounds between the prefix *me-* and the stem. The nasal sound adjusts with the initial sound of the stem. The bilabial [p] will encounter with the bilabial nasal [m]. The alveolar [d] and [s] will match the alveolar nasal sound [n], the velar sound [k] and [g] will meet the velar nasal sound [ŋ], the velar nasal sound [ŋ] will also emerge in combination with the stem supported initial vowel sound. The phonological process of assimilation also occurs in borrowing internet lexicons, like in *men-donlot*, *mem-posting*, *meng-edit*.



REFERENCES

- Andersen, G. (2014). Pragmatic borrowing. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 67, 17–33. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2014.03.005>
- Calude, A. S., Miller, S., & Pagel, M. (2017). Modelling loanword success - A sociolinguistic quantitative study of Māori loanwords in New Zealand English. *Corpus Linguistics and Linguistic Theory*, 1–38. <https://doi.org/10.1515/cllt-2017-0010>
- Calvin, V. (1983). *Language Shift in the United States*. Walter de Gruyter & Co.
- Carol W. Pfaff. (1979). Constraints on Language Mixing: Intrasentential Code -Switching and Borrowing Spanish/English. *Linguistic Society of America*, 55(2), 291–318. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/412586>
- Cleland, A. A., & Pickering, M. J. (2003). The use of lexical and syntactic information in language production: Evidence from the priming of noun-phrase structure. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 49(2), 214–230. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0749-596X\(03\)00060-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0749-596X(03)00060-3)
- Finegan, E. (2015). *Language: Its Structure and Use* (seventh ed). Cengage Learning.
- Fought, C. (2006). *Language and Ethnicity*. Cambridge University Press.
- Francis, N. (2007). Carol Myers-Scotton: Multiple Voices: An Introduction to Bilingualism. *Applied Linguistics*, 28(1), 155–158. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/aml055>
- Gatsalova, L., Novikova, T., & Parsieva, L. (2018). Cognitive Basis of Conceptual Borrowing. *SHS Web of Conferences*, 50, 01120. <https://doi.org/10.1051/shsconf/20185001120>
- Goss, E. L., & Salmons, J. C. (2000). The evolution of a bilingual discourse marking system: Modal particles and english markers in german-american dialects. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 4(4), 469–484. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13670069000040040501>
- Haugen, E. (1950). Linguistic Society of America. *Linguistic Society of America*, 26(2), 210–231. <https://doi.org/10.2307/4341113>
- Hultgren, A. K. (2013). Lexical borrowing from English into Danish in the Sciences: An empirical investigation of “domain loss.” *International Journal of Applied Linguistics (United Kingdom)*, 23(2), 166–182. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1473-4192.2012.00324.x>



- Ilinawaty, & Yokie Prasetya Darma. (2018). English Borrowing Words in Indonesian Daily Conversation. In *Journal of English Educational Study* Vol. 1. No. 12, pp. 164-172.
- Karūrū, D. W. (2013). Borrowing and Communication in Language: The Impact of Morphological Adaptation Processes. *International Journal of Education and Research*, 1(9), 1–14.
- Kenstowicz, M., & Suchato, A. (2006). Issues in loanword adaptation: A case study from Thai. *Lingua*, 116(7), 921–949. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2005.05.006>
- Meysitta, L. (2018). Perkembangan Kosakata Serapan Bahasa Asing Dalam KBBI. *Bapala*, 5(3), 1–10. <https://jurnalmahasiswa.unesa.ac.id/index.php/bapala/article/download/23982/21922>
- Mufwene, S. S. (2003). The Ecology of Language Evolution. In *Australia*. Cambridge University Press.
- Onysko, A. (2008). Anglicisms in German: Borrowing, Lexical Productivity, and Written Codeswitching. *Journal of Language Contact* –, 1(2), 85–91. <https://doi.org/10.1515/angl.2008.052>
- Peperkamp, S. (2004). A Psycholinguistic Theory of Loanword Adaptations. *Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 30(1), 341. <https://doi.org/10.3765/bls.v30i1.919>
- Plaza-Pust, C. (2016). Bilingualism and Deafness. In *Bilingualism and Deafness*. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9781501504990>
- R.A.Hudson. (2005). *Sociolinguistics* (Second Edi). Cambridge University Press.
- Shaligram, S., & Linton, J. C. (2006). *An Introduction to Language and Linguistics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Shi, L. (2004). Textual Borrowing in Second-Language Writing. In *Written Communication* (Vol. 21, Issue 2). <https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088303262846>