A Linguistic Analysis of Social Network Communication

Kakharmanova Alua[1]

[1]PhD Doctoral Student of M. Auezov South Kazakhstan University, Kazakhstan, Shymkent

[1]ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0009-0000-1609-3879

Issayeva Zhazira[2]

[2]Candidate of Philological Sciences, Associate Professor

Khoja Akhmet Yassawi International Kazakh-Turkish University, Kazakhstan, Turkistan

[2]ORCID ID: https://orcid.org /0000-0001-9801-8943

ABSTRACT

This article provides a definition of linguistic analysis in Kazakh for social network communication. The article defines the linguistic properties of social network language using materials of social network speech in Kazakh. The article's purpose is to recognize and describe the linguistic characteristics of online communication in the context of Kazakh language interaction on various social media platforms. The specific paper was written using a combination of methods, including linguistic analysis of Kazakh writings from social networks and the analysis, comparison, and systematization of scientific literature. Moreover, the article also highlights the primary distinctions between written and spoken language, as well as discusses how oral and written communication differ from the freshly discovered "Internet language".

Keywords: Internet, social networks, virtual communication, written and oral communication, Kazakh language, Internet language

INTRODUCTION

In the digital era, social networks have become integral to human interaction, reshaping communication patterns and language usage. Platforms like Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, and WhatsApp offer users diverse avenues for expressing thoughts, emotions, and opinions. Understanding the linguistic dynamics of social network communication is crucial for comprehending contemporary social interactions. This article investigates the intricacies of language use in social networking contexts, exploring its implications and significance. The usage of the "Internet language" in social networks as a way to obtain information on the web is discussed in the article. The topic has scholarly value since it clarifies the distinction between the "Internet language" and everyday speech in the Kazakh-language social network.

According to Fedotov et al. (2020), the most widely utilized type of communication in the modern globalized world nowadays is online communication. Social network communication is regarded as a technology that serves its own purposes and has its own exchange environment. Moreover, Miftakhova et al. (2021) states that Internet communication encompasses a variety of discourse experiences, unique approaches, and communication formats. There is now debate on the virtual language personality (Zummo, 2018). Because of this, it is nevertheless crucial to examine the linguistic features of Internet language, a topic that interests researchers more and more.

The social network in Kazakh is recognized as an objective aspect of modern Kazakh society. According to the datareportal.com website, 90.9% of total population of Kazakhstan, i.e. 17.73 million people used Internet as of January, 2023. As such, napoleoncat.com website states that in March 2024, there were 12,413,800 Instagram users in Kazakhstan, or 63,5% of the country's total population; 13,477,900 of Facebook users, 69% of its entire population; roughly 8 million of WhatsApp users; and over 11 million of TikTok users. Apart from these social networks, there are other popular networks in Kazakhstan, such as Telegram and Vkontakte.

These data demonstrates how widely used the Kazakh language is on social media. Language culture is lost in network language contexts, which are characterized by literary language infringement, improper speech manners, and the predominance of other language elements. It cannot, however, be ignored that the fact that social network language is a functional domain or a variety with distinct features, employed in a given communication context to fulfill a particular communication requirement (Kurmanbekova et al., 2023). In actuality, Kazakh language usage on the Internet is expanded by social networking languages. This study thus focuses on the key aspects and linguistic qualities as well as the distinctions between spoken and written communication and the language used in social media. No particular attempt has been made in Kazakh linguistics to investigate language used on social media from this angle.

Written and spoken communication are not the same in social networks (Hilte et al., 2018). For example, there are two ways to communicate in Kazakh: oral and written communication. Each has unique qualities and varies in terms of the addressee's personality, the linguistic tool system, and the reception aspects (Gulgaisha et al., 2016). Amirov (1977) asserts that oral communication is the foundational kind of language. The three primary communicative conditions that comprise spoken language are as follows:

1) expressing an opinion is done orally and necessitates face-to-face interaction between the speaker and the listener;
2) expressing an opinion takes the form of a dialogue in which two or more people participate;
3) expressing an opinion happens on its own during casual conversation.

Although spoken and written languages are similar, they are not the same as "speech units". Kurmanbekova et al. (2023) differed the principal distinctions between them are as follows:

- the speaker of oral communication has a dominant influence on the communication process since people are actively involved in spoken language even though they are not directly involved in written language. Written language is unique in that the writing process is inherent only to the author because only the author can see the reader in his/her head; the recipient does not read or edit anything when it is being written;

- oral communication is a mode of communication in a conversational situation, whereas written speech is mostly used to communicate information over great distances. Consequently, oral and written speech serve distinct purposes.

- a variety of expressive and creative techniques that enhance communication and ensure accurate and efficient information receipt and transmission are characteristics of colloquial language. There are nonverbal speech activities involved that modify slang words to fit the context of the discourse. Semantic completeness, or the lexical and grammatical completeness of the expression of information content, is a characteristic of written speech. The author must simultaneously make sure the reader fully comprehends the text.

- Ayapova (2003) notes that oral speaking is mastered by children since they naturally interact with adults. Written speech is generated through conscious learning, i.e., reading, therefore knowing the ways in which thoughts are formed visually in writing is necessary.

- written communication gives the writer the chance to prepare ahead of time; it gives the author the chance to go over and edit sentences, alter passages of text, add new terms, provide clarification, and reference materials, while during oral conversation, colloquial speech is spoken spontaneously.

- standard language structures and literary (written) features are used in written speech. A sentence's word order is set in stone. Written speech does not have inversion, and in many situations – like formal writing – it is even not feasible. Written speech has comprehensive sentence structures with intricate syntactic constructs, pronouns and prepositional phrases, sophisticated determiners, allied constructions, and other common elements. Paragraphs are structured to communicate a complicated idea, and sentences are meaningfully connected to one another. Although inconsistencies and departures from the norm are prevalent, colloquial language follows the literary norm as well. This is because colloquial language is characterized by its individuality, whereas language and speech differ in their commonality.

METHODS

To conduct a linguistic analysis of social network communication, a comprehensive approach is required. Therefore, researchers typically employ both qualitative and quantitative methods to examine various aspects of language use on social media platforms. Qualitative analysis involves scrutinizing individual posts, comments, and conversations to identify linguistic features such as vocabulary choice, syntactic structures, and discourse patterns. Quantitative analysis, on the other hand, entails statistical examination of large datasets to uncover trends and patterns in language usage across different demographics and platforms. Methods used in writing the particular article are analysis, comparison, and systematization of scientific literature, as well as the linguistic analysis of Kazakh texts from the social network.

RESULTS

The social network functions as both a venue for language communication and a linguistic economy system, which gives rise to an unusual language specific to the Internet. This approach uses language economy to "provide more information in less time" by reducing down on social network users' time without sacrificing the material's quality. Social media language uses a variety of graphic patterns because the law of language economy matters at all linguistic levels. With graphic patterns, people may express a lot of information in less time and with fewer characters while maintaining the message's emotional tone. Punctuation and writing, or spelling, also take on new meanings in social media lingo. This accomplishes the goal of a relationship's emotional expression. For example, in the common language of social media, an exclamation point can convey irony, opposition, appreciation, or a desire to draw particular attention to something, whereas, a question mark might convey irony, demand, amazement, or regret.

Furthermore, it can also be said that that social network users have no use for paralinguistic cues like word stress, tempo, diction, gestures, or facial expressions. In addition, Internet slang has spread through social media and become part of several general used terms. In this regard, Sadirova (2019) argues that a brand-new language known as "Internet language" was recently discovered.

It should also be highlighted that as a lexical aspect there is a general trend in oral communication to deliberately substitute foreign words for their Kazakh equivalents: creativity instead of *shygarmashylyk*; jury instead of *kazylar alkasy*; audio/video recordings instead of *audio/beinezhazulary*; council instead of *kenes*. Moreover, because of the social networks, the Kazakh language has partially adopted the Russian speech clichés and patterns through grammatical assimilation, such as *"Metod bumeranga eshkim otmenyat' etpedi"* – No one has canceled the "boomerang method"; *"Bolmaytyn narseden problema sozdavat' etpe"* – Do not create a problem out of the blue; *"Nikogda ozin birinshi bastama!"* – Never start first!

As for the phonetic aspect, it is not unusual for written orthographic or spelling requirements to be violated due to the peculiarities of Internet communication. For instance, in the texts of Kazakh social network users, their comments or posts, it is noted that certain letters in the Kazakh script are disregarded and are substituted with more common Cyrillic alphabetic letters that have a similar sound. As such, o instead of ө, g instead of ғ, a instead of ә, i instead of kazakh i, n instead of ң, k instead of қ: anshi, aldekashan, korermen, kozaiymy, bolgan, algan, etc. This could be because the user's gadget is not configured for the Kazakh font, but there is a high probability that the user does not bother to search for additional letters on the keyboard, because he/she is sure that he/she will be understood.

Thus, grammatical, lexical, and syntactic characteristics of Kazakh writings in the social network can be broadly categorized into the following groups depending on the material analyzed:

- omission of the subject;
- omission of interjections;
- using inversion in the sentences;
- sending each word of the sentence as a separate phrase in the messages;
- using emojis and emoticons;
- omission of consonant letters: balder (ba-la-lar), kelp tur (kelip tur);
- repeated use of vowel letters: bilmeymiiin, kashaaaaaaan?
- expressing the main idea in a sentence with capital letters: KUZHATTARDY TEZ ZHIBER!
- not using the proper punctuation.

The linguistic analysis of social network communication yields a plethora of intriguing findings. Another notable result is the prevalence of informal language and abbreviations, reflecting the casual nature of online interactions. Emoticons and emojis are frequently employed to convey emotions and tone, adding nuance to text-based communication. Moreover, linguistic innovations, such as hashtags and memes, emerge and spread rapidly within online communities, shaping the discourse and influencing language evolution. Studies

also reveal linguistic variations across different social networks and user demographics, highlighting the dynamic nature of online communication.

CONCLUSION

To conclude, the examination of social media communication through linguistic analysis offers significant understanding of the complexities of virtual communication. It draws attention to how crucial language is in digital contexts for socialization, identity construction, and cultural expression. Through the analysis of language use patterns on social media platforms, a more profound comprehension of modern communication practices and social dynamics can be acquired. Furthermore, the data gathered from this kind of study can be utilized to create algorithms for sentiment analysis, opinion polling, and social network analysis, which will improve our comprehension and navigation of the constantly shifting social media environment. In addition, the information obtained from such analysis can be used in the development of new language examining methodologies that meet the requirements of the people of the present time as well as comprehend the ever-evolving landscape of social media.

REFERENCES

Amirov, R. (1977). *Peculiarities of spoken language syntax.* School Press.

Datareportal. DIGITAL 2023: KAZAKHSTAN. (2023). *The state of digital in Kazakhstan in 2023.* https://datareportal.com/reports/digital-2023-kazakhstan

Fedotov, A., Barakhnin,V., Murzakhmetov, A., & Milyuk, I. (2020). Modelling of process information dissemination and its impact dynamics to mass consciousness. *Journal of Theoretical and Applied Information Technology, 98*(23), 3691–3702.

Gulgaisha, S., Lyazat, M., Magripa, Y., & Karlygash, S. (2016). General lexicological fund of Turkic languages. *Social Sciences, 11*(22), 5418–5426. https://doi.org/10.3923/sscience.2016.54 18.5426

Hilte, L., Vandekerckhove, R., & Daelemans, W. (2018). Social media writing and social class: A correlational analysis of adolescent CMC and social background. *International Journal of Society, Culture & Language, 6*(2), 73-89.

Kurmanbekova, Z., Sarekenova, K., Oner, M., Malikov, K., & Shokabayeva, S. (2023). A Linguistic Analysis of Social Network Communication. I*nternational Journal of Society, Culture & Language, 11*(1), 119-132. doi: 10.22034/ijscl.2023.1972010.2824

Miftakhova, A., Bochina, T., & Malikov, A. (2020). Woman vs. baba in Russian culture and internet language. *International Journal of Society, Culture & Language, 8*(3), 54-62.

NapoleonCat. *Instagram/ Facebook/ WhatsApp/ Tiktok users in Kazakhstan.* (2024). https://napoleoncat.com/stats/social-media-users-in-kazakhstan/2024/03/

Sadirova K. (2019). İnternet jelisindegi qazaq tiliniñ erekşelikteri (Features of the Kazakh language on the Internet) // *Diskursologya máseleleri.* Aqtóbe: Kolibri, 71-78 pp. [In Kaz.]

Zummo, M. (2018). The effect of CMC in business emails in lingua franca: Discourse features and misunderstandings. *International Journal of Society, Culture & Language, 6*(1), 47-59.