



**International
Journal of Society, Culture & Language
IJSCL**

Journal homepage: www.ijsc.net
ISSN 2323-2210 (online)

A Linguistic Analysis of Social Network Communication

Zulfiya Rahmatdildaevna Kurmanbekova^{1a}, Karlygash Kurmangaliyevna Sarekenova^{2a},
Mustafa Oner^{3b}, Kuanyshbek Turarbekovich Malikov^{4a}, Saltanat Sagatovna
Shokabayeva^{5a}

ARTICLE HISTORY:

Received October 2022
Received in Revised form December 2022
Accepted December 2022
Available online January 2023

KEYWORDS:

Social network communication
Colloquialization
Expressiveness
Polycode
Unmotivated multilingualism

Abstract

This article defines the linguistic analysis of social network communication in the Kazakh language. Based on the materials of Kazakh-language social network speech, the article defines the linguistic characteristics of social network language. At the same time, language levels (phonetics, vocabulary, morphology, and syntax) and social network communication characteristics are examined. The language of social networks is used to gather materials, which are then examined using structural-functional, comparison, and description methods. The authors identify the linguistic characteristics of social networks language through the analysis of linguistic materials. These characteristics include unmotivated multilingualism, colloquialization, expressiveness, polycode, vulgarity, and cheapness of speech in network language. The identification of these social network linguistic elements reflects the article's scholarly uniqueness. Additionally, it clarifies that virtual communication is quickly expanding into the third area in which the Kazakh language is used, expanding the notion that it only exists in two forms - oral and written.

¹ PhD Candidate, Email: kurmanbekova.zulfiya@mail.ru (Corresponding Author)
Tel: +7-870-02283825

² Professor, Email: sareke.kk@gmail.com

³ Professor, Email: mustafa.oner@ege.edu.tr

⁴ Professor, Email: k.malikov@mail.ru

⁵ Professor, Email: shokabaeva@yandex.kz

^a L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Kazakhstan

^b Ege University, Turkey

<http://dx.doi.org/10.22034/ijsc.2023.1972010.2824>

© 2023 Kurmanbekova, Sarekenova, Oner, Malikov, and Shokabayeva.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY).

1. Introduction

It is known that human being exists in an informational environment. Information technology (IT) gained widespread popularity at the beginning of the 21st century. At present, the state program “Digital Kazakhstan” is functioning (State program “Digital Kazakhstan”, 2017) which emphasizes the significance of educating a competitive and forward-thinking generation by presenting IT technologies to all spheres of society (Adilbaeva et al., 2022).

Today, in the era of globalization, the most generally used form of communication is Internet communication (Fedotov et al., 2020). Internet communication has become the image of contemporary times. Many linguists admit that the Internet expansion has led to the appearance of electronic communication along with spoken and written forms (Goroshko, 2007). The electronic form of communication has its own exchange environment and is considered as a tool that meets its own needs. Internet communication comprises numerous discourse experiences, distinctive methods, and formats of communication. The virtual language personality has become an issue of discussion (Zummo, 2018). As a result, it is still important to analyze the linguistic characteristics of the Internet language, in which researchers are becoming more and more interested (Miftakhova et al., 2021).

The Kazakh-language social network is regarded as an objective fact of Kazakh society today. According to the Internet world stats website, 14,669,853 people used the Internet in Kazakhstan on June 30, 2021, accounting for 77.2% of the total population, with 11,825,000 people using Facebook. Aside from Facebook, there are other popular networks in the country, with 1 million users per day. WhatsApp has 125,000 views, Instagram has 558,000 views, and V Kontakt has 252,000 views (International world stats. Usage and population statistics, 2022). According to these figures, the Kazakh language is extensively used in social media. Literary language infringement, poor speech etiquette, and the dominance of other language elements are all features of network language, situations in which language culture is lost. However, we cannot deny that social network language is a functional area (variety) with distinct characteristics used in a specific

communicative environment to meet a specific communicative need. The language of social networks, in fact, is increasing the use of the Kazakh language on the Internet. Thus, this research study focuses on the general language and vocabulary of the network rather than the internal features of the network language (Uderbaev, 2017; Zhumataev, 2018). In so doing, we attempt to consider the differences between social network language and spoken and written language, as well as linguistic characteristics and main features. In Kazakh linguistics, no concrete efforts have been made to consider social network language from this perspective.

2. Theoretical Framework

Communication in social networks differs from spoken language and written communication (Hilte et al., 2018). Kazakh literary language is expressed in two ways: oral and written communication. Each has its own characteristics and differs in terms of the language tool system, the character of the addressee, and the reception features (Gulgaisha et al., 2016). According to Amirov (1977), oral speech is the initial state of language. Its main communicative conditions that form the spoken language are:

- 1) giving an opinion is oral and requires the speaker and listener to be face-to-face;
- 2) expressing an opinion takes the form of a dialogue, requiring the participation of two or more people;
- 3) expressing an opinion occurs spontaneously during a free conversation.

Bookishness, rational-logical structures, formality, and standardization of language tools are the foundations of written language (Aliszhanov, 2007). Written and spoken language are closely related, but they differ as a “speech unit.” The following are the main differences between the two:

1. The speaker is not directly involved in the written language, but the speaker is directly involved in the spoken language, so the speaker’s influence on the communication process is dominant. The written language is unique in that the writing process is unique to the writer. He can only imagine the reader in his mind, and there is no reading or correction on the part of the receiver during the writing process.

2. If the primary function of written language is to convey information over long distances, spoken language serves as a means of communication in a conversational setting. As a result, the functions of written and spoken language differ.

3. Spoken language is distinguished by a number of emotional and artistic tools that enhance communication and make information reception and delivery accurate and economical. Nonverbal means of speech activity are involved, and they adapt the spoken language to the speech situation. The semantic completeness of written language is distinguished, whereas language tools (lexical and grammatical) are distinguished by the complete expression of information content. Simultaneously, the writer must ensure that the reader fully comprehends the text.

4. Children learn spoken language through natural communication with adults (Ayapova, 2003). Because written language is formed as a result of conscious learning (reading), mastering the methods of expressing thoughts in writing, which is formed visually, is required.

5. Written language enables the writer to plan ahead of time; the writer has the possibility to review and correct sentences, replace parts of the text, replace words in the text, clarify, and consult dictionaries and reference books. Spoken language emerges spontaneously during a conversation.

6. Book (written) elements and standard language structures are used in the written language. The order of the words in the sentence is fixed. Inversion is not a feature of written language, and in some cases, such as in formal style, it is not even possible. Sentence structures in written language are complete, with complex syntactic structures, pronoun and prepositional phrases, complex determiners, conjunction constructions, and other features that are typical. Sentences are connected in meaningful ways, and paragraphs are organized to convey a complex idea. Spoken language also adheres to the literary norm; however, contradictions and deviations from the norm are common because the distinction between language and speech (speech) is in their generality and individuality, and spoken language is characterized by individuality.

Although there are fundamental differences between written and spoken language, they cannot be contrasted. Both spoken language and written literary language affect and complement each other at the early stages of interaction and at the advanced stages today.

The Internet has emerged as a new sphere of Kazakh language use, and it is rapidly expanding. Internet space, as a multifaceted, multifunctional communication medium, has a number of distinguishing characteristics. The Internet prioritizes written communication. At the same time, visual information is essential. Some researchers refer to the Internet system as an oral communication system. According to Kuderinova (2010), today, the primary communicative activity of writing has been pushed to second place by technical means of oral communication (types of telephones and Internet systems). The written language (*WL by Z.K.*) system is not preserved due to the fact that we refer to the Internet system as an oral communication system even though writing graphics and symbols are used. The oral language (*OL - Z.K.*) system generates information, and it has even spawned its own communication (audio-visual) system. Today, the writing communication function is seen in two forms: 1) in the official, business nature of communication (official document); and 2) within the framework of correspondence via the Internet system. Chats and forums, as well as tools for exchanging short text messages (ICQ and its analogs), are popular Internet components for linguistics. Moreover, they are well-known among Internet users. The characteristics of social network communication are as follows:

1. Anonymity manifests itself in situations where a person who registers on a social network fills out a form and even posts a photo, but it is difficult to accept someone through the network. Furthermore, there are various types of false information and presentations on the Internet. Such Internet anonymity leads to a reduction of the Internet user's responsibility. And a lack of responsibility results in factors that reduce social and psychological safety during communication: enthusiasm, irresponsibility, and frequent deviation from the standard of some network participants. A person on the Internet may speak or act rudely while asserting the freedom of speech afforded by the Internet.

Users do all of this knowing that they will not be held accountable for their actions.

2. Communication is carried out in accordance with the network user's will and desires. A member of the network has the option to voluntarily form relationships with any other users and to end those relationships at any moment.

3. The difficulty of the emotional component of communication is the fact that the text is accompanied by symbols expressing various emotions.

4. The persistence of acts on the network that are unusual and do not follow any standards means the intention to do so. Some internet users engage in inappropriate behavior that defies social norms.

On the Internet, the Kazakh language is primarily utilized in written form, and interactive network communication has a pace that is similar to spoken language (Uderbayev, 2017). The social network is similar to a "second life", a substitute for real life, in which communication takes place differently than in email, chat, or forums, and it is rich and unique in its own right. A person shares detailed information about himself in social networks, which, on the one hand, reduces the hidden (anonymous) aspect of communication. A person provides detailed information about identity, address, and place of employment (educational organization) on social networks, whereas, in chats and forums, a nickname can be used. Personal information, such as family status, and political opinions, is displayed in some situations. There is an opportunity to look at other users' profiles and become acquainted on social networks. The difference between virtual and live communication is that it allows the user to choose whether or not to respond to a received message. Most of the time, when Internet users post something (such as sketching a picture, updating their status, changing their avatar, or sharing an idea), they anticipate the response of others (support or write a comment) (Fedotov et al., 2018). This indicates that the network is grounded in reality since when you ask someone a question in the real world, you have to wait for their response before you can act on it. On social media, waiting for a response can take some time, and occasionally there may be none at all. There are

other circumstances in such an online setting that go unresolved and remain incomplete.

Gestures, which are an integral aspect of the conversation, are typically used to communicate with one another in everyday situations. In social networks, these paralinguistic techniques are applied in a slightly different way. On the network, it is unable to always confirm if what is posted or uttered is accurate or untrue. A user may send a smiling emoticon, but in real life, the user's emotional state may be different. Take this conversation from a social network as an example:

- *How are you doing?*
- *Not too awful.*
- *What happened? You seem sad?*
- *No, everything is fine ...*

This conversation shows that the person who inquired about the circumstance took into account the other person's mood. The speaker believes the second speaker is not in a good mood. The dialogue would have gone differently if the second speaker had responded *Great! Strong! Excellent!* We take into account such circumstances when describing the difficulty of the emotional component of communication. Thus, the language of social networks is virtual communication. This is the third form of language communication, with the exception of oral and written forms. Virtual communication is not much different from oral and written communication. They are characterized by linguistic features as well as originality.

3. Methodology

3.1. Materials

For this research, different literature addressing the problems of linguists of the Kazakh language was used. Moreover, digital technologies, including social networks, were used. During the experiment, various ICT tools were used, which were found in free access to the Internet and did not affect the registration and payment of services. Posts on Facebook, VKontakte, web pages, dialogues, comments, posts on various topics, and statuses were taken as the basic materials of the research. These posts on social networks in the Kazakh language were necessary for us to identify the linguistic features of the social network language. During the research, about 2000 language materials were collected. The relation between language

units and language levels (vocabulary, morphology, word formation, and syntax) was determined. The changes in language units in the social network were also studied. We tried to show the relationship between the Kazakh literary dictionary and the language of the social network. It was taken into account that the place and role of the language in social network communication are determined by identifying and analyzing its linguistic features. It was also shown that speech experiments on social networks are a kind of language communication related to virtual communication.

3.2. Methods

Special linguistic methods were used in the research work, such as structural and functional analysis, classification and systematization of linguistic units, pragmatic analysis, comparison and partial comparison, and component and contextual analysis. In the course of linguistic observation, the method of mass sorting was used. We believe that such methods of analysis allow us to identify the specific features of the language in social networks, as well as to clarify the linguistic nature of virtual communication.

3.3. Procedure

3.3.1. Data Collection

The collection of language materials consisted of three stages: in the first stage, language examples were collected by random method. In the second stage, the relationship of language was determined by examples of language levels (vocabulary, morphology, word formation, and syntax). In the third stage, based on linguistic analysis, we tried to determine the place of language examples in the expression of the features of virtual communication. The article's materials were sourced from Kazakh language social networks, such as Facebook and Vkontakte, as well as posts and comments on web pages. The time period for the language examples, which ranged from 2020 to the present, was chosen at random. Facebook held a unique position in the collection of linguistic materials. According to data from the Internet World Stats website, as of June 30, 2021, 14,669,853 people - or 77.2% of the country's total population - were using the Internet in Kazakhstan, including 11,825,000 users of Facebook. (International world stats. Usage and population statistics, 2022). The methods of

analysis, comparison, description, and cognitive narration were used when using linguistic and graphic examples. Along with scientific literature, explanatory dictionaries and data from the Internet (e.g., Pishghadam, 2020) were used to determine the origin of some words.

3.3.2. Data Analysis

The analysis of language examples from the perspective of language culture was given special attention. In this regard, we have seen that social network language frequently deviates from the standard of literary language. Numerous language resources that are alien to the language culture were encountered during the analysis. Social and psychological issues, including those related to an individual's degree of literacy, education, emotional state, linguistic proficiency, etc., might be considered as one of the variables impacting this. In this regard, we are frequently compelled to draw attention to the negative factors, such as youth illiteracy, a lack of education, a lack of emotional self-control on the part of individuals, and a lack of in-depth mother tongue knowledge. Such unfavorable outcomes increase the vulgarity and cheapness of the language used in social networks. Such language usage is also permitted by social network communication's inherent anonymity.

In fact, the social network has no power to teach people to be illiterate. Users are to blame for the problem. People haven't given language culture, speaking, and writing culture enough attention since the advent of social networks. There are mistakes, including incorrectly applying brackets around words, incorrectly shortening words, blending other languages with Kazakh, and misusing the language (Abulaish, 2020). We must keep in mind that all of this not only diminishes the status of our native tongue but also may limit its application.

The context was taken into account when analyzing the language resources that were provided. The written post and the comments that were made on it served as the linguistic data for this study.

4. Results

Social network communication, like oral and written communication, has its own set of characteristics. Table 1 summarizes the concerns that have been discussed.

Table 1*Language Characteristics in Spoken, Written, and Online Social Media*

№	Language type	Oral language	Written language	Social network language
	Features			
1	The presence of the interlocutor during the conversation	The actual interlocutor participates in speech (listener's reaction influences the conversation)	Non-participation of the interlocutor in the speech (the writer can only guess the possible reaction)	The interlocutor may or may not be present (enabled as "online", but not communicating, in "invisible" mode)
2	Main function	communicative	development and transmission of new ideas	Both, communicative + self-promotion
3	Unpreparedness of speech or pre-preparedness	Speech occurs without preparation (appears during a conversation without prior preparation)	The speech must be prepared in advance, involving the possibility of editing at various stages of its preparation	Unpreparedness and preparedness are involved; unpreparedness brings closer to spoken language
4	Ways of mastering	Children's language emerges during natural conversations with adults	Formed as a result of conscious learning	Carried out on the basis of existing skills in both spoken and written language, technological knowledge, online etiquette knowledge, knowledge of online slangs, and memes are required.
5	Method of reception	Hearing	Seeing	Seeing
6	Method of use (way of living)	Lives in a period of time, the character of variability prevails	Lives in space can be returned or reread	Lives in space but can also be destroyed by the author himself
7	Nonverbal participation as a component	Non-verbal means are used (gestures, intonation), which show the interlocutor the sincerity of the communication	Non-verbal means are not used, which shows the importance of spelling and punctuation	Nonverbal tools together with paragraph elements (emoticons, smileys, stickers, animation, audio, and video recordings, etc.)
8	Degree of normalization	The deviation from the norm prevails	Literary standards are strictly followed	Weak norm

The primary characteristic of Internet language is its broad linguistic nature, which is reflected in its combination of both oral and written forms of linguistic communication. In particular, the main characteristics of the network language include 1) colloquialization; 2) expressiveness; 3) polycode; 4) vulgarization and cheapness of speech, and becoming multilingual. Each of these signs will be covered in detail below.

4.1. Colloquialism

The term "colloquialism" refers to the insertion of words from spoken language into the literary lexicon. Despite the social network's

predominant use of written language, members frequently use linguistic elements that are typical of spoken speech. The unpreparedness of speech is the root cause of colloquialisms in internet language. In the online community, it might be claimed that there is an unspoken rule that you should write as you speak. This allows for language preservation aspects and is acknowledged as common practice by the online community. The active use of words typical of spoken language, the dominance of vocabulary in speech tone, and the number of structures that adhere to the rules of the linguistic economy are characteristics of colloquialism (abbreviation, incompleteness, etc.). Colloquialism is prevalent in chat and

forum conversation, different types of blocks, pleasant letters and comments, and status updates on social media, but it is infrequent in formal business and educational messages, as well as on the pages of well-known people. Colloquialism occurs at all linguistic levels. Here are some examples to focus on.

Phonetics: According to phonetics, colloquialization is indicated by the reduction of sound series and the existence of numerous sound alterations. In this instance, certain phonetic processes also occur (Myrzabekov, 1993). An example of an apheresis phenomenon: *nestein?* (ne istein?) *neşesiñ?* (ne işesiñ?), *salyvatsyn ba?* (türtki) *salyp jatyrşyñ ba?*, *quyvatsyn?* (quyp jatyrşyñ?); Elements of haplology (similar or identical syllables dropping): *baldar* (balalar, *Notariusqa baldar metrika jasap...*); Diaeresis (last syllable dropping): *körinem* (körinemın), *aşymaid* (janym) *aşymaidy*); Reduction: *qiyyn* (qiyn), *jiyyn* (jiyn). There are some sound resemblances: *Kiiv* (Kiev). The phenomena of missing one sound: *täuraq* (Men bülardy körsem täur-aq jynym keledi); *jem ğo* (jem ğoi); and adaptation of foreign words: *resebı* (resept), *qūpia*, etc. Elements of graphoderivatology: *4aiaqty deputat*, *Tileuqabyıl 1000 jasar*.

Reduction is one of the effects of contracted language. In social media, contractions and abbreviations are frequently used for both original words and borrowings. For instance: *somen* (sonymen); *ne did?* *Men söidim, koment* (komentari), *İnsta* (İnstagramm), *separ* (separatis), etc.

Lexis and Morphology: In the language of social networks, colloquial words, basic vocabulary, vulgar words, barbarisms, and slangs are examples of colloquialisms. It is known that insulting terms are frequently used in oral language when the Kazakh language is spoken. Three categories of impolite words are listed by Sergaliev (2006):

- 1) Expressions used with the intent to humiliate, insult, or offend another person: – *İapyr-ai, myna malğünnyñ atymdy aluy-ai...* (S. Mukanov);
- 2) It can be used equally to describe an ugly or repulsive thing or person: – *Osy mağan şaitan qaptap ketti!* (S. Mukanov);
- 3) Phrases that emphasize a person's negative behavior in order to convey a negative

meaning: – *Al, biraq Japparhanovtai itti planetadan izdep tabu qiyn bolar* (S. Dosanov). Social media posts on different networks often have a similar image. On the Internet, vulgar words are used to discuss a range of societal issues. Examples are as follows: *orysqūl* (... köp baiqadym orysqūl adam au äldede orystyñ jieni me bilmedim); *bäle* (Ne bäle mynau? Qai el?); *doñyz* (Namyssyz doñyz bolyp öz ana tilinen jerinip ketkender ğoi...); *sorly*, *baiğūs* (Ai sorly qazaq oryssa söilesem bai, danyşpan bolyp körinem dep); and etc.

Word-formation patterns are found at the morphological level. Joined words: *Äleujeli* (Jer dauy bastalğaly berı äleujeli qoğamy "sabyrşylar" men "bülikşiler", "aqyldylar" men "aqymaqtar" bolyp bölünip aldy); *laikqūmar*; *JeBe* (meaning "arrow"; contraction for network activists). This word was created by a network user for the following reasons: What kind of name is it? It is also appropriate, in my opinion, to use a single term to identify active and well-known writers on the network, not only the word "Blogger". A blogger is someone who regularly blogs and maintains a blog. This is different from network activists. And Arrow appears to be succeeding. There will be headshots, behind-the-back shots, night shots, long-range arrows, short-range arrows, long-range arrows, and mass shootings. Should we use this name? (Arshat Oraz); *sūqpabastar men būqpabastar etc.*

The purpose of syntax is to express the speech characteristics of spoken language. Such syntactic forms are prevalent in spoken languages and are simple to say and comprehend. The social network also uses its grammatical system to convey speech because it is based on textual communication, which is essential to sustain and create the image of unprepared, natural dialogue. For instance, syntactically incomplete structures, the word order which is typical for spoken language patterns, etc. The development of phrases and sentence patterns both maintain the informal aspect of online language. The following model generates a number of characteristics of the syntax of social networks in the construction of phrases:

- 1) Dative case personal words + nouns: *good to say, criticize the authorities, do not follow the propaganda, stick to one's word, stick to one's work, a lesson for others, etc.*

2) Initial case personal words + nouns, verbs: *äkimnen ümit joq, qoldan qaiyr joq, şetinen qortyq, etc.*

The grammar level of the network language has abnormalities such as inconclusive and unfinished sentences and complicated constructions without conjunctions (*Kim bolğanyn sūrady – Kim boldy, sony sūrady*). For instance:

Incomplete structures: *Şyğarmaityndary joq; Arman krasavchik;*

Word order: *Būlardyñ nany ğoi qazır bül instagram ... (Qazır instagram būlardyñ nany ğoi (jep otyrğan); Osylardyñ köz jasy jibermes ony (Ony osylardyñ köz jasy jibermeidi);*

Nominals: *Köktem şai; Resebı qūpia; Küluun! Küştı! Keremet! Tamaşa! Detäl! Zäkeñnuñ aruağy üşin!*

Parcellation structures: *Mynadai başylardy bazarğa sauda jasauğa şyğaru. Satuşy etp.*

4.2. Expressiveness

Similar to other forms of communication, sharing, sending, and receiving many types of information, including emotional information, is the primary goal of virtual communication. Social network platforms today have a very emotional virtual environment. Users attempt to communicate in a clear, expressive, and powerful manner with the intention of achieving a certain communication goal. Word manipulation (the use of erratives, word innovation, etc.), which is characteristic of both individual users and the network community as a whole, holds a special place. With the introduction of multimedia and new semiotic signs, the limitless freedom and immediateness (mobility) of the Internet area is opening up new possibilities. Both natural language components and paralinguistic techniques (emoticons, Internet memes, gif images, audio recordings, etc.) are used to express expressiveness. In other words, verbal and non-verbal techniques are both used for expressiveness in online communication. The following are some examples of expressive methods made possible by social network language proficiency:

1) Phonetic and graphical aids

a) The use of emotional words that contain sound repetitions. Consonants and vowels both

exhibit it, and it can be used singly or in combination. The writer's desire to catch the attention of many people on the network is strengthened by the expression of their powerful emotions in their writing. When writing a word with vocal rhythm in informal language, the sounds used to describe the feelings—such as joy, wrath, excitement (excitement), sneer, etc.—are stretched:

Keeeremet; Rahmeeet; Qattyyyy şarşapppp jür ğoi jūmys jasap... ūqqqqō pışşşşşş; Küştui; Qaidaaasyñ? RAHMEEEEEET!!!!!!!! RAHMET, KRASAVITSIA!!!!!!!!!!!!, etc.

This style of writing (or speaking) words is used to stimulate the interlocutor's activity and to restart communication with others after a long break. Internet users desire to express their emotions to the public through this stretching of sounds, which is similar to a social network “copy” of words uttered with the pace of spoken language.

b) Erratives are words and expressions generated by purposeful distortions and wrong speech of persons speaking in accordance with the norm of literary language. This word, which derives from the Latin verb *errare*, means “to make a mistake”. In Internet communication, this phenomenon is referred to as “Olban language”, “Padonkaf language”, “Neograph language”, “ORFO-art language,” etc. It goes by a variety of names. Erratives are a particular kind of online slang; they are words that have “found a second life” by deviating from accepted writing conventions. Orthography, which is the representation of words and morphemes by letters, serves as the primary visible medium for erratives. The deliberate infractions of written composition are being disseminated via the Padonk language.

Both phonetic writing (also known as “write as it sounds”) and hypercorrection writing were methods of altering words in this manner (letters not conforming to writing standards at all). First and second level erratives are categories into which all erratives in the language can be placed. In the first-level erratives, the written norm is distorted in order to take on the shape of actual speech, and in the second-level erratives, the hyper-distorted, difficult-to-pronounce speech patterns utilized in the first erratives are included. Erratives in Russian are frequently broadcast on Kazakh-

language networks. For instance, the word “krasavchik,” which is frequently used, is corrupted to “krasafchek” at the second level. The following is a list of the words that are most frequently misspelled on the social network:

Ava (Avatar) - is a tiny image that the user uses to introduce himself as a “personality” on the social network.

Battl – competition

Bomba - a powerful protest against anything that occurs when someone is furious

Bot - a special program that executes any operation automatically and in accordance with a set timetable.

Bro - a caring person, not a friend or an acquaintance.

Varic - option.

Dr - birthday.

Jiza - life, vital.

Infä - information.

Lichka-LS - private messaging on social media.

Lol - derived from English laughing out loud.

Mb - maybe.

Mä - an abbreviation of "mässağan".

Nice - meaning “good” in English.

Nzch – meaning “You are welcome”.

Ninaiu- I don’t know.

Nihatü - I don’t want.

Norma - a variant of the word “normal”.

Nraisa - I like it.

Bummer - failure.

Obidka - pity.

Okeis - ok, alright.

Padazritelna - suspicious.

Päl - fake.

Pasä - thank you.

Pliz-pj - please.

Pok-pokasiki - goodbye.

Post - post on the Internet.

Prank - intentionally humorous activity;

Fah - funny.

Selfi - a self-portrait.

Spoki - Good night.

Sorän-sörki - sorry.

Tvit - a reaction to any inquiry (message, action), review.

Ugar - a very funny thing.

Haip - deception, easy fame.

Haïter - someone who feels hatred (both covert and overt) for something or someone.

Heşteg - a tag used in blogs and social networks.

Che-cho - what.

Chivo - what.

Şk - an abbreviation of “school”.

Şmot - a garment.

Şo - what.

ŞA - right now.

Obviously, the language culture does not support words that have been perverted in this way. The emergence of a “Padonkov subculture” in the online environment is entirely feasible if the literary norm’s words continue to be warped for everyone’s convenience and there is a language that is absolutely incomprehensible to the general populace, educated and literate individuals.

c) Phonetic compression represents the linguistic efficiency principle that is unique to spoken language. For example, men söidim (*söittim*); ne did? (*deidi*); separ (*separatis*); etc.

Word change serves as the foundation for such strategies as well as the use of erratives (also called “word play”). Word change has previously been thought of as one of the stylistic techniques for updating and modernizing language units, but with the rise of social networks, it has acquired a new quality. Internet users deliberately deviate from the accepted language norm by forming a casual setting with like-minded individuals, family members, and friends. Following writing, conventions are less crucial in this setting than they are for people to comprehend you clearly. The most important thing is to have a comfortable conversation so that words like “ne did”, “pj,” and “kaksyn” will turn the conversation into an emotional channel without even realizing it. It aims to lighten the atmosphere of network participants by making a serious subject humorous. There is stuttering, sarcasm, and irony. In reference to the fact that the officials are sleeping in the conference room, for instance: Qattyyyy şarşapppp jür ğoi jūmys jasap ... ūqqqqö pışşşşşş (şeneunikterdiñ mäjlilis zalynda ūiyqtap otyruyna orai); jeputat; etc.

2) Lexical and phraseological tools

a) In the online language, three categories of the expressive-emotional lexicon can be distinguished:

1) Words that stand alone without any additions and have an emotional color: *keremet*, *ğajap*, *şırkın*, *esil*, *tamaşa*, *jaisañ*, *darqan*, *baiğūs*, *teksız*, *şıkireigen*, *aljyğan*, *boqmüryn* etc. 2) Words that have an emotional color in the text

include: *El bolamyz ba degen armanymyzdy qūl qylatyn paradoks; Jarq-jūrq etken jelsiz qatıup ömir süruge bolady? Bürkit torǵaidyñ äñgimesin aıtypty; Osyny körsem orysşany on şainap üzer jūtatynyma quanam; Tūieqūs bop ömir süre bermeisñ ğoi*; 3) Words with emotional connotations created by word-forming suffixes, such as: *sūqpabas, būqpabas, şalaorys, nōlbireke, ataşka, aqordist, inşek, etc.* Many computer slang terms, such as *kaif, obaldet, otstoi, figovo, etc.*, are used in the context of the Internet in the youth language or in Russian. There are regional dialects such as “*qasqa* (Qasqa, aiap kettim ğoi), *ölä, qaiqaqtan*”.

b) Abbreviation usage. Abbreviations can be understood as acronyms, and the processes used in their construction allow us to observe how vocabulary and word formation interact. Acronyms, which initially appear as abbreviated units, “take on a life of their own” as distinct words. Many acronyms from the English language are still used in Kazakh-language networks, especially among young people, and such phrases have entered the Kazakh language from English:

DWBH - “never be sad, be happy” in Kazakh.
HAGD – Have a great day;
HNY – Happy New Year;
BFF - Best friends forever;
CYL – See You;
IMHO – In my opinion;
LOL - “Laugh out loud”;
OMG – Oh My God;
ROFL - I roll on the floor laughing (in the sense of laughing out loud) etc.

This type of abbreviation first came into use for linguistic economy reasons. Contractions are used in every language, and the Kazakh language has its own examples, particularly in the context of network communication. Examples include using *qa* («qazır» dep tolyq aitudyñ ornyna), *ĝo* (ĝoi), *ra* (raqmet), and others.

c) Fixed units. For social networks, internet memes are a dependable building block. By consistently disseminating any idea or phrase online, an Internet meme has evolved into a representation of stability. Internet memes have the benefit of being shorter and more concise, and this is their main focus (Shchurina, 2014). The reader (internet user) also discovers further

continuation, ensuring that their ideas are consistent and that they can see exactly how to get to their destination. The modern Internet contains a variety of Internet meme groups, including text memes, image memes, media memes, and Creole memes (Polishchuk, 2020). In this case, it is obvious that textual memes, rather than non-verbal memes, will be covered. Text memes can take the shape of words, phrases, or sentences, but no matter how they combine, they convey a single idea. For instance, *ūiatmen* (a sign of inappropriate embarrassment), *Bākeden keldim* (a sign of corruption), *sūrpriz* (a surprise from the village), etc.

3) Word-formation units

Joining: *sūqpabas, būqpabas, etc.*;

Conjugation of suffixes: *-şyl/-şıl: ūtikşıl* (ūltsyl emes ūtikşıl boldy ğoi); *bolymysz körsetkışteri -syz/-sız: ūltsyz, teksız, namyssyz, otansyz, dınsız, etc.*;

Contraction: *inet* (Internet), *insta* (Instagram).

4) Morphological units

Interjection: *Apyrma-ai, Bārekeldi, Tāit, Tāāk, Fu, Oibu, Uh, Ua, ätteñ, Bāse, Tāıırı etc.*

Imitative words: *qalt-qūlt* (*qalt-qūlt etken şaldar*); *jarq-jūrq* (*jarq-jūrq etken jeli serileri*); *tyrtyñ-tyrtyñ, myrtyñ-myrtyñ, haha, eee-de* (*eeee dedim*); *sylyñ-sylyñ* and etc.;

5) Syntax units

Parcellation. The parcellation phenomenon has a long history in language as part of the expressive syntax. A. Baitursynuly once referred to similar sentence structures as “adjacent clauses” (Baitursynov, 1992). Social network syntax contains similar structures. They break up the sentence and convey information in small parts. These are semantically emotional details. As an example: *Mynadai basşylardy bazarǵa sauda jasauǵa şyǵaru. Satusy etip; Qairan sary aptobyz. Tañǵy saǵat 8:00-de ketetin. Audan ortalyǵyna. Tūska bırler şamasynda keletin. Audan ortalyǵynan.*

Use of ellipsis and adding dynamism and impact by removing one part of the sentence: *Men balamdy äskeri mektepke bergem sol mekomandırıne sekirup oqymaim dep ... Men*

oğan ne zvandaisyñ ol turbkany tastai saldy, sodan söilespedik ...

Repetitiveness: *Qoş endi, qoş bol instagramm ... Üiatsyz, üiatsyz eken, üiaty joq ... Qazaqtyñ jartysy – blogger, jartysy – balger, etc.*

4.3. Polycoding

The fact that the text does not consist only of single language units has become very popular, especially in the modern era of the Internet; thus, hybridity, bimedia, polymedia, multimedia, verbal-visual, and multi-coded text as a communicative unit has firmly entered the scientific circulation. The text's nature is comprised of the unity of the aforementioned elements and is accepted as a whole. The text network is made up of not only linguistic symbols but also graphic, font, and visual tools that work in tandem with linguistic units to help the reader understand the meaning of the text. Emoticons, stickers, and Internet memes are some examples. Lined texts can be found in Internet language and are also an example of polycode. Multimedia, audio, and video recordings convey emotion and mood. These are nonverbal materials known as multicode in linguistics (polycode). Emoticons, stickers, and memes are examples of nonverbal materials.

4.4. Speech Coarsening and Cheapness, as well as Multilingualism

The abuse of literary language conventions, the decline in speech etiquette, and the uncontrolled use of foreign words (barbarisms) are some of the most destructive aspects of Internet language. There is now a networking etiquette known as “netiquette” due to the social network language's rapid adoption in daily life. The social network and other factors both have an impact on how coarse and cheap speech culture has become. As non-social network factors, we would classify social and psychological (psychological state of people) problems, such as a person's literacy level, education, emotional state, language proficiency, etc. In this regard, we are frequently compelled to draw attention to the negative aspects, such as youth illiteracy, a lack of education, a lack of emotional self-control on the part of individuals, a lack of in-depth mother tongue knowledge, etc. It is no secret that such unfavorable outcomes increase the vulgarity and cheapness of the language used in social networks.

In the end, the social network neither has the ability nor the responsibility to teach us to be illiterate. Users are to blame for the problem. In fact, since the advent of social networks, people have not given language culture - including speaking and writing culture - enough attention. While providing examples above, we mentioned a few of them. Deficits include incorrect word formation, inappropriate word shortening, the blending of other languages with Kazakh, and linguistic confusion. We must keep in mind that all of this not only diminishes the status of our native tongue but also may limit its application. The language must be preserved, norms must be thoroughly understood, and a high level of general linguistic competence must be attained, especially for young people who have only recently started to distinguish between right and left.

What is the cause of this decline in language culture? The main justification for users of social networks to use a false name to appear undercover is the relative anonymity (secrecy) of communication on these platforms. This circumstance, in our opinion, contributes to recklessness, impunity, irresponsibility, and slander on social media. Internet users, especially young people, who are aware of their impunity, engage in a variety of rude behaviors during communication that are directly related to language use. These factors allow for the use of vulgar language, language deviations, and cheap speech in the social network's language.

The casual use of Russian slang terms and expressions is an illustration of this. Because of the distorted words above, we quoted them. Other instances of impolite speech in the Kazakh language include *Mal, tılıñe ie bol; Ölseişiş, etc.* The dialogs below as an example:

Type-I

- *Sälem dosym, hal qalai?*
- *Şükır jaqsy, öziñ qalaisyñ?*
- *Bügingı keşke daiyndyğyñ qalai?*
- *Ata-anam jümystan kelgesin baratyn boldym.*
- *Jaraidy, endeşe keşikpe, kütemiz!*
- *Kezdeskenşe!*

Type-II

- *Salam kent kaksyn*
- *tema ozin*
- *tema goi che tam keşke neisteisin kelesinba*
- *problema keş baram*
- *dyvai keşikpe jdem*

If we pay close attention, we can see the two dialoguers' literacy and cultural backgrounds. Which conversation partners do you find more enjoyable to engage with? Naturally, the first. This is because he has excellent language skills, is visually appealing, and responds readily. It is clear and punctuated. We cannot say the same about the second one. It is necessary to strengthen explanatory work so that users of social networks do not break the word, write a word together, use words borrowed from other languages, or shorten the word structure.

5. Discussion

The linguistics field is becoming increasingly interested in the language of social networks. A group of authors led by Yergaliyeva investigated the emergence of text creation in virtual space in Kazakh and English (Yergaliyeva, 2022). It is a fact that there is more Kazakh-language content on social networks in our nation. One of the most pressing issues is to take into account the linguistic characteristics of the online language as Kazakh usage has started to reflect in the virtual world. The study of the language of social networks started in Kazakh linguistics. There are, however, still very few studies that offer a detailed linguistic analysis of online language. We made an effort to close this linguistic knowledge gap in this article.

There are two varieties of the Kazakh language: spoken and written. The third area in which the Kazakh language is used is virtual communication. Social network communication has unique characteristics, just like oral and written communication does. These characteristics are mentioned in this article as being such: 1) anonymity; 2) communication on the network which is carried out in accordance with the will and preferences of the network user; 3) non-verbal cues which are used in addition to text to express emotion; and 4) online behavior deviating from conventional social norms.

The social network was also compared to different forms of oral and written communication in terms of the speaker's participation and role during the speech, preparedness or lack thereof, transmission and reception techniques, lifestyles, and the degree of normalization, participation, and outcomes of using non-verbal communication. The social

network language has unique traits; it is distinguished by stylistic variety, multifunctionality, multilingualism, speed, and features of both its oral and written manifestations.

The article lists unmotivated multilingualism, colloquialization, expressiveness, polycode, vulgarity, and cheapness of speech as linguistic characteristics of the language of the social network. To recap, the term "colloquialization" describes the process by which words from the spoken language are incorporated into the canon of literature. The social network is dominated by written language, but despite this, users of the network frequently use linguistic elements that are typical of spoken speech. There are many different ways to express yourself in the social network language. Internet users strive to communicate clearly, expressively, and forcefully while pursuing a specific communication objective.

Speech (use of erratives and word creativity) holds a special place, and expressiveness is a trait shared by the network community as a whole as well as by individual users. Texts on social networks include graphic, font, and visual elements in addition to natural language units, which demonstrates the polycode nature of the network language. The purpose of polycoding is to comprehend both the linguistic units and the meaning of the text. Some aspects of social network communication contribute to the cheapness and rudimentaryness of speech. This was cited as one of the linguistic traits that make communication in contemporary social networks distinct.

At different language levels, these linguistic-stylistic characteristics manifest in different ways. At the level of vocabulary, phraseology, and morphology, as well as to a lesser extent at the level of phonetics, colloquialization and expressiveness are almost equally discernible. The vocabulary and phraseology exhibit polycode, vulgarization, and cheapness. Accordingly, it is evident that the vocabulary of social networks undergoes significant changes and stands out when compared to other language levels.

The study of the social network's language from a linguistic perspective shows that it differs from other kinds of communication in a number of ways. We offer to define the

pragmatics of social network communication, the different ways that social network users communicate based on their language use strategy, as a perspective for the research effort. The results of the research will allow us to further research the pragmatics and language strategy of social network communication. Therefore, the linguistic characteristics in this paper may be the basis for future research.

References

- Abulaish, M., Kamal, A., & Zaki, M. J. (2020). A survey of figurative language and its computational detection in online social networks. *ACM Transactions on the Web*, 14(1), 1-52. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3375547>
- Adilbaeva, U., Mussanova, G. A., Mombekova, N. B., & Suttibaev, N. A. (2022). Digital communication technology for teaching a foreign language and culture through reading. *International Journal of Society, Culture & Language*, 10(3), 21-30. <https://doi.org/10.22034/ijsc.2022.543110.2472>
- Aliszhanov, S. (2007). *Syntax of scientific prose (structural and communicative foundations)*. Arys Press.
- Amirov, R. (1977). *Peculiarities of spoken language syntax*. School Press.
- Ayapova, T. T. (2003). *Ontogeny of speech*. Rarity Press.
- Baitursynov, A. (1992). *Language training (Kazakh language and educational works)*. Ana Tili Press.
- 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.
- Fedotov, A. M., Murzakhmetov, A. N., & Dyusembaev, A. E. (2018). Expansion of ideas and processes in social and biological communities. *Eurasian Journal of Mathematical and Computer Applications*, 6(4), 17-28.
- Goroshko, E. I. (2007, January 1). *Internet linguistics: The formation of a disciplinary paradigm*. CORE. https://core.ac.uk/display/343952107?utm_source=pdf&utm_medium=banner&utm_campaign=pdf-decoration-v1
- 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.2016.5418.5426>
- 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.
- International world stats. Usage and population statistics. (2022). *Internet 2022 usage in Asia Internet users, Facebook subscribers & population statistics for 35 countries and regions in Asia*. <https://www.internetworldstats.com/stats3.htm>
- Kuderinova, K. (2010). *Theoretical foundations of Kazakh writing*. Almaty Press.
- 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.
- Myrzabekov, S. (1993). *Phonetics of the Kazakh language*. Kazakh University Press.
- Pishghadam, R., Ebrahimi, S., & Derakhshan, A. (2020). Cultuling analysis: A new methodology for discovering cultural memes. *International Journal of Society, Culture & Language*, 8(2), 17-34.
- Polishchuk, O., Vitiuk, I., Kovtun, N., & Fed, V. (2020). Memes as the phenomenon of modern digital culture. *Wisdom*, 2(15), 45-55. <https://doi.org/10.24234/wisdom.v15i2.361>
- Sergaliev, M. (2006). *Basics of stylistics*. L.N. Gumilyov National University Press.
- Shchurina, Yu. V. (2014). Internet meme in the structure of comic speech genres. *Genres of speech*, 1(9), 147-153. <https://doi.org/10.18500/2311-0740-2014-1-2-9-10-147-153>
- State program "Digital Kazakhstan" (2017, December 12). *Information and legal system of normative legal acts of the Republic of Kazakhstan*. <https://adilet.zan.kz/kaz/docs/P1700000827>
- Uderbaev, A. (2017, March 02). *The Internet and the new space of the Kazakh language*. <https://anatili.kazgazeta.kz/news/41454>

- Yergaliyeva, S., Anesova, A., Melnik, N., Uaikhanova, M., & Sarybayeva, B. (2022). Linguistic-personological strategies and practices of commenting on political texts in virtual space. *International Journal of Society, Culture & Language*, 10(3), 125-136. <https://doi.org/10.22034/ijsc.2022.558154.2714>
- Zhumataev, E. (2018). Literary language and social network: Language competition and modern nature of literary language. *L.N. Gumilyov ENU, Bulletin. Philology Series, 1*, 50-57.
- 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.
- Fedotov A. M., Murzakhmetov A. N., & Dyusembaev A. E. (2018). Expansion of ideas and processes in social and biological communities. *Eurasian Journal of Mathematical and Computer Applications*, 6(4), 17-28.