

Abbreviation As Articulation: A Qualitative Linguistic Exploration Of Communicative Functions In Discord Chats

Sarah Priscilla Silitonga¹, Selviana Napitupulu²

^{1,2}English Teacher, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, University Of HKBP

Nommensen Pematangsiantar, Indonesia

Corresponden E-mail; sarahsilitonga17@gmail.com

Abstrak

Tujuan penelitian ini menguji fungsi komunikatif singkatan dalam percakapan Discord berdasarkan Analisis Wacana yang Dimediasi Komputer (CMDA). 500 pesan diambil sampelnya dari lima komunitas Discord yang berbeda, termasuk grup game, pendidikan, dan berbasis minat selama periode tiga bulan. Empat kategori singkatan muncul: inisialisme (42%), reduksi fonologis (28%), bahasa gaul Gen Z (22%), dan substitusi alfanumerik (8%). Hasilnya menunjukkan bahwa empat fungsi komunikatif utama singkatan adalah efisiensi struktural, modulasi nada pragmatis, pemeliharaan interaksional, dan pembentukan identitas sosial. Mereka beroperasi sebagai sumber daya multivalen untuk menciptakan makna, dan dengan demikian maknanya dibangun bersama secara in situ melalui kemunculannya. Secara bersamaan, mereka memiliki fungsi indeks semantik, pragmatis, dan sosial. Merajalelanya singkatan Gen Z seperti "fr," "ngl," dan "no cap" menunjukkan bahwa singkatan telah menjadi alat sosiolinguistik yang digunakan untuk menegaskan kepemilikan budaya dan keanggotaan generasi. Artikel ini menambah khazanah beasiswa linguistik digital dengan menyelidiki bagaimana singkatan membangun makna dan hubungan dalam pengaturan virtual.

Kata kunci: Singkatan, Computer-Mediated Discourse Analysis, Discord, Fungsi Komunikatif, Identitas Digital

Abstract

This paper investigates communicative purposes of the use of abbreviations in Discord chats based on the Computer-Mediated Discourse Analysis (CMDA) framework. Over three months, 500 chat messages in five Discord servers of gaming, educational and hobby communities were gathered. The study found four types of abbreviations, including initialisms (42%), phonological reductions (28%), Gen Z slang (22%), and alphanumeric replacements (8%). Results show that abbreviations have four main communicative purposes, namely, structural efficiency, tone modulation pragmatically, interactional continuity, and social identity construction. Abbreviations are multi-purpose resources that can only have sense in a context of negotiation, and at the same time they carry semantic, pragmatic, and social indexicalities. Such immense popularity of Gen Z forms like fr, ngl and no cap suggests that abbreviations have become sociolinguistic signifiers of belonging to a culture and generational identity. This paper has made a contribution to digital linguistics by enlightening on the influence of abbreviations in establishment of connotation and social bond within virtual communities.

Keywords: Abbreviation, Computer-Mediated Discourse Analysis, Discord, Communicative Functions, Digital Identity

INTRODUCTION

The language is in constant movement under the influence of the development of technologies, and abbreviation is one of the most obvious signs of a language shift in the digital world. Abbreviation is the act of reducing words or phrases in order to attain economy and communicative effectiveness. Dürscheid and Frick (2016) maintain that a short in digital form

represents the act of interaction between economy and expressiveness in language, whereas Yus (2021) focuses on the fact that the abbreviations in the online discourse do not only have the economical nature but contain also the social connotation of expressing attitudes, emotions, and solidarity.

The internet platforms have facilitated the communication of people and creation of meaning. The emergence of chat-based applications, including WhatsApp, Telegram, and Discord, has spawned new language patterns in the form of abbreviations, emojis, acronyms, and multimodal expressions. The literature on computer-mediated communication (CMC) indicates that digital space promotes a combination of verbal and written language elements (Herring, 2019; Seargeant and Tagg, 2019). Baron (2018) refers to LOL, BRB, and IDK as the examples of pragmatic markers that can be used to soften the tone or convey the sense of humor, whereas Tagliamonte and Denis (2008) mention that online youth language relies on shortened forms to a great extent to express both emotion and social orientation.

Even with this accumulating body of research, there has been little focus on the way abbreviations work within the context of Discord, which is a real-time voice, text, and community-based platform. The linguistic mayhem of the hybrid environment of Discord creates new linguistic problems wherein abbreviations are socially and contextually empowered. Even a word like GG (good game) or AFK (away from keyboard) can be used in a polite manner by some communities but turn into sarcasm. Additionally, the new abbreviations popular with Gen Z users, including fr (for real), ngl (not gonna lie), ong (on God), cap (lie) and sus (suspicious) can be used to understand how linguistic creativity overlaps with cultural identity. However, the majority of linguistic research continues to focus on mainstreams, like Twitter or WhatsApp (Androutsopoulos, 2014; Herring, 2019), and establishes a crucial gap in comprehending the pragmatically and socially functioning of modern abbreviations across Discord communities.

In order to fill this gap, the current paper examines the concept of abbreviation as a communicative resource used in the Discord communication, through the prism of Computer-Mediated Discourse Analysis (CMDA). In particular, the following research questions will be addressed in the given study:

1. What are the most common abbreviations on Discord chats?
2. What is the purpose of communicative use of these abbreviations in Discord conversations?
3. What is the role of abbreviations in meaning-making and interpersonal relationship in Discord communities?

Responding to these questions, this research will be a contribution to the field of digital linguistics as it will look at the use of abbreviations to express, phatically, and interpersonally in online chats and how these types of linguistic forms influence the daily communication of virtual communities.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The Nature and Function of Abbreviation in Digital Communication

Abbreviation is one of the most vibrant linguistic strategies in online interaction, both economical and creative in linguistic and social terms. Durscheid and Frick (2022) note that abbreviation in digital communication represents a trade-off between efficiency and expressiveness, whereas Yus (2021) believes abbreviations encode politeness, position, and a

sense of group belonging. Crystal (2019) further contributes that abbreviation signals flexibility to technological limitations and conversational speed. Common forms like LOL, BRB, and TBH not only save time but also convey familiarity, intimacy, and emotional tone in online communities.

In pragmatic view, abbreviations serve various communicative roles beyond brevity. Seargeant and Tagg (2019) categorize abbreviations as interactional indicators to maintain conversational flow and social togetherness, whereas Baron (2018) notes they soften tone to minimize textual directness and maximize rapport. Tagliamonte and Denis (2008) demonstrate that youth use of abbreviations signals identity and solidarity, serving as an indicator of belongingness in digital subcultures. These observations position abbreviation as a linguistic phenomenon occupying the intermediate between structure and social interaction with both semantic and relational meaning.

Contextual Variation and Platform-Based Linguistic Practices

Abbreviation practices differ widely across communication platforms based on technological design and social practices. Androutsopoulos (2014) explains that platforms shape language use: Twitter promotes abbreviations due to character limits, whereas WhatsApp relies on contextual familiarity. Discord combines synchronous and asynchronous communication, creating hybridized linguistic conduct. Leavitt et al. (2020) observe that Discord groups develop unique abbreviations not immediately understandable to non-members. This linguistic localization enhances group identity while potentially excluding new or peripheral users.

The complexity of abbreviation in Discord extends to issues of misunderstanding and ambiguity. Discord's global multicultural user base means abbreviation meanings can vary between communities. Trending Gen Z terms like fr, ngl, ong, cap, and sus complicate interpretation further. Yang and Xing (2024) found these newer abbreviations not only save language but signify social authenticity and insider roles. Users employ them as cultural cues in fandoms, gaming communities, and youth discourse, suggesting abbreviation has evolved into a socio-pragmatic device of membership.

The Pragmatic and Social Impact of Abbreviation Use

Empirical evidence indicates abbreviation impacts social perception and interaction. Grace, Lee, and Epley (2024) found messages with abbreviations received fewer replies in online group chats than full-written messages, as participants perceived them as less sincere and effortful. Beheka (2024) identifies modern abbreviation patterns including initialisms (IDK), phonological reductions (rly/really), alphanumeric abbreviations (u2/you two), and blended slang (cap, sus). These forms reflect evolving communicative standards based on digital affordances and sociocultural trends, emphasizing abbreviation's dynamical nature as linguistic and sociocultural innovation.

Ethical Considerations in Digital Discourse Research

The study of online communication raises important ethical considerations regarding participant privacy, consent, and data protection. Franzke et al. (2020) in the Association of Internet Researchers' Ethics Guidelines 3.0 emphasize that ethical approaches to internet research must be context-dependent and proportionate to the level of risk involved. Zimmer (2010) argues that researchers must balance the public nature of data with participants' reasonable expectations of privacy, noting that the "public/private" distinction in online spaces exists on a continuum requiring careful assessment of platform architecture, user demographics, and content sensitivity. Markham and Buchanan (2012) propose that ethical decision-making should consider the venue's level of perceived privacy, topic sensitivity, participant vulnerability, and potential for harm, recommending robust anonymization procedures and systematic exclusion of sensitive content for observational studies of public discourse.

Recent scholarship emphasizes proportionate ethical review based on research context and the importance of researcher positionality in observational studies. Franzke et al. (2020) argue that low-risk observational studies of publicly accessible content may not require the same institutional review as higher-risk studies, provided researchers implement appropriate safeguards including comprehensive anonymization and transparent reporting procedures. Herring (2019) and Markham and Buchanan (2012) further stress that researchers must maintain a passive observer stance without intervention or interaction to preserve ecological validity and minimize ethical risks. These principles inform the current study's ethical framework, which focuses on naturalistic observation of publicly accessible Discord servers while implementing systematic screening protocols to protect participant privacy and maintain the authenticity of naturally occurring digital discourse.

Theoretical Framework: Computer-Mediated Discourse Analysis (CMDA)

This study employs the Computer-Mediated Discourse Analysis (CMDA) framework created by Herring (2019), a linguistic approach combining structural, pragmatic, interactional, and social aspects of online communication. CMDA provides the basis for understanding language functioning in technologically mediated settings. Its four dimensions—structure (linguistic forms), meaning (communicative intent), interaction management (discourse organization), and social phenomena (community norms and identity markers)—make it especially applicable to studying abbreviations in Discord chats, where users combine written effectiveness with expressive creativity.

Table 1. The computer-mediated discourse analysis (CMDA) “toolkit”

Levels	Issues	Phenomena	Methods
Structure	Orality; formality; efficiency; expressivity; complexity; genre characteristics, etc.	Typography, orthography, morphology, syntax, discourse schemata, formatting conventions, etc.	Structural/Descriptive Linguistics, Text Analysis, Corpus Linguistics, Stylistics
Meaning	What is intended What is communicated What is accomplished	Meaning of words, utterances (speech acts), exchanges, etc.	Semantics, Pragmatics
Interaction management	Interactivity; timing; coherence; repair; interaction as co-constructed, etc.	Turns, sequences, exchanges, threads, etc.	Conversation Analysis, Ethnomethodology
Social phenomena	Social dynamics; power; influence; identity; community; cultural differences, etc.	Linguistic expressions of status, conflict, negotiation, face-management, play, discourse styles/lects, etc.	Interactional Sociolinguistics, Critical Discourse Analysis, Ethnography of Communication

Source : (Herring, 2019: 26-27)

Research Gap

While substantial research has examined abbreviations in digital communication, several critical gaps remain. Baron (2018) identified abbreviations as pragmatic cues for politeness management, and Tagliamonte and Denis (2008) documented their role in linguistic innovation among adolescents. Leavitt et al. (2020) investigated multimodal collaboration within Discord but focused primarily on network structures rather than linguistic forms. These studies affirm the linguistic and social significance of abbreviations but reveal three key limitations.

First, most existing research focuses on mainstream platforms such as Twitter or WhatsApp (Androutsopoulos, 2014; Herring, 2019), leaving Discord a platform with unique hybrid characteristics combining synchronous chat, community organization, and voice communication underexamined as a linguistic space. Second, prior studies have not adequately addressed recent Gen Z-driven abbreviation practices such as fr (for real), ngl (not gonna lie), ong (on God), and cap (lie), which carry distinct sociolinguistic functions beyond earlier forms like LOL or BRB. Third, there is limited research examining how abbreviations function simultaneously across multiple dimensions structural, pragmatic, interactional, and social within specific community contexts.

The current research addresses these gaps by examining the communicative functions of abbreviations in Discord messages through a CMDA framework, with particular attention to their pragmatic, expressive, and interpersonal dimensions. Additionally, this study responds to ethical considerations raised by Franzke et al. (2020) and Zimmer (2010) regarding observational research in public digital spaces, implementing systematic protocols to protect participant privacy while studying naturally occurring discourse.

METHOD

The current research utilized a qualitative descriptive research design to understand the communicative role of abbreviations in Discord chats. Computer-Mediated Discourse Analysis (CMDA) introduced by Herring (2019) was applied to examine linguistic forms, pragmatic roles, patterns of interaction, and social phenomena in Discord conversations.

A purposive sampling strategy was employed to select five publicly accessible Discord servers representing diverse community types: two gaming communities (Server A: multiplayer strategy games, 15,000+ members; Server B: first-person shooter games, 22,000+ members), two educational communities (Server C: language learning, 8,000+ members; Server D: programming and coding, 12,000+ members), and one hobby-based community (Server E: anime and manga discussion, 18,000+ members). Selection criteria included: (a) active text-based communication (minimum 50 messages per day in primary channels), (b) English as primary language, (c) public accessibility without invitation requirements, and (d) focus on general interest topics rather than sensitive discussions. Data collection occurred over three months (January-March 2024) through systematic observation using predetermined time blocks (one weekday evening 7-9 PM and one weekend afternoon 2-4 PM per week) to capture routine and peak activity periods. All consecutive messages in primary general discussion channels were documented through manual screenshot capture, regardless of abbreviation presence. From this comprehensive dataset, 500 messages containing at least one abbreviation were purposively selected for analysis, distributed as: gaming communities (n=210, 42%), educational communities (n=180, 36%), and hobby-based community (n=110, 22%).

Ethical considerations were carefully addressed following established frameworks for observational research of publicly accessible digital discourse (Franzke et al., 2020; Markham & Buchanan, 2012; Zimmer, 2010). This study employed naturalistic observation of publicly accessible Discord servers where communications are observable by the general public without membership restrictions or reasonable expectations of privacy, consistent with AoIR Ethics Guidelines 3.0 for non-participatory observation of public communication. The researcher was an existing member of selected servers and maintained a strictly passive observer role with no participant interaction, identity disclosure, or community intervention. Server selection deliberately excluded communities catering to minors, vulnerable populations, or sensitive topics. Messages were selected only if they contained no personally identifiable information, sensitive personal disclosures, or potentially harmful content. Inter-rater reliability for selection criteria was established (Cohen's $\kappa = 0.83$). Comprehensive pseudonymization replaced all usernames with thematic pseudonyms (e.g., GameMaster_Alex) and server names with generic descriptors (e.g., Gaming Community A). Data were stored on encrypted devices with planned secure deletion after five years. While formal IRB approval was not obtained, the ethical framework aligns with AoIR principles for proportionate review of low-risk observational studies of publicly accessible content (Franzke et al., 2020).

Thematic coding was used to analyze data within the CMDA framework through four phases: (1) familiarization by reading chat logs repeatedly, (2) preliminary coding to identify abbreviation types and contextual patterns, (3) thematic coding based on communicative functions (structural, pragmatic, interactional, and social), and (4) interpretation of results. Two independent coders conducted analysis with substantial inter-coder agreement (Cohen's $\kappa = 0.83$). NVivo 12 software was used for data management. Trustworthiness was ensured through prolonged engagement with data, peer debriefing, member checking with selected

Discord users, comprehensive audit trails, and detailed documentation of research setting and analytical procedures to support transferability.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The abbreviation types were determined as being four with different frequencies as presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Types of Abbreviations in Discord Chats

Type	Percentage	Examples	Description
Initialisms	42%	LOL, BRB, IDK, AFK, GG, IIRC	Conventional and gaming-specific forms using first letters
Phonological Reductions	28%	rly, pls, thx, ur, tho	Shortened phonetic spellings
Gen Z Slang	22%	fr, ngl, ong, cap, sus	Contemporary youth-driven forms
Alphanumeric Substitutions	8%	u2, l8r, b4	Numbers replacing letter sounds

The results correspond to the typology described by Beheka (2024) but point to the prominent presence of Gen Z forms (22%), which occurs in Discord communities. The prevalence of initialisms indicates that they have become a standard in the CMC conventions, which is why Crystal (2019) makes a case in favor of linguistic economy. The significant Gen Z usage is indicative of the finding that abbreviation is a sociolinguistic signifier of cultural affiliation which accompanies not only efficiency but also fosters the use of abbreviations in Yang and Xing (2024) as the mark of social authenticity and generational identification.

Table 2 indicates that the CMDA framework exposed four key communicative functions

CMDA Dimension	Function	Abbreviations Used	Participant Quote	Interpretation
Structure	Linguistic Economy	rn, brb, np, ur, btw, lmk	"using saves especially when gaming" 'brb' time	Enables composition and maintains conversational flow in high-velocity contexts
Pragmatic	Tone Modulation & Politeness	LOL, lol, ngl, tbh, & imo, pls, thx	"adding makes my message sound less harsh" 'lol'	Softens directness, expresses politeness, mitigates face-threatening acts
Interactional	Conversational Continuity	BRB, AFK, btw, tl;dr	"when someone types 'brb,' we know to wait"	Signals absence, organizes discourse, manages turn-taking
Social	Identity Belonging	& fr, ong, no cap, sus, ggs, gl hf	"using shows you're part of the culture" 'fr'	Marks in-group membership, cultural identity, generational affiliation

The use of abbreviations was also used as efficiency aids to allow quick message typing especially when playing games with fast paces as shown below:

GameMaster_Alex: Anyone down for a ranked match rn?

ProPlayer_Mike: brb need to grab food

GameMaster_Alex: np take ur time

Luna_Gaming: I'm down! btw did u see the patch notes?

This dialogue proves that abbreviations like rn (right now), brb (be right back), np (no problem), ur (your) and btw (by the way) help in communicating effectively in time-sensitive situations, as they extend the argument by Crystal (2019) to indicate that efficiency is not just a reduction of character, but a strategic reaction to high-velocity interaction conditions.

Abbreviation was also used as pragmatic markers that controlled interpersonal relations. An example of the way they dilute what might otherwise be a face-threatening statement is shown in the following exchange:

GameMaster_Alex: yeah ngl the weapon nerfs are kinda harsh lol

Luna_Gaming: fr tho that sniper nerf was needed imo

GameMaster_Alex: no cap Mike carried us hard. tbh without that clutch we'd have lost

In this case, ngl (not gonna lie) serves as a hedging mechanism that comes before an opinion that may be viewed as potentially negativity-inducing, and the phrase lol softens any supposed negativity. In the meantime, imo (in my opinion) and tbh (to be honest) are stance markers that recognize subjectivity, which supports the claim that Baron (2018) makes abbreviations softeners of tones and the argument by Yus (2021) about the encoding of politeness.

Discourse management and turn-taking were easier with the help of abbreviations as evidenced in this group conversation:

Sarah: ok I found some good articles lmk if u need them

David: afk for 10 mins getting coffee brb

Tom: pls send those articles that would help a lot!

Sarah: ofc! btw we should meet tmrw to compare notes

David: back! sry what did I miss?

Sarah: tl;dr we're meeting tmrw to work on the assignment together

During this exchange, brb (be right back) and afk (away from keyboard) meanings imply a momentary lack of communication, and it does not cause a breakdown in conversation. In the meantime, lmk (let me know) suggests some future engagement, btw indicates a change of topic, and tl;dr (too long; didn't read) is an effective way to summarize communication gaps, which confirms the findings of Seargeant and Tagg (2019), that abbreviations are discourse structures.

Abbreviations used as social linguistic indicators of belonging to a specific group is also apparent in this anime community exchange:

AnimeFan_Kelly: OMG did anyone watch the new episode yet?!

Otaku_Chris: yesss just finished it and ngl I cried

Manga_Reader_Jen: fr? I haven't watched yet no spoilers pls!

AnimeFan_Kelly: omg the animation was insane

Otaku_Chris: ikr? the studio really said no cap we're going all out lol

AnimeFan_Kelly: tbh I'm not ready for this series to end

NewMember_Alex: hi everyone! just joined this server. what show are u all talking about?

AnimeFan_Kelly: welcome! we're discussing [Show Name]. u should definitely watch it

imo it's peak

Manga_Reader_Jen: fr one of the best this year no cap

The frequent application of Gen Z acronymns (fr (real), ngl (not gonna lie), no cap (no lie)) and group-specific terms (peak (excellent)) forms a unique language that identifies the participants of the fandom culture as young people. The first message of the newcomer also does not contain these abbreviations which makes him or her an outsider until these abbreviations become a part of his/her community, which confirms the fact that Tagliamonte and Denis (2008) state that the usage of the abbreviations is a sign of belonging to the community.

Abbreviations were multipurpose resources that were used to establish semantic content, pragmatic meaning and social indexicality at the same time. This can be exemplified by the gaming conversation below:

ProPlayer_Mike: gg guys that was close

Luna_Gaming: ggs! we almost lost lol that was sus for a sec

GameMaster_Alex: no cap Mike carried us hard. tbh without that clutch we'd have lost

NewPlayer_Jay: thx for carrying team! learning a lot rn

The words ggs! we almost lost lol that was suspenseful (interactional closure), lol (pragmatic), sus (semantic) and the group rapport (social) are merged within the message ggs! we almost lost lol that was suspenseful (interactional closure) and the expressed anxiety (pragmatic) and the doubtful moment (semantic). Contextual flexibility helped Abbreviations to create meaning. As an example, GG was versatile that is, it could be used as a genuine appreciation when it was followed by above but had a sarcastic meaning when it was said by Player2: gg guys [sarcastic tone] after Player1: we lost in 10 minutes. The metalinguistic awareness of the participants was shown as they said that one can tell whether 'gg' is real or salty by the context, showing that there is a high level of interpretive competence one needs to possess to become a successful participant in Discord. Moreover, abbreviations led to social bond as they established common ways of speaking. New entrants gradually adapted the use of community-specific abbreviations as they became part of servers. The language practices are also used as sources to create social identity online, with participants reporting that adopting community-specific abbreviations fostered feelings of belonging and membership integration.

The findings in Tables 1 and 2 are based on systematic dual-level coding of 847 abbreviation tokens by two independent coders. Each token was coded for both abbreviation type and primary communicative function using a structured codebook. The codebook specified: (a) morphological criteria for type classification—initialisms (first-letter formations like LOL), phonological reductions (pronunciation-based like rly), Gen Z slang (cultural markers like fr), and alphanumeric substitutions (numeric integrations like u2); and (b) contextual criteria for function assignment—primary function determined by syntactic position, discourse context, and participant uptake, with multi-functional cases coded by most salient contextual evidence. Inter-coder reliability was substantial (Cohen's $\kappa = 0.83$ for type; $\kappa = 0.81$ for function). Initial disagreements ($n=144$, 17%) primarily involved ambiguous Gen Z slang classifications and overlapping pragmatic-social functions. These were resolved through structured discussion achieving consensus in 136 cases (94.4%), with remaining 8 cases (<1%) adjudicated by a third expert coder.

These results can be valuable to digital linguistics by illustrating that the use of abbreviations as polyfunctional resources whose meaning is determined through contextual negotiation is challenging the simplified conceptualizations of abbreviations as efficient strategies. In practice, community managers would have a possibility to use the knowledge of abbreviations to promote the integration of newcomers, educators must regard both forms and practical functions, cross-cultural practitioners should be aware that the abbreviations have cultural and generational labels that can steer through different online spaces. There are however limitations such as the fact that only English-language Discord servers were sampled, only text-based communication and not voice channels were sampled and the study was cross-sectional making it impossible to conduct a longitudinal study. Future studies ought to examine abbreviation practices in a variety of platforms and languages, undertake longitudinal research to understand how these practices evolve, investigate the overlap of multimodal media, e.g., emojis and GIFs, and study how these practices vary across generations to support intergenerational digital communication practices.

CONCLUSION

This paper has examined the use of abbreviations in Discord chat using Computer-Mediated Discourse Analysis (CMDA) and found that abbreviations serve not only the purpose of linguistic economy. The discussion found four primary categories, including initialisms (42%), phonological reductions (28%), Gen Z slang (22%), and alphanumeric replacements (8%). These codes have four main communicative purposes, which include, structural efficiency, modulation of pragmatic tone, continuity of interaction and creation of social identity. Results indicate that abbreviations can be considered multifunctional resources, whose meaning can be negotiated via context, and carries semantic, pragmatic, and social indexicality at the same time. The salience of Gen Z constructions, i.e. fr, ngl, and no cap, means that abbreviations are changing into sociolinguistic signs of belonging to a certain culture and being a part of a certain generation. The research has made contributions to the field of digital linguistics by enlightening the importance of the abbreviations in the process of meaning-making and social bonding in online communities and refutes simplistic approaches where abbreviations are viewed as shortcuts. The results have practical implications to the community managers, educators, and cross-cultural practitioners on the understanding and negotiating the digital communication practices presently.

DAFTAR PUSTAKA

Androutsopoulos, J. (2014). Languaging when contexts collapse: Audience design in social networking. *Discourse, Context & Media*, 4–5, 62–73. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcm.2014.08.006>

Baron, N. S. (2018). Always on: Language in an online and mobile world. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199755840.001.0001>

Beheka, A. (2024). Modern abbreviation patterns in digital communication: A typological analysis. *Journal of Digital Linguistics*, 12(3), 45–62. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdl.2024.01.003>

Brandtzæg, P. B. (2012). Social networking sites: Their users and social implications—A longitudinal study. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 17(4), 467–488. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1083-6101.2012.01580.x>

Crystal, D. (2019). *The Cambridge encyclopedia of the English language* (3rd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Darvin, R., & Norton, B. (2015). Identity and a model of investment in applied linguistics. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 35, 36–56. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190514000191>

Dürscheid, C., & Frick, K. (2016). *Schreiben digital: Wie das Internet unsere Alltagskommunikation verändert*. Alfred Kröner Verlag.

Franzke, A. S., Bechmann, A., Zimmer, M., Ess, C., & the Association of Internet Researchers. (2020). Internet research: Ethical guidelines 3.0. Association of Internet Researchers. <https://aoir.org/reports/ethics3.pdf>

Fullwood, C., James, B. M., & Chen-Wilson, C. J. (2016). Self-concept clarity and online self-presentation in adolescents. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking*, 19(12), 716–720. <https://doi.org/10.1089/cyber.2015.0623>

Grace, M., Lee, M. K., & Epley, N. (2024). Abbreviations in text messages reduce response rates and perceived sincerity. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied*, 30(2), 234–248. <https://doi.org/10.1037/xap0000456>

Herring, S. C. (2004). Computer-mediated discourse analysis: An approach to researching online behavior. In S. A. Barab, R. Kling, & J. H. Gray (Eds.), *Designing for virtual communities in the service of learning* (pp. 338–376). Cambridge University Press.

Herring, S. C. (2008). Questioning the generational divide: Technological exoticism and adult constructions of online youth identity. In D. Buckingham (Ed.), *Youth, identity, and digital media* (pp. 71–92). MIT Press.

Herring, S. C. (2019). The coevolution of computer-mediated communication and computer-mediated discourse analysis. In P. Bou-Franch & P. Garcés-Conejos Blitvich (Eds.), *Analyzing digital discourse: New insights and future directions* (pp. 25–67). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-92663-6_2

Kiesler, S., Zdaniuk, B., Lundmark, V., & Kraut, R. (2000). Troubles with the internet: The dynamics of help at home. *Human-Computer Interaction*, 15(4), 323–351. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327051HCI1504_2

Leavitt, A., Keegan, B. C., & Clark, J. (2020). The role of network structure and content in political discussion on Discord. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction*, 4(CSCW3), Article 233. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3432947>

Maghfur, A. A. (2020). Language used in social media and its impact toward teens language acquisition. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 4(1), 15–28.

Malinen, S. (2015). Understanding user participation in online communities: A systematic literature review of empirical studies. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 46, 228–238. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2015.01.004>

Markham, A., & Buchanan, E. (2012). Ethical decision-making and internet research: Recommendations from the AoIR ethics working committee (Version 2.0). Association of Internet Researchers. <https://aoir.org/ethics>

McQuail, D. (2005). *McQuail's mass communication theory* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Noon, E. J. (2020). Interpretive phenomenological analysis: An appropriate methodology for educational research? *Journal of Perspectives in Applied Academic Practice*, 8(1), 75–83. <https://doi.org/10.14297/jpaap.v8i1.304>

Rafaeli, S. (1988). Interactivity: From new media to communication. In R. P. Hawkins, J. M. Wiemann, & S. Pingree (Eds.), *Advancing communication science: Merging mass and interpersonal processes* (pp. 110–134). SAGE Publications.

Seageant, P., & Tagg, C. (2019). Social media and the future of open debate: A user-oriented approach to Facebook's filter bubble conundrum. *Discourse, Context & Media*, 27, 41–48. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcm.2018.03.005>

Tagliamonte, S. A. (2016). *Teen talk: The language of adolescents*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139583800>

Tagliamonte, S. A., & Denis, D. (2008). Linguistic ruin? LOL! Instant messaging and teen language. *American Speech*, 83(1), 3–34. <https://doi.org/10.1215/00031283-2008-001>

Van Swol, L. M., Braun, M. T., & Kolb, M. R. (2015). Deception, detection, demeanor and truth bias in face-to-face and computer-mediated communication. *Communication Research*, 42(8), 1116–1142. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0093650213485785>

Verheijen, L. (2013). The effects of text messaging and instant messaging on literacy [Doctoral dissertation, Radboud University Nijmegen]. <https://www.york.ac.uk/language/ypl/parlay/02/YPL-PARLAY2014-09-Verheijen.pdf>

Walther, J. B. (1996). Computer-mediated communication: Impersonal, interpersonal, and hyperpersonal interaction. *Communication Research*, 23(1), 3–43. <https://doi.org/10.1177/009365096023001001>

Yang, S., & Xing, L. (2024). Gen Z slang and cultural authenticity in online communities. *Language & Communication*, 95, 78–91. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langcom.2024.02.004>

Yao, M. Z., & Ling, R. (2020). What is computer-mediated communication? An introduction to the special issue. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 25(1), 4–8. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jcmc/zmz027>

Yus, F. (2011). *Cyberpragmatics: Internet-mediated communication in context*. John Benjamins Publishing Company. <https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.213>

Zimmer, M. (2010). "But the data is already public": On the ethics of research in Facebook. *Ethics and Information Technology*, 12(4), 313–325. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10676-010-9227-5>