



# The Impact of Internet and Intercepting of Word Usage in English Language in the Current Trends

**Prof. Ebinezer D, Prof. Maheswari S, Dr. A. Rajeswari**

Assistant Professor, Assistant Professor, Assistant Professor  
Department of English,

Vel Tech Rangarajan Dr. Sagunthala R&D Institute of Science and Technology, Chennai, Tamil Nadu, India

**Abstract :** In the present world scenario, the Internet hugely becomes a central informational mode that is converting the way we learn, teach, and communicate. Social media provides a public platform that allows us to: Share thoughts and ideas through posts, tweets and comments, but count words and characters limit. Obviously, content length limits but doesn't limit our creativity. The emergence of the short story genre called short story and a new dialect of English called text speak proves this. All clouds actually have a silver lining. The popularity of social media sharing means that the technology of its users have. We have embraced the rapidity of social media interactions as our new normal and adapted our writing accordingly to content restrictions. Academicians and parents are concerned about disparate attitudes and habits of tech-savvy generation's contamination of Standard English as a text language permeates student assignments and blurs their distinctions between formal and informal writing. An example is the incredible popularity of short stories that fit into tweets and text. How can adversity turn into opportunity? But literary purists believe that digital literature shrinks, and short stories separate characteristic elements to comply with restrictions. This paper describes the impact of technology and internet on everyday English writing and language

**Keywords:** *internet slang, online communication, net-generation, social media, short-hand writing, short stories, text-speak, twitter fiction*

## Introduction

Text-speak is especially popular among the digital natives or net-generation (Rosen et al., 2010). The Internet generation is adept at developing and experimenting with thinking skills using online resources. Various learning methods, self-understanding, performance of academic work, cooperation with peers, teacher. Nevertheless, the constant influx of information can be in the form of tweets, emails, posts, and comments. Not surprisingly, this information overload leaves students with less time to perfect their knowledge. As a result, text-to-speech appears frequently in student assignments and is detrimental to schools performance. Therefore, teachers are warning and emphasizing the shortcomings of the text language. Standard English is the foundation for academic and professional success in an English-speaking country. This paper explores how technology has evolved the English language.

## The Evolution of Technology on Learning:

Internet users have potentially huge online resources for learning, communication, career planning, and many more. This technology provides students with a vital learning tool that fosters collaboration, offers exciting alternatives for learning and developing language skills through experimentation (Ahmadi, 2018) and assists students in learning the working rules of formal and informal languages (Douglas, 2009). Internet based Learning promotes student autonomy, increases motivation, and enriches the learning experience student-centered (Ahmadi, 2018). Many

schools now appreciate their students to use online resources to improve their English skills. Learn and provide an online portal where students can submit assignments, review grades, and collaborate with peers (Strain-Moritz, 2016).

### **Tech Distractions**

A recent literature review concluded that technology enhances student thinking and improves language learning skills (Ahmadi, 2018). The Internet facilitates short and frequent communication through limited tweets and posts. In addition, the constant flow of digital information allows web users an attention deficit. Second, the Internet takes advantage of short attention spans to provide social media. A media platform that induces technology addiction. Born in the age of technology, the Internet generation is especially good at interacting with online peers and share quickly on social media to build loyalty and never miss out on familiar activity. For example, the Net Generation is adept at multitasking digital activities (Bromley, 2010) such as social media, surfing websites, viewing emails, sending instant girlfriend messages, playing music, displaying advertisements, while doing schoolwork at the same time. This constant flow of information is conducive to learn and concentrate on one's studies. In a course study, students agreed of doing their schoolwork with multiple tasks. They have other online activities and report that their online activities interfere with their academic focus. It can also lead to not completing the assignment (Adams, 2007). Hence the temptation to participate in online activities makes students struggle and hinder their academic success. Additionally, students report feeling less willing to use Standard English (Strain-Moritz, 2016). This may explain the low striving for perfection and grammar.

### **Social Media and Text-Speak**

In general, social media allows us to put our thoughts into words and use language to bond and communicate, stay informed, learn from our experience, and build on the work of others (Shariatmadari, 2019). Social media is revolutionizing social conversation and providing unlimited access to people around the world. Social media clicks generate tags, likes, retweets, and repost. This ease of sharing makes digital social communication endless. Social media has also created a need for a short term dialect, Digi-talk, Text, Technology, and Internet Slang. Speak text in both private and public online interactions. The main modes are public and private communication in the Net-Generation (Moyle, 2010). To the anger of teachers and parents, incomplete sentences, misspelled words, pictograms (symbols which mainly express my feelings). The text is spoken in the default language, but emulates colloquial speech (French, 2018). Text-specific languages use acronyms and simple spellings to enable efficient input on mobile devices. The net-generation has changed to participate in small exchanges and make an online presence of standard English words with abbreviations (i.e. word adaptations) Proper punctuation and capitalization cause structural adaptations to English (Cingel, & Sundar, 2012). Examples of text-speaking words are in Table 1. Text-speak can also be considered attempts by teenagers to codify communication (Youth Code; French, 2018). In addition, textual language can be seen as a manifestation of rebellion contrary to linguistic rules (Akbarov & Tankosić, 2016).

Adaptations of words found in Text-Speak flow into everyday use of English. Naturally, textual adaptations can convey a sense of normalcy and acceptance, making and learning Standard English difficult (Cingel & Sundar, 2012). Standard English refers to the correct use of vocabulary and grammar in communication (Baker, 2014). It also supports government, science, and in other formal contexts (Birner, 1991). The text language tramples on the rules of Standard English, a challenge for academics and parents. Educators are concerned about the prevalence of misspelled, abbreviated content words and ungrammatical sentences creeping into student work, blurring distinctions between formal and informal texts (Strain-Moritz, 2016). The results of the study showed that there is a reversal relationship

between text and professionally written communication and reading accuracy in a sample of college students (Drouin, 2011). Today, both grammar and language are collapsing (Sonn, 2006). Users are increasingly turning their backs on reading and writing Standard English. It's basically a customary way of writing. It used to be necessary to apply standard grammatical rules correctly, but it seems that we have fallen into an abyss. Below table gives some examples of words in the text speak.

<i>Standard English</i>	<i>Text-speak</i>
My	Ma
Oh My God	OMG
That	Tht
Please	Pls
Your	Ur
See	C
You	U
People	Ppl
Sister	Sista

Students and parents recognize the shortcomings of text language. There is a wealth of research pointing to the disadvantages of using Text-Speak. For example, students who also have informal online communication reportedly avoid high-level vocabulary (Adams, 2007), and another study found that more than half of students reported difficulty in recalling standard English as a result of frequent emailing (Drouin & Davis, 2009). These results were further confirmed by another study. According to researchers, when it comes to academic writing, students engaged in informal writing, 50% reported using incorrect technique (grammar, punctuation), 38% used text shortcuts, and 25% reportedly used emoticons (Lenhart et al., 2008). Based on these statistics, it is not surprising that students increasingly forget to spell words correctly and to use correct words grammar and/or punctuation. Teachers, parents and students all agree that effective writing is an important factor in academic achievement and professional success. For example, leave it to employees and students who can use grammar correctly representing the company or school in written communications (Rushkoff, 2013) is more valuable and An ambiguous writing style is more conductive than a person creating uncertainty, confusion, and liability Embarrassment (Rushkoff, 2013). Research studies also highlight the importance of effective writing late success. For example, in some studies, researchers asked teachers, students, and parents about: Importance of effective writing in life. As a result, 92% of 2,462 teachers objected to the letter. To be successful in life, you need to be effective (Purcell et al., 2013). Similarly, 86% of students felt good writing is important for success in life, with 83% of parents believing that students need to write well in order to be successful in life (Lenhart et al., 2008). Parents were also concerned, reporting a growing need to write more at this age than twenty years ago (Lenhart et al., 2008).

## Technology and Literature

Technology advances rapidly and so does literature. Rapidly with the advent of social media, digital interaction seems to be the future of social communication. Because the reader is emotionally, temporally and spatial, relationships to books are rapidly changing (Sesek & Pusnik, 2014), and book production and consumption. The literature is also evolving towards shorter and more frequent messages (Strain-Moritz, 2016). Short digital stories are now recognized as a new literary genre, with various aliases such as flash fiction, mini fiction, minute stories, sudden fiction, memo fiction, mobile phone fiction, and twitter fiction (Barnard, 2016). Like the name, Character or word limits, in large part, suggest that these stories are very short. For example, Twitter sets a limit of 280 characters for each tweet, which is up from 140 characters (for an overview see Al Sharqi & Abbasi, 2015, 2016). It's no surprise that digital short stories lack traditional elements. A story including setting, characters, plot, conflicts and resolutions. Digital shorts lack energy description and representation of characters. So readers use themselves to connect with characters' experience or the experience of others (Sethi, 2017). In addition, authors are also forced to exclude unnecessary information, digressions, odd explanations and repetitions, at the same time compensating for lack of detail with acronyms, contractions, puns, alliterations, rhythms, and even typos. Claims of proponents of the short story that Social media encourages sophisticated forms of literary performance art (Franklin, 2014).

### Conclusion:

The Internet connects the world beyond time and space. Technology is how we write, how we think, and communicate with others. The popularity of rapid social interaction on social media has changed our society. It created communication patterns and text language. This is the primary mode of communication online generation. Young people are not accused of using short-hand styles that comply with character limits. Speaking the text is now considered a dialect of English and children who can communicate in Standard English and text languages are considered bilingual. Worrying about short-hand comes to the fore when text language pervades academic writing and undermines student performance. At the same time, social media also contributes to the popularity of its Twitter/Flash fiction. The length of these stories is equivalent to the attentiveness of a tech-savvy reader. With further technological advances, we see more dialects and genres born as products of need

### References

- Adams, J. (2007). *Student perceptions of the impact of instant messaging on academic writing*. Literacy Learning: Ahmadi, M. R. (2018). The use of technology in English language learning: A literature review. *International Journal of Research in English Education*, 3(2), 115-125. <https://doi.org/10.29252/ijree.3.2.115>
- The Middle Years, 2, 37.  
<https://www.questia.com/library/journal/1G1-166201100/student-perceptions-of-the-impact-of-instant-messaging>
- Akbarov, A. & Tankosić, A. (2016). Impact of Social Networks and Technology on English Language Learners. *Journal of Linguistic Intercultural Education*, 9(3), 7–28. <https://doi.org/10.29302/jolie.2016.9.3.1>
- Al Sharqi, L. & Abbasi, I. S. (2015). Flash fiction: A unique writer-reader partnership. *Studies in Literature and Language*, 11(1), 52-56.
- Al Sharqi, L. & Abbasi, I. S. (2016). Twitter Fiction: A New Creative Literary Landscape. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 7(4), 16-19. <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.all.v.7n.4p.16>
- Baker, F. (2014). *Is Social Media Killing Literature?* Retrieved from <https://www.thelondonmagazine.org/is-social-media-killing-literature-by-francesca-baker/>
- Barnard, J. (2016). Tweets as microfiction: on Twitters live nature and 140-character limit as tools for developing storytelling skills. *New Writing: The International Journal for the Practice & Theory of Creative Writing*, 13(1), 3–16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790726.2015.1127975>
- Bromley, K. (2010). Picture a world without pens, pencils, and paper: The unanticipated future of reading and writing. *Journal of College Reading & Learning*, 41(1), 97–108. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10790195.2010.10850337>

- Bull, S. & Ma, Y. (2001) Raising learner awareness of language learning strategies in situations of limited recourses. *Interactive Learning Environments*, 9(2), 171-200. <https://doi.org/10.1076/ilee.9.2.171.7439>
- Cingel, D. P. & Sundar, S. S. (2012). Texting, techspeak, and tweens: The relationship between text messaging and English grammar skills. *New Media & Society*, 14(8), 1304–1320. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444812442927>
- Constantinou, F., Chambers, L., Zanini, N. & Klir, N. (2019). *A diachronic perspective on formality in students writing: Empirical findings from the uk*. Language, Culture and Curriculum. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07908318.2018.1563609>
- Douglas, J. (2009). *Children who blog or use Facebook have higher literacy levels*. Retrieved from [www.debaired.net/blendededunet/2009/12/uk-study-children-who-blog-or-use-facebook-have-higher-literacy-levels.html](http://www.debaired.net/blendededunet/2009/12/uk-study-children-who-blog-or-use-facebook-have-higher-literacy-levels.html)
- Drouin, M. A. (2011). College students text messaging, use of textese and literacy skills. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 27(1), 67-75. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2729.2010.00399.x>
- Drouin, M. & Davis, C. (2009). R u txtng? Is the use of text speak hurting your literacy? *Journal of Literacy Research*, 41(1), 46-67. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10862960802695131>
- Franklin, R. (2014). Character development. *Foreign Policy*, (209), 104.
- French, J. (2018). *Help! My Students Write Like They Text*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Jackowski-Bartol, T. (2001). *The impact of word processing on middle school students*. Retrieved from <http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED453825>.
- Kaplan, N. (1995). E-Literacies. *Computer-Mediated Communication Magazine*, 2(3), 3-35. <http://www.ibiblio.org/cmc/mag/1995/mar/kaplan.html>
- Lenhart, A., Arafeh, S., Smith, A. & Macgill, A. (2008). *Writing, technology and teens*. Washington, DC: Pew Internet & American Life Project. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED524313>
- Merritt, A. (April, 2013). *Text-speak: language evolution or just laziness?* Retrieved from: <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/education/educationopinion/9966117/Text-speak-language-evolution-or-just-laziness.html>
- Moyle, K. (2010). *Building Innovation: Learning with Technologies*. Victoria: Australian Council of Educational Research. Retrieved from: <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.660.1412&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
- Patea, V. (Ed.). (2012). *Short story theories: A twenty-first-century perspective*. New York, NY: Rodopi <https://doi.org/10.1163/9789401208390>
- Penny, L. (July, 2014). *The great English novel is dead. Long live the unruly, upstart fiction thats flourishing online*. New Statesman. Retrieved from: <https://www.newstatesman.com/culture/2014/07/great-english-novel-dead-long-live-unruly-upstart-fiction-s-flourishing-online>
- Rosen, L.D., Chang, J., Erwin, L. L., Carrier, M. & Cheever, N.A. (2010). *Communication Research*. 37(420). <https://doi.org/10.1177/0093650210362465>
- Rushkoff, D. (2013). *Its not just grammar; its clear thinking*. The New York Times. Retrieved from: <https://www.nytimes.com/roomfordebate/2012/08/13/is-our-children-learning-enough-grammar-to-get-hired/its-not-just-grammar-its-clear-thinking>
- Rudin, M. (2011). From Hemingway to Twitterature: The short and shorter of it. *Journal of Electronic Publishing*, 14(2), 1-8. <https://doi.org/10.3998/3336451.0014.213>
- Sethi, C. (June, 2017). *A Brief History into The Popularity of Micro-Fiction*. Retrieved from: <https://medium.com/@chaitanyasethi/the-long-and-short-of-micro-fiction-5d66c7fa88d8>
- Shariatmadari, D. (2019). *Dont Believe a Word by David Shariatmadari review – the truth about language*. Retrieved from: <https://www.theguardian.com/books/2019/aug/10/dont-believe-a-word-by-david-shariatmadari-review-the-truth-about-language>
- Šesek, L. & Pušnik, M. (2014). Reading popular literature and digital media: Reading experience, fandoms, and social networks. *Anthropological Notebooks*, 20(2), 103–126. Retrieved from <https://search-ebSCOhost-com.libaccess.sjlibrary.org/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=100267026&site=ehost-live&scope=site>
- Strain-Moritz & Tessa E. (2016). Perceptions of Technology Use and Its Effects on Student Writing. *Culminating Projects in Teacher Development*, 8. [https://repository.stcloudstate.edu/ed\\_etds/8](https://repository.stcloudstate.edu/ed_etds/8)
- Sonn, W. (2006). *Paradigms lost: The life and deaths of the printed word*. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press.