

PalArch's Journal of Archaeology
of Egypt / Egyptology

**HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF ORTHOGRAPHY IN ENGLISH AND IMPACT
OF COMPUTER-MEDIATED COMMUNICATION (CMC) ON THE EMERGING
ORTHOGRAPHIC PATTERNS IN ENGLISH**

¹Sana Nazir Ahmed, ²Furrakh Abbas, ³Falak Naz

¹*School of English Language and Literature, Minhaj University Lahore*

²*School of Languages, Civilization and Philosophy (SLCP), University Utara Malaysia*

**Sana Nazir Ahmed, Furrakh Abbas, Falak Naz: HISTORICAL
DEVELOPMENT OF ORTHOGRAPHY IN ENGLISH AND IMPACT OF
COMPUTER-MEDIATED COMMUNICATION (CMC) ON THE EMERGING
ORTHOGRAPHIC PATTERNS IN ENGLISH --PalArch's Journal of
Archaeology of Egypt/Egyptology 17 (11), 162-175. ISSN 1567-214x
Keywords: Historical Impact, Orthographic Patterns, Computer-Mediated
Communication (CMC)**

Abstract

The current study aims to find out the historical impact on the English orthographic patterns used by Pakistani students in their Facebook 'wall' conversations. Computer-Mediated Communication (CMC) has emerged as a new genre, the third medium because it is said to incorporate the features of both speech and writing. The growing popularity of CMC has had an impact on English orthography. The orthographic patterns of CMC in use these days have exhibited features of divergence from historical and traditional orthography. This study aims at investigating the patterns of divergence taking place over three years from 2018 to 2020 in CMC and also comparing them with conventional English orthography. Linguistic variability is an evolutionary process which the languages of the world have gone through since their inception. In order to investigate the propositions, language posts (collected on the Facebook wall for 50 university students) were analyzed. The results reveal the emergence of numerous novel features of orthography emerging in CMC. These findings lead to the conclusion that facebook has played an important role in changing CMC patterns of English orthography. English language is now more integrated into online communication. The findings reveal that there has been significant change exhibiting divergence from traditional English in the orthographic patterns. It is also expected that the future will reveal many novel features of English orthography therefore, the future research will lead to expansion of the current research.

Introduction

Computer-Mediated Communication has realistically changed the patterns of communication since its rise as part of cultural discourse. The English language is considered to be the most prestigious language used in non-local writing for communication. Bames (2002) said that non-natives of the English language used this language as a primary language to express their feelings, thoughts on their

Facebook 'Wall'. In Pakistan, most people learned this language as a second language. Pakistan learns this language in their institutions along with Urdu as a medium of communication. Moreover, the development of the language from the Middle Ages to the Modern age is briefly described in this research. Besides, certain thought processes are presented which looks like to hinder the development of non-standard English orthography instances on the Facebook Timeline. Language change can best be placed whenever it is measured separately (Seargeant, 2020). However, historical testing of language is not an easy task. Since Facebook started in mid-2004 and is well known until it started in 2020 in Pakistan. It was as traumatized as the underground network communication vehicle. The proliferation of the Facebook wall and expansion continue to spread in the short, mysterious and speculative ways that language research has been doing for a few years. There is reason to accept that language change that has already occurred for centuries or decades seems to happen in a relatively short period concerning the CMC. The skeptical but questionable way paves the way in the middle of the front bottle. The other difficulty awaits the absence of outstanding test features. Either way, past tests may recommend specific arrangements that may be made. While exploring the orthography of the dynamic languages, it can make common or very complex parameters for example diminution and neologism that can further be separated into a word of content (Bames, 2002).

Students who use the English language on Facebook 'wall' make changes in the structure of the words like in spellings. This modified the structure of the words uniquely distinguished from this experiment showing the transformation that has taken place from the Chaucerian period to the modern CMC era. Davidson and Upward (2018) claimed that Chaucerian spellings over time improved. For example, the word "fysshe" became "fishe" and "fish" and in CMC "fsh" replaced "fish". Oversimplification was easy and there was in the English language in many assortments. Cavus and Ibrahim (2009) believed that decrease (which is disentanglement) such as "LOL, DP (display picture), BTW, ASAP, RAM, PIC, BF (boyfriend) and more omnipresent. The simplicity of the orthographic patterns of CMC is bound with these reasons. The primary cause is that the clients of Facebook give importance to consonants and less to vowels.

The users of CMC have begun to give very little importance to vowels rather than consonants are empowering the content (Dante, 1998). It is for these reasons that they feel that the removal of the vowel does not affect the comprehension of the word and that the innovative orthography of the word is easily understood. As "I LOVE YOU can be Luv Y, ILU, or luv u and so on and Thanks can be Thnx, Thx, Tx, or tnx." (Crystal, 2009). The following explanation lies in the development of such devices that reinforce specific content. Facebook meanwhile is not only available using gadgets right now with the addition of handheld, advanced cells and l-pads that contain various highlights of the language. The very next explanation regard to this changed orthography is that people used to save their time through short words; they save their lot of time through this simple orthography and communicate more rapidly. "Gud, frnd, pryr consumes less time than writing good, friend, prayer, etc. (Bodomo, 2017). This study aims at investigating the patterns of divergence taking place over three years from 2018 to 2020 in CMC and also comparing them with conventional English orthography.

Literature Review

The language brought by the Germanic tribes in England is called early English or old English. This type of English is far different from the present English in terms of sound and orthography which is very difficult for the present speaker to understand old English. Most of the English words derived from the old English and phonemic spelling with a runic substance were used by the early English speakers (Barnes, 2009). Many other languages such as Norse and Celtic vernaculars contributed to create old English. William conquered England in 1066 and he was a French. Since then, French became the main or official language of the country and this language had been used in all the matters of the country. At that time, there was no importance to the English language at a high level and people of the lower class used the English language (Baym, 2010). In this way, there are a lot of French words that are found in the English language.

Geoffrey Chaucer was the main poet and pioneer in that era who used comparative language in his writings. The usage of English in the 12th, 13th, 14th and 15th centuries was very difficult because Latin letters all together with certain Anglo-Saxon phonemes continued making disturbance and discomfort in spelling (Baym, 2010). Even in the works of Geoffrey Chaucer, there were many elements of Latin language in the fourteenth century of Canterbury tales. In modern English, many elements and words have the different spelling of Middle English language period. The word "Knight" is derived from the old English word "Cniht". The letters "k and h" are silent because they were verbalized by the old English which looks better method to describe Knecht, the German word from which cniht is resolute (Baym, 2010).

The Great vowel shift, diversity in elocution began close to the furthest limit of Middle English, brought shorter vowel sounds. Bodomo (2010) further defined that a quick interaction began in the 16th century between the world and England. Besides, one-third of the world area was occupied by British powers, therefore, English has become modern and to date. In 1500, this English orthography had taken on correctly devolving current-day structure. With the help of this enhancement, English has been reported all over the world because of the specific stimulus behind the move. The great vowel shift as the name suggests included an upward move in the way to express vowels- five vowels moved upward a two became diphthongs (Bodomo, 2010). The coinage of new words and expressions began in the Renaissance of classical learning. The print machine was designed and presented less expensive books and caught an extraordinary number of users. It made English progressive; therefore, English language was rearranged and printing has likewise carried normalization to English and made it effective. Language structure and spelling were fixed and then, this language developed into a standard language and used in official matters also commonly spoken in houses and school (Camenev, & Melenciuc 2010).

A good number of distributions for the recommendations of spellings variation was distributed from the mid of 16th century to mid of 17th century. Many authors such as Thomas Smith, John Hart, Chester Herald, William Bullokar, Dr. Alexander Gill and Charles Butler contributed to spelling variations. All these perceptions are radical and based on less understanding of English phonology and for the most part did not pull in genuine thought (Camenev, & Melenciuc 2010). They related the different English words with Greek and Latin words. Quiet letters were added

to make the real and anecdotal relations all the more clear (Camenev, & Melenciuc 2010). There were also a lot of French influence on English in Norman rule in early English. Focus English words demonstrated a lot of variations which provide us the model. Numerous events of the French consolidate the use of “c” to make the “s” sounds before vowels, the swap of qu for cw and the primer of the diphthong (Camenev, & Melenciuc 2010).

Bromme (2005) argues that colonialism and the industrial revolution were two essential reasons that helped the spread of English language. At that time, England covers all the sovereign seas of the world, in this way they conquered one-third of the world and the sun of the British Empire never set (Bromme, 2005). Augmentation of the English language over the globe accomplished significantly created more and more English words. An analysis began to respell particular words with an ultimate objective to include their Latin and Greek sources in the late 15th century. At that time, the re-spelling was phonologically definite in various cases these respelling further expelled spelling and phonology. These calm letters are made by these respelled words regularly. As an instance, in salmon which is the new face of salmon the letter “l” is takes after the Latin salmonis (Campbell & Moseley 2012).

The progression of phonetics built up the system of the second time of spelling variation in the 19th century. There are many varieties of spelling variation that gave an unimaginable variation to American English (Campbell & Moseley 2012). In 1876. Philadelphia a spelling reform society was established which named as “general convention for the amendment of English orthography” the association between the American spelling reform and English spelling reform was set up after this society. These spellings were are→ar, give→giv, have→hav, live→liv, though→tho, through→thru, guard→gard, catalog→catalog, (in) definite→ (in) definit, wished→wisht. The American Philological Society and American Philological Association, in 1883, created consensus on 24 standards of spelling which were applied along these lines (Campbell & Moseley 2012).

In 1906, the USA spelling board was developed and 30 experts from around the country gathered to create, educate and edit word reference. There was a list of 300 words arranged by these people some were by then being utilized. This summary was acquainted with Theodore Roosevelt who immediately provided a request for the usage of these spellings with fast effect. US congress gave a verdict against the spelling variation before the completion of 1906 then; the old English spellings came into work. At any rate of a couple of spelling from the summary of 300 made sense of how to preserve. In 1920, the disentangled spelling board presents its handbook of simplified spelling which gave 25 rules of spelling changing. This was the triumph in the light of the inadequacy of store, SSB was broken down. In British, the necessity of variation of the spelling was empowered and it pulled in various supporters. The latest referenced composition ensures that the orthography of the English language has experienced numerous stages and has been balanced chance to time. This variation is not unpredictable but instead, it follows specific models for instance revisions is one of the models. A subsequent forward adjustment has been a consistent model that is reflected through the diachronic history. This adjustment can be seen at the level of vowels, consonants, trip lashes and diphthongs.

When figuring out how to peruse in English, a student must view printed letters (graphemes), interpret their sounds and join those sounds together to frame words. For instance, to peruse the words feline a starting peruser must comprehend that the grapheme c makes a [k] the grapheme a makes a [ae] sound and the grapheme t makes a [t] sound before joining them into [kaet] a word which they know the significance orally (Cavus, & Ibrahim, 2009). The particular examples of correspondences between the realistic and phonological structures are the orthography of a language. Every language has its exceptional orthography. Along these lines, all students who are figuring out to peruse in English, regardless of their first language foundation need to build up their insight into the orthography of English. There are three primary kinds of composing frameworks alphabets, syllabic and morphographic. In alphabets dialects, graphemes speak to phonemes or individual sounds. English is an alphabetic language in the same way as other European dialects, for example, Spanish, German, French and Italian yet besides dialects for example Arabic, Hebrew and Korean hangul. Then again, in a syllabic composing framework (for example Japanese) every grapheme speaks to a syllable for instance the sounds ba, bi, bu, be, and bo would each be spoken to by a single grapheme. In a morphographic composing framework every grapheme speaks to a morpheme or a unit of importance (Cavus, & Ibrahim, 2009).

The latest of development which influenced the patterns of English orthography is the emergence of computer mediated communication (CMC). Herring (1996) defines that Computer-mediated communication is a communication that takes place between human beings via the help of computers. John, Thurlow, Lengel and Tomic (2004) stated that computer-mediated communication is a process of human communication that takes place through computers involving people. Wright & Webb (2011) also offer a dynamic definition saying that CMC is a procedure of using the computer for human communication which along with certain media may be utilized for a wide range of purposes. With the passage of time and the modernization of technology, new gadgets such as mobile and other cyber means of communication came in use. The definition of CMS was broadened to include communication through all these gadgets in communication. Therefore, CMC is also called virtual communication, virtual conversation, electronic communication, online communication cyber communication and cyber language or cyber conversation, etc. In the modern times, this kind of communication has created much influence on the orthographic patterns of English language. The data of the current study aims at analyzing the changes that have taken place in English through the lens of CMC.

Research Methodology

The present study is descriptive and quantitative in nature. This research is based on the theoretical frame of diachronic analysis which was made by Rooker (1994) about Biblical Hebrew late later used by Mayor & Alcaraz (2008) on adverbial frequency; by Gerow & Ahmed (2019) on diachronic analysis in grammatical relationships and by Camenev & Melenciuc (2017) on the analysis diachronic semantics. The current research is also based on a diachronic analysis of orthographic patterns and is concerned with Facebook while looking at three-year data (2018, 2019 & 2020), the researcher analyzed three language posts (each

from the above years) for one Facebook user. An altered orthography pattern is analyzed in the same way and the researcher has described vivid and minute details of the fields of data analysis. University students who use Facebook in the English language are the population of the research. As more than 70% of people who use Facebook in Pakistan; are young university students. The researcher has further delimited the population to the students of Minhaj University Lahore because the main agenda of the research is the changed orthography patterns of English CMC (Facebook). The convenient sampling method is used to select the sample, those students who used the timeline feature of Facebook. Fifty (50) Facebook wall are selected as a sample to address the research question. The size of this sample, although not large enough yet represent university students as almost the same writing patterns are noticeable on Facebook everywhere. Besides, it is not but three (3) individual linguistics posts are analyzed to make 150 analyzes which can be considered as an acceptable sample size. Student's linguistic posts are not randomly selected. It was difficult to get data randomly because some linguistic postings were having inappropriate language ethically not suitable for research. Therefore, possibly available and ethically appropriate linguistic postings are selected. Data were gathered or collected from the students of different departments of Minhaj University Lahore. Furthermore, data were collected from their conversation with their friends and family members on their Facebook account. The data were consisting of their last three years (2018, 2019 & 2020) Facebook posting as well as conversation. There are almost thirty-two million Facebook users are found in Pakistan till recently. The data were collected for the last three years because it is very difficult to get data from their previous Facebook conversation timeline. The categories are abbreviations/acronyms, omission/deletion and numeric/insertion. These parameters are morphological orthography, phonological orthography and phonemic orthography. The methodology used in this study focused on diachronic changes in orthographic CMC models. So the sounds of the members are defeated. The study found exciting posts for members over three years. A few semantics posts from 50 members have been taken without hesitation from their dividers. Appropriately, 150 posts were broken by merging test parameters. The results of the study were reflected in the frequency of etymological post variations over three years.

Data Analysis and Interpretation

The CMC Orthographic patterns have reflected the current and visible change in Pakistan as the Pakistani student community plays a key role in this transformed issue. Data was collected from languages posted on the Facebook wall from 50 participating students. These students come from different cities in Pakistan and enroll in various programs in Minhaj University Lahore. Participant language posts show specific orthographic patterns that are also organized into three categories namely omission/subtraction, marking/counting and acronyms/encryption. The basic thing is to know these chemical methods because it will help to understand the nature and understanding the details as well. Understanding various strategies created by Facebook users, fonts, morphological, phonological, morphophonemic orthographic change show certain patterns such as mixing, counting, summarizing, using icons, creating new revenue, words, mixing, deleting and deleting, etc.

Table No. 1
Frequency of Orthographic Features of CMC

<i>Time/Variable</i>	<i>Deletion/Omission</i>	<i>Insertion/Numeric</i>	<i>Abbreviations/Acronyms</i>
2018	32	8	32
2019	40	19	40
2020	50	30	50

Table 1 shows the numbers / entries, abbreviations / annotations and subdivisions / non-existent 250 non-Facebook language posts for 50 participants. It is noted that in 2018, 08 price/inclusion models were observed while in 2019 the number reached 19 and in 2020 the figure reached 30 which indicate significant use/number of input by end-users three years. Acronyms which is great growth and the 32 for removal/removal in 2018, then in 2019, it was 40, and in 2020 there were 50 cases which is a major change in orthographic patterns. Table 2 shows the "invisibility of these changes". The data shows that in 2018, there were 15 examples of non-removal of any language post. Also in the year 2019, there have been 07 cases found in the removal/deletion. Besides, in 2020, there was only 01 example that did not show removal/termination. Similarly, computation/inclusion was a rare occurrence in 2018, as 35 out of 50 vacancies did not show numbers/inclusion and by 2019 the number had dropped to 24 and by 2020, it had dropped to 13. There were 35, of 50 language posts not showing the use of abbreviations/words. And by 2019, it has dropped to 25 out of 50 language spaces. In 2020, we have been reduced to 03. Therefore, we can say that there has been a diachronic change in CMC patterns. The following Table 2 describes the Frequency mentioned above for diachronic change.

Table 2
Frequency of Diachronic Change in Orthographic Patterns

<i>Time/Variable</i>	<i>Deletion/Omission</i>	<i>Insertion/Numeric</i>	<i>Abbreviations/Omission</i>
2018	+/-	+/-	+/-
2019	+	+	+
2020	+	+	+

In the table above the + sign indicates the frequency of the diachronic transition. This indicator shows a significant change in CMC patterns. While the +/- sign indicates that some conditions indicate a change in CMC patterns while others do not. Moreover, - the mark does not mean that there is no change but it does not appear on the table because the changes in the CMC patterns have been on Facebook since 2018 at the oscillating rate. Table 2 shows that the year 2018 had some diachronic change conditions. This change was very rapid in 2019 and 2020. There is a rapid change in orthographic patterns in 2019 and 2109. The frequency of these diachronic changes in 2019 and 2020 seems to be more than doubled than in 2018 describe the above-modified CMC patterns. The following Facebook

language posts have been selected by from 50 Facebook users. These cases stand as a representative of the complete data because almost all deviations in the parameters have been described in the above sections.

Example 1

- i. "Has chocolate and is not sharing." (2018)
- ii. "Yuppeeeeeee my g.fizgudlolzzz." (2019)
- iii. "Time 2 kil the bloody Aztecs.....lolx ☺ nd me headuizabt 2 bloow...booooooom □ □" (2020)

Analysis

In 2018 posting seems normal but without the individual use of the status quo which shows that it is considered inappropriate. In 2019 the 'Good' post is converted to 'gud' and the removed / left vowel is visible. 2 vowels are excluded but the name is all accounts that give their meaning in the context. No numbers/entries appear in the 2018 year post. Two summaries/summaries are used by Facebook users for example 'lolzzz' and 'g. f'. 'Lozzz' has become such a big place to be popular with people on Facebook. Summarizing and 'zzz' extensions has become very common on Facebook. In 2012 posting 'l' was removed from the word 'kill' but we see that while reading the context, extracting a single book goes by the concept. The word 'Head' has been changed to 'head' which reflects the new use of words by Facebook users. In addition, we see that the vowels of 'O' have not been added to the word 'About' and have been joined to 'abt'. The release of these vowels shows a surprising tendency for Facebook users in the use of concrete and vowel closures. In the post above '2' there is a number extension representing 'To' in two places. 'Oxx' is already in use by the user. This 'lolx' has changed the structure from 'lolz' but both show user enthusiasm through the use of abbreviations and the introduction of new words.

Example 2

- i. "Yes, now im using f.b regularly." (2018).
- ii. "Thnx you are 1st who wshed me." (2019).
- iii. "wawwooo, 1 of my fvrtsg, I like it 2 mch. Gr8" (2020).

Analysis

In 2018 post shows a lot of common use of English without a short form. Changes in orthographic patterns start from 2019 when 'bongile' replaces 'thnx'. Delete / exit appear when you 'wish non-shed places'. 'Favrt' happens with 'Favorite', and 'mch' happens with 'many' and Gr8 and 2 are added to the numbers. We are analyzing how gradual and gradual removal, numbering and use of short forms and acronyms start from 2019.

Example 3

- i. "Has sweets but can't give u." (2018)
- ii. "tme 2 fly, yahoooo! Goinabrd" (2019)
- iii. "OMG! watchin beauty n da beast. Lovinit ☺" (2020)

Analysis

This year's post is standardized but next year the post shows the vowel 'i' is missing from 'Angha' and 'G' has been removed from 'walk', 'watch' and 'like'. OMG (Oh my God) is also here used as an acronym.

Example 4

- i. "And here is this song dedicated to all the beautiful girlzzzzzzzz. ☺" (2018)
- ii. Esp! thssng is 4 smonespecl.... ☺ ☺ ☺ (2019)

iii. “ali, thnxxxx dost.....@ amnathnku. (2020)

Analysis

The post above looks normal except for the word 'girlz' instead of 'girls'. Also 'this' is substituted for 'ths', 'some' substituted for 'sme'. We also note that the input of the number 4 (because) is used. 'Anxis' is replaced by 'thank you' and replaced with 'k' and the vowels 'a' is released in Thanks. One name thank you gives it a completely different look but it all satisfies the Facebook customers because they didn't get the story to understand you. It is usually named as thx, thnk, tx, thx and so on. We can therefore say that all that is understandable in CMC is not enough for users who pay close attention to normal spelling usage.

Example 5

i. “I don't like exams. And I want to skip them.”(2018)

ii. “ thesear nix pic ovgirlzzzzzzzz.”(2019)

iii. “Tnx 2 u sis esp ☺ ndthnkuguyzzzzlolzzz.” (2020)

Analysis

In 2018, the language submissions appear in accordance with Standard English. As the word 'good' has been replaced by 'the letter' c 'and' e 'does not exist. The word 'Photos' has been dropped after some time in the 'pic' and 'thnku' replaces 'Thank you'. It is also noteworthy that 'yes' was locked out and 'u' joined 'thanks'. As we can see, almost all users have used the addition of the number 2 to their 'to' post. The word 'lolzz' is an abbreviation commonly used by users in their posts.

Example 6

i. “Life iz cool. Im loving it.”(2018)

ii. “2 day was really memrble ☺ yummy ice cream espwnwrwatng 4 da point ☺”(2019).”

iii. “imgtngdamn bore wht shuld I do “(2020)

Analysis

In the word 'where' the letter 'H' and the word 'removed' the letters 'ee'. It is also noteworthy that the word 'Waiting' exists' i 'and' memorable words' o, a 'lost in new orthographic patterns. There are two additions with the numbers 2, 4. The word 'am' was replaced with 'M'. a few letters also disappear in the word 'Discovery' as it is spelled 'gtng. We also see that the vowel 'la' is missing from the word 'what' and the word 'should' 'O no l' is also missing. This is evidence of a gradual change in orthographic patterns. CMC orthographic patterns change rapidly and this is considered an attractive change.

Example 7

i. “AH! Logging off□”

ii. “It is very beautiful place. It's my favourite”

iii. “My bro showed me this London pics”

iv. “yahoo... finally m on Facebook”

v. “u know u likd my comment whch I jst gave that's enuf”

vi. “v will make da travel 2 lhr”

vii. “I ws good, I m good, and I snd u my goodness”

viii. “Watshud I do by goin 2 skul”

ix. “lolz I am happy”

x. “dammit 2 all, m ntjstsilnt, m getting bored”

Analysis

The categories given above from (i) to (x) refer mainly to the standard statements and orthographic examples used on Facebook. Punctuation has been discarded from 'it' in this way. 'Thanx' occurs with great appreciation (ks sent). Word removal can also be accepted and words like 'Bro and pic' inserting 'Brother' and picture 'indicate a case of amputation. Facebook itself is a collective term and can also be categorized under neologism." The abbreviation 'AH' is abbreviated as 'Allah Hafiz'. It is also clear that Vowel 'e' has been dropped from 'beloved'. 'It is also replaced by 'Jo ', the vowel 'o' is removed from 'azi', the vowel 'I' is discarded there, the vowel 'A' is dropped from 'word'. Vowel 'a' is missing from 'am' and the vowel 'e' has been removed from posting. In the above examples, it is worth noting that the vowels 'oo' has been taken out and entered 'u'. 'E' and we are in both letters missing and replaced by 'V'. Similarly "all the's 'letters are underlined and replaced by' 'da'. The vowels 'a, o and e' are not found in 'hlr'. The insertion of 'number' 2 'symbolizes' in 'and' 'M' stands for an unspecified vowel. 'Hell' is mixed with 'edamnit' and this is a completely new word in Facebook conversations.'2 'Number input is embedded to replace' pl 'in it.' Vowel o ' is replaced by " is 'and' M 'stands for' am 'as the missing vowel. It is simply replaced by' jst't 'and the vowel' is not removed. In the word, 'calm' vowel e e is discarded in it.'M 'stands for' am 'as the vowel' a 'is missing in it. A few letters are missing from' find 'and the word is formed as' gng '. In the word which is the vowel' a 'left. And you must' O and l 'are not included. C, h, o are removed from kul's and the insertion of 2 numbers is substituted instead. The word 'lolz' (laughs) is more likely to appear in posts. Thus, the above data clearly shows that an unusual change in orthographic patterns is reflected in Facebook user submissions. Here are the data of 50 Facebook respondents that are classified annually broken down into five categories to become specific gynecological orthography, phonological, morphological orthography, morphophonemic orthography and innovation. Phonemic orthology shows unusual patterns of orthography conditions by the similarity of the sounds of compound words. Orthology of natural sounds defines 'literature and the structure of pressure' as conveyed by compound words. Morphological orthography describes neologism, mixing, deleting and cutting words. Morphophonemic orthography features historical and socially orthography-based orthography simulations and developments that reflect Facebook customer naming while including emoji's, insertion of numbers and publication numbers and other etymological posts. At the back of the table specifies the data-based data showing the most intelligent events of the year using symbolic data, resource art plan, morphological orthography, morphophonemic orthography and the establishment of the above mentioned 50 respondents who responded to Facebook.

Conclusion

Significant differences have appeared in the Orthographic patterns of English as used by facebook users. This use of cancellation/inclusion without the input number and short/abbreviated short is now commonplace. The findings reveal that common spelling patterns are often ignored on facebook walls because dynamic orthographic examples convey what is said without a problem. The abbreviations of words and sentences are now in vogue as was found in many examples of computer mediated communication through facebook. Multi-character

cancellation / moderation are also visible and the vowel extraction looks more visually appealing than concrete and users like to name words blocking vowels. The participants of the study believe that there is a speech text that undoubtedly transcends its importance without the use of excessive vowels. The orthographic changes are so fast and dynamic and can be traced even in the data analyzed over three years as the data from 2018 to 2020 show marked differences. The data suggests that the vast majority of study participants tend to use numbers and the dynamic patterns of orthography are gaining more and more popularity with passing time. The study implicates that in future, abbreviations and shortcuts would be commonly used. The data shows a gradual increase in the duplication of contracts with adjectives from the data of 2018 to 2020. The emergence of lexemes/phonemes closer to the sound of words is also an innovation in orthography as it saves them time. Coinage of new words or word extensions to create pressure also reveal dynamic behavioral patterns possessing divergence from the conventional English orthography. In conclusion, the study implicates that the future holds the potential emergence of innovative orthographical patterns full of short version and vibrance.

References

- Abbas, F., Farid, M. F., Iqbal, A., & Parveen, S. (2020) Impact of Using Newspapers Reading in Improving English Reading Proficiency: A Study of Pakistani University Students. *International Journal of Innovation, Creativity and Change* 14(10), 223-232.
- Abbas, F., Jalil, M. K., Zaki, H. N., & Irfan, F. (2020). Implicit measure of language attitude: study of Punjabi native speakers by using matched guise technique. *International Journal of Innovation, Creativity and Change*, 13 (1), 194-206.
- Abbas, F., & Iqbal, Z. (2018). Language Attitude of the Pakistani Youth towards English, Urdu and Punjabi: A Comparative Study. *Pakistan Journal of Distance and Online Learning*, 4 (1), 199-214.
- Barnes, B. (2009). Relationship Networking Society and Education. *Journal of Computer Mediated Communication*, 735–742.
- Baron, N. (2000). *Alphabet to email how written English evolved and where it's heading*. New York Rutledge Press.
- Barnes, S. (2002). *Computer Mediated Communication*. London Press.
- Baron, N. (1998). Language and Communication. *Journal of Computer Mediated Communication*, 133-170.
- Baym, K. (2010). *Personal Connections in the Digital Age*. Cambridge Polity Press.
- Bodomo, A. (2010). *Computer-mediated communication for Linguistics and Literacy Technology and Natural Language Education*. New York Information Science Publishing.
- Bromme, R. (2005). *Barriers and biases in computer mediated knowledge communication and How they may be overcome*. USA Springer Science & Business Media Inc.
- Camenev, Z., & Melenciuc, D. (2010). Diachronic and synchronic analysis of semantic evolution of lexeme. *Inter-text*, 1-12.

- Campbell, G., & Moseley, C. (2012). *Routledge Handbook of Scripts and Alphabets*. New York Routledge.
- Cavus, N., & Ibrahim, D. (2009). E-learning an experiment in using SMS to support learning new English language words. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 78-91.
- Crystal, D. (2009). *A glossary of net speak and text speak*. Edinburgh Edinburgh University Press.
- Crystal, D., & Fengxin, W. (1997). *English as a global language*. Cambridge Cambridge University Press.
- Danet, B. (2001). *Cyberplay communicating online*. USA Oxford University Press.
- Danet, B. (1998). *Revisiting computer-mediated communication and community*. London: Sage Publications.
- Danet, B., & Herring, S. (2007). *The multilingual Internet Language, culture, and communication online*. USA Oxford University Press.
- Davidson, G., & Upward, C. (2011). *The history of English spellings*. USA Wiley Blackwell.
- Desk, W. (2012, December 30). *Pakistan crosses 8 million Facebook users*. Retrieved from The Express Tribune. <http://tribune.com.pk/story/486676/Pakistan-crosses-8-million-Facebook-users/>
- Doval, S. (1999). *The English spelling reform in the light of the works of Richard Mulcaster and John Hart*. SEDERI yearbook of the Spanish and Portuguese Society for English Renaissance Studies, 115-126.
- Field, S. (1981). Why your friends have more friends than you do. *American journal of Sociology*, 1464-1477.
- Gerow, A., & Ahmed, K. (2012). Diachronic variations in grammatical relations. *Coling Posters Volume I*, 380-391.
- Haque, J. (2013, May 5). *By the numbers Facebook in Pakistan*. Retrieved September 27, 2013, from The Express Tribune [http://tribune.com.pk/story/543529/by-the-numbers Facebook In-Pakistan/](http://tribune.com.pk/story/543529/by-the-numbers-Facebook-In-Pakistan/)
- Herring, S. (1996). *Computer-mediated communication Linguistic, social, and cross cultural Perspectives*. New York John Benjamins publishing company.
- Herring, S. (2001). Computer-mediated discourse. *The handbook of discourse analysis*, 612-634.
- Herring, S. (2013). *Relevance in computer-mediated conversation*. New York Routledge.
- Herring, S., & Nix, G. (1997). Is "serious chat" an oxymoron? Pedagogical vs. social uses of Internet relay chat. *American Association of Applied Linguistics*, 33-50.
- Khan, A. B., & Mansoor, H. S. (2020). Integrated Collaborative Learning Approach (ICLA): Conceptual framework of pedagogical approach for the integration of language skills. *Competitive Social Science Research Journal*, 1(1), 14–28. Retrieved from <https://cssrjournal.com/ojs/index.php/cssrjournal/article/view/21>
- Magnan, S. (2008). *Mediating discourse online*. London John Benjamins Publishing Co.

- Mayoral, R., & Alcaraz, A. (2008). A diachronic analysis of frequency adverbials variation in Peninsular and Latin American Spanish. *4th Workshop on Spanish sociolinguistics (pp. 81-90). Somerville Cascadilla Proceedings Project.*
- Naughtin, P. (2008). Spelling meter or meter. *Discussion of the spelling meter or meter*, 3-18. \
- Paolillo, J. (1999). The virtual speech community social network and language variation on IRC. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication.*
- Philomena, O. (2009). *How to manage spelling successfully*. New York Routledge.
- Pyles, T., & Algeo, J. (2009). *The origins and development of the English language*. New York Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Rana, R. A. K., Bashir, I., & Abbas, F. (2020). English for future employment: The perceptions of academia. *Hamdard Islamicus*, 43(2), 215-223.
- Rehman, Z. ur R., Bashir, I., & Rehman, A. R. ur. (2020). An exploration of teachers' code switching: The case of English language classroom . *Competitive Social Science Research Journal*, 1(2), 54–71. Retrieved from <https://cssrjournal.com/ojs/index.php/cssrjournal/article/view/19>
- Rollings, A. (2004). *The spelling patterns of English*. New York Oxford University Press.
- Rooker, M. (1994). Diachronic analysis and features of late Biblical Hebrew. *Bulletin for Biblical Research*, 114-35.
- Sergeant, P. (2012). *Exploring World Englishes Language in a Global Context*. New York Routledge.
- Sergeant, P., & Greenwell, B. (2013). *From Language to Creative Writing an Introduction*. Bloomsberry Acadmics New York.
- Shimron, J. (2006). *Reading Hebrew language and psychology of Reading it*. New York Routlegde Publishers.
- Sontoro, G. (1995). *Computer mediated communication and the online classroom what is Computer-mediated communication?* London Z.L. Berge and M.P.Collins.
- Steinfeld, W. (1986). Computer-mediated communication systems. *Annual review of Information science and technology*, 167-202.
- Thurlow, C. (2004). *Computer mediated communication Social interaction and the internet*. London Sage Publications Ltd.
- Thurlow, C. (2011). *Digital discourse language in the new media*. USA Oxford University Press.
- Thurlow, C. (2003). Teenagers in communication, teenagers on communication. *Journal of Language and social psychology*, 50-57.
- Thurlow, C. (2001). *The internet and language the concise encyclopedia of sociolinguistics*. London Pergamon.
- Thurlow, C., & Bell, K. (2009). Against technologization Young people's new media Discourse as creative cultural practice. *Journal of computer-mediated communication*, 1038-1049.
- Thurlow, C., & Poff, M. (2011). *Text-messaging. Handbook of the pragmatics of CMC*. Berlin Mouton de Gruyter.
- Werry, C. (1996). Linguistic and interactional features of internet relay chat. *Pragmatics and beyond new series*, 47-64.

Wiersma, W., & Jurs, S. (2009). *Research Methods in Education*. New Delhi
Pearson Education.

Wright, K., & Lynne, W. M. (2011). *Computer mediated communication in
personal Relationships*. New York Peter Lang Publishing Co.