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This study conducts on the pattern of English borrowing on the internet lexicon as the internet code used by university students in Medan, Indonesia. The data collection is purposely done during one semester (four months in every Monday and Thursday). The amount of the data is 53 lexicons. To recheck the reliability and validity of the data, 100 of first-year students of Political and Social Science Faculty, University of Islamic Sumatera Utara participated. The result shows that sounds of English borrowing lexicon convert into the typical Indonesian sounds. Consonant [t] at the end position of the stem in a cluster [nt] automatically dropped, like print > prin. Sound [v] replaced by [f] in all of the distribution. The passive form of the borrowing follows the Indonesian passive pattern, indicated by prefix di-. The borrowing ones adapt the Indonesian prefix me- to convey transitive verb forms, with the allomorph /mem-, men, men/\textsuperscript{g}, like mem-prin ‘to print’. The nasal sounds emerge in allomorphs influenced by the initial sounds of the stems based on the point of articulation of the sounds confronted.
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Introduction

Languages regularly change over time. One of the most critical sources of language change is contact between speakers of different languages. This condition will support the adoption of elements from another language or dialect known as linguistic borrowing (Shaligram & Linton, 2006; Calvin, 1983; Mufwene, 2003; Hudson, 1996) expressed different languages may become mixed up with each other is through the process of borrowing. This process involves mixing the systems the languages themselves because an item is borrowed from one language to become part of the other language. Further Hudson (1996) marked, it is important to recognise that borrowing can keep their foreign associations for a long time, whether or not the language community recognises them as loans.
In a study of linguistic borrowing, two terms that commonly used are recipient and donor languages. The recipient one is a term to convey the borrowing language while the donor one is the one which element borrowed (Finegan, 2015; R.A.Hudson, 2005; Shaligram & Linton, 2006). When speakers adopt elements that have already existed in their languages or vernaculars for the objects and concepts belonging to the donor language, the process is known as loan ship or loan translation. The prominent elements that more undergo changing in linguistic borrowing are lexicons of the languages in contact by these lexicons commonly leads to further changes in the recipient language. Borrowed items are often changing to conform to the recipient linguistic rules, a process recognised as adaptation. The adaptation in which the donor sounds occurred in the borrowing lexicons replaced by their variant phonological feature of the borrowing language. An example English sounds that Fought (2006) gave such as [θ] in teeth becomes [f] in AAVE (African American Vernacular English), the English sounds [aj] in climbing become [a] in AAVE simply because the vowels [i] and [u] realised with no glides in AAVE.

An alternative conception of phonological similarity in the borrowing or loanwords from English to Thai was based on shared features and natural. Kenstowicz and Atiwong (2006) examined loanwords adaptation on the Thai language used in the Central Thai pointing out that the adaptation of consonants directly correspondent in the Thai phonemic inventory and an optional structure of similarity of phonemes concentrate on shared features and natural. Here are some of the loanwords of the English phoneme /g/> /k/like in goal > koo in Thai, and /ʤ/ in English to be /k/ In Thai like to jam > cĕm, and the phoneme /z/ >/s/ like zip > sip. Such correspondences are because of the entire aspects of loan phonology since there is no specific procedure to conduct the process of adaptation in which the phoneme taken from the recipient stocks. Admittedly some pattern of similarity is at play that the domain of such proportion in feature geometry and prosodic constructions are the pertinent factors. The adapter will seek the minimal alteration in the place assigned by the feature. These loans cited without tone relationships are, certainly, one of the most captivate aspects of borrowing phonology since there are no preferences to carry out the adjudgment process as to which phoneme to choose from the recipient inventory. Other investigations into phonological impacts on the selection of concepts are more about lexical access, therefore it does not necessarily make any predictions about the selection of construction type of phonological effects on the specific manifestation of subject-verb agreement (Cleland & Pickering, 2003). To examine the effects of phonological encountering on syntactic priming, one must define how prime and target nouns might be phonologically related.

Language borrowing, according to Hoffer (2006), has been prominent in the fields of linguistics for some time since the study of language borrowing and loanwords is the only type of investigation that occurs across language boundaries. The speakers of a language have various options when acquiring new terms or words in another language that could be imported or
substituted for the sound confronted. An approach to language adaptability study is borrowing vocabulary from another language. First of all, the investigation has to run on the phonological systems of the two languages. Language borrowing investigation is much harder for a language that has a lack of consonants and vowels in its phonological inventory or towards the language, which has a straightforward syllable structure. Another difficulty may arise if the language has a much different intonation system in general, like Chinese, Japanese, English, and French.

Linguistic borrowing is a growing area of sociolinguistic research since the interrelationship between language, including the borrowing lexicons, and social life can be inherently in all aspect of human life. Therefore this field study is more about language in the social life of the bilingual and multilingual community (Plaza-Pust, 2016). Consideration of this area of research reveals a number of issues which could be examined, among others code-switching and code-mixing, pidgin and creole, loanword and borrowing. Lexical borrowing will consider inherently in the science and the non-science domain of human life. Terms in computer science, for example, employ plenty of variation of borrowing lexicons within the science domain with a considerably higher proportion of loans than physics and chemistry (Hultgren, 2013). In a case study of loanwords from Māori into (New Zealand) English, Calude et al., (2017) propose a model of loan-use and demonstrate its benefits. The model contributes a rich range of linguistic characteristics of the loanwords such as loan length and word class, as well as a similarly detailed group of sociolinguistic characteristics of the speakers using them such as gender, age and ethnicity of both, the speakers and the addressee. This model is sophisticated in carrying out together of all these factors at the same time. The findings illustrated the benefit of a quantitatively balanced approach to modelling loanword use with the complex interaction between linguistic and sociolinguistic factors in such language contact (Karũrũ, 2013).

On processing of all borrowing by one language from another, Haugen (1950) adequately assumed that it is an attempted reproduction done by the language users in the process of adopting another language (the donor) into their languages (recipients) which might employ the original pattern towards its imitation to be more similar or less to it. Hence, lexicon adoption has been recognised as a process of conveying reproduction and providing innovation in those languages. Haugen pointed out an appropriate definition for the term borrowing as the process of reproducing a pattern from one language in another done by bilingual communities which involve two kinds of activity of borrowing known as substitution and importation in which these activities convey forms of a comparison between the donors and the recipients. The type of substitution refers to distinguishing morphemic and phonemic substitution by which to be possible to set up classes of the borrowing words with complete morphemic substitution. The type of importation is commonly found in phonology; however, the structural effect of borrowing seems to be largely in certain instability in the categories because, in phonology, it may produce extensive phonemic redistribution.
The analysis of borrowing frequently interprets as a procedure of reproduction the donor’s as the original pattern with its imitation in the recipient (Haugen 1950; Cleland & Pickering, 2003; Karũrũ, 2013; Andersen, 2014). Like other forms of borrowing as what Andersen (2014) noted about which pragmatic borrowing should be separately regarded from code-switching since this term refers to synchronic or diachronic contact in the item of language change. While code-switching deals with the synchronic variation of the bilingual language speakers’ competence, however, as is well known, it could be a bit complicated to distinguish single-word switches from cases of borrowing, and the relationship between them regarded as a continuum (Carol W. Pfaff, 1979; Onysko, 2008). Borrowed items, according to Andersen (2014) often occur initially, that serve to demonstrate speakers’ capability doing the code-switching.

An argument from Goss and Salmons (2000) is that any original single-word switching and other types of language change are potentially an incipient borrowing. It could capture on a speaker or a language community groups, scatter to neighbouring groups by which it finally becomes a well-manufactured borrowing in the entire recipient language, like English discourse markers first entered German speech as emblematic code-switches, but in some period the markers regarded as German.

A study on comparisons of two L1 groups done by Shi (2004) showed that the Chinese students borrowed prominently more words from the source texts than the native English-speaking students did in which the Chinese students did not use references for lexicons those were neither copied nor modified. They denied syntactically designed lexicon from the source texts. In doing summary assignments, the Chinese students commonly used the borrowed ones not more than ten words for a long summary task. On the other hand, the native English-speaking students mostly used a lot of borrowing citation words in every single summary of assignments from the documented sources. The findings of this study proved that the Chinese students are more convenient and capable of using their own original words in doing a summary assignment.

Gatsalova et al. (2018) stated that the borrowing process done by the bilingual community depends on the quality of interpreting the concept borrowed not only on the stage of the linguacultural competence but on the encouragement to acquire some new information from the other language as well since the speaker of different language might sometimes use a different pattern of others. This situation could be related to the process of conceptualisation and categorisation stored and fossilised in the cognitive of the language users. Like Gatsalova et al. and Francis (2007) said that the discussion of lexical borrowing research focuses on the cognitive aspects of bilingualism. Therefore, borrowing is never equal that depends on a reflection of social inequalities that are in both core and cultural borrowings. The lexical borrowing items and grammatical structures depend on different processes and within the former category, such as the differences between phonological and morphological integration,
as well as the differences in how nouns and discourse markers integrated as opposed to verbs. Other investigations into phonological impacts on borrowing lexicon have commonly focused on the lexical construction type of phonological effect on morphological priming lexicons. Therefore, it is not common to predict the phonological impact on the specific terms of subject-verb agreement in morphological construction (Peperkamp, 2004).

Indonesian is a national language used by all of the Indonesian people, and it serves and plays prominent rules as a medium of communication, especially in every formal situation and in official domains. In the unformal area, however, the language communities are encouraged to use their tribal languages in their daily activities, and the Government supports foreign language (English, Japanese, Arabic, and Chinese) for a particular purpose. Therefore, Indonesian people are not only bilingual but also tend to be multilingual. Indonesian Government releases rule used for foreign language lexicons to adopt. The way of lexicon adoption and the rule must be compatible. By doing this, the Government expects to enrich the Indonesian inventory of vocabulary in KBBI (Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia Language Dictionary).

Meysitta (2018) argued that the development vocabulary of foreign-language in KBBI acquired the addition of 1,140 words from foreign languages such as Latin, Arabic, English, and French. The vocabulary is arrayed in the fields of law, science, religion, fashion, music, sports, and culinary in Indonesia. English borrowing words in Indonesian daily conversation, as Ilinawaty and Yokie Prasetya Darma (2018) noted that there are two kinds of the reason for the borrowing; culture borrowing and core borrowings. The core borrowing conveys words stored in the recipient language inventory, and the cultural borrowing is new words that promote the new artistic concept in the recipient language inventory.

The Government has displayed Indonesian internet lexicons to use; conversely, the language community commonly use the English ones. The internet users are more accustomed to using the English internet lexicons it is because, for the first time, the internet code used is entirely English. Moreover, people of the world as the internet user will recognise those lexicons. Therefore the Indonesian internet lexicons are less well known compared to the English ones among those communities in colloquial code. The Indonesian internet lexicons, however, are compulsorily functioned in the official and the formal chambers.

This paper will discuss English borrowing on internet lexicon those specifically conducted on internet lexicon used by university students of the Indonesian language community. The donor language is the English and the recipient, the Indonesian, which deals with the internet terms. The discussions in this paper are about:
a. The manifestation of the borrowing lexicons phonemic system closely related to sound changing on phonetic interpretation?

b. The elaboration of the morphological design of the borrowings on the morphological systems, which might exist in those lexical items, insofar Indonesian and English, are structurally not identical.

Research Methods

The data of this study is internet lexicons which commonly used by university students in Medan in interpersonal communication. Medan is the capital city of North Sumatera Province, Indonesia. The collecting data is purposely done during one semester (four months in every Monday and Thursday). To check the reliability and validity of the data, 100 of first-year semester students of Political and Social Science Faculty, University of Islamic Sumatera Utara (UISU) participated. The data is 53 words on the table below:

List of the data: 53 words those the most commonly used in the following table.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>English Internet Lexicons</th>
<th>Borrowing Internet Lexicons</th>
<th>Indonesian Internet lexicons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>Asep [asԑp]</td>
<td>Terima, menerima</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Account</td>
<td>Akun [akun]</td>
<td>Akun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Add</td>
<td>Et [rt]</td>
<td>Tambah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Block</td>
<td>Blok [blok]</td>
<td>Kunci</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Blog</td>
<td>Blok [blɔʔ]</td>
<td>Blok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Bookmark</td>
<td>Bukmak [bukmaʔ]</td>
<td>Penanda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Browsing</td>
<td>Brosing [brosin]</td>
<td>Penelusuran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Click</td>
<td>Klik [kliʔ]</td>
<td>Tekan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Cloud</td>
<td>Klot [klɔt]</td>
<td>Awan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Komen [kɔmԑn]</td>
<td>Komentar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Content</td>
<td>Konten [kɔntԑn]</td>
<td>Isi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Delete</td>
<td>Delet [delԑt], [dilet]</td>
<td>Hapus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Download</td>
<td>Donlot [dɔnlot]</td>
<td>Unduh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Imel [imԑl]</td>
<td>Surat (surat elektronik)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>Fitbek [fitbek], [pitbek]</td>
<td>Umpan balik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Follow</td>
<td>Folο [fɔls]</td>
<td>Ikuti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Forward</td>
<td>Fowat [fɔwat]</td>
<td>Teruskan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Log in</td>
<td>Lojin [lɔʥin], [lɔgin]</td>
<td>Masuk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Log out</td>
<td>Logot [lɔgɔt]</td>
<td>Keluar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Highlight</td>
<td>Hailait [hailait]</td>
<td>Sorotan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Hack</td>
<td>Hek [hԑk]</td>
<td>Bajak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>Histori [histɔri]</td>
<td>Riwayat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Hoax</td>
<td>Hoak [hɔak]</td>
<td>Palsu, bohong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Insert</td>
<td>Inset [insət]</td>
<td>Sisip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Invite</td>
<td>Infait [infait]</td>
<td>Undang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Like</td>
<td>Laik [laiʔ]</td>
<td>Suka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Loading</td>
<td>Loding [lɔdin]</td>
<td>Memuat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Notification</td>
<td>Notifikasi [notifikasi]</td>
<td>Notifikasi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Online</td>
<td>Onlain [ɔnlain]</td>
<td>Tayang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Offline</td>
<td>Oflain [ɔflain]</td>
<td>Mati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Posting</td>
<td>Posting [pɔstin]</td>
<td>Tampilan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Power</td>
<td>Pawer [pɔwər]</td>
<td>Arus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Print</td>
<td>Prin [prin]</td>
<td>Cetak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Profile</td>
<td>Profil [profil], [profil]</td>
<td>Profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Provider</td>
<td>Profider [profidɔɾ]</td>
<td>Penyedia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Publish</td>
<td>Publis [publis]</td>
<td>Terbit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Register</td>
<td>Register [rɛʤistəɾ], [rɛʤistɔɾ]</td>
<td>Daftar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>recent update</td>
<td>Risen apdɛt [risɛn apdɛt]</td>
<td>Terbaru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Save</td>
<td>Sef [sɛf]</td>
<td>Simpan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Scan</td>
<td>Sken [skɛn]</td>
<td>Pindai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Selfie</td>
<td>Selfi</td>
<td>Swafoto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Share</td>
<td>Ser [sɛɾ]</td>
<td>Membagikan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>Sinyal [sɪnəl]</td>
<td>Sinyal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Result and Discussion

**Phonological Feature Interference**

An account of interference phonological feature is the most common investigation of lexical borrowing in the recipient as well as in the donor. There is relatively little tolerance in the concept of the smallest unit changing. The process of phonological feature interference on loanwords from the donor (English) internet words to the recipient (Indonesian) discussed next. The English phonemes of internet borrowing lexicons used by the Indonesian students generally go changing adjusted to the construction of the phonological feature of Indonesian.

The consonant of English phoneme /t/ will automatically drop if it exists in the consonant cluster of English phonemes /nt/ in the final position of the distribution, like; account > akun; content > konten; comment > komen, and print > prin. It also happens towards the consonant cluster phoneme /pt/ in word accept > Asep.

The voiced alveolar dental phoneme /d/ substituted by the voiceless alveolar dental /t/ in the final position of the distribution, such as; add > et, cloud > klot, download > donlot, forward > fowat, and upload > aplot. It is not always possible to judge, however, whether the English phoneme /d/ spontaneously substituted by the Indonesian phoneme /t/ in all of their distributions. It happens merely in the final position. The glottal /ʔ/ phoneme substitutes velar /k/ and /g/in the final position distribution of lexicons block > bloʔ, bog > bloʔ, click > kliʔ, and feedback > fitbeʔ. Flap English phoneme /r/ substituted into trill /ɾ/, provider > profider, register > register, and power > power. The /v/ phonemes substituted to /f/ in all distribution position. In an initial position like viral > firal, and virus > firus. In middle positions is provider > profider, and invite > infait and in the final position; save > seif.

Like the consonants, the vowel phonemes have also gone changing in terms of vowel
harmony. The vowel [o] will become [ɔ] such as posting > /pɔstiŋ/, loading > /lɔdɪŋ/, and profile > /prɔfil/ and the gliding vowel [au] will occur in vowel [ɔ], such as download > /dɔnɔt/, and power > power.

**Morphological Manifestation Interference**

The borrowing process not only covers phonological interference but carries out the morphological process in the borrowing language as well. The speakers conventionally manufacture the structure of the recipient items encountering with Indonesian structure circumstance. In compliance with the essential facet of construction used, the speakers do not accede the donor’s inherent structure manifestation. Neither English nor Indonesian share identical structural shapes not only reflect differences within the languages, but they shape and reinforce those differences as well.

The language users of Indonesian on the internet lexicons, merely adapt the lexicons which spontaneously modify the structure following or fixing it up the Indonesian morphological process. The most common process of the terms, among others, is passive forms of the lexicons.

Indonesian passive form exists by jointing a passive morpheme indicator with the verb stems. The passive indicator is a bound morpheme stands as prefix di-, example, stem *makan* ‘to eat’ > *dimakan* ‘is/was eaten’, *tidak dimakan* ‘is/was not eaten’, *sudah dimakan* ‘has/have been eaten’, and *apa sudah dimakan?* ‘has it already been eaten?’

Some examples of the passive borrowing lexicons which commonly used by the students:

(1) di-donlot, ‘be downloaded’

\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{bahan} & \text{sahe} & \text{di} & \text{donlot} \\
\text{the material} & \text{has} & \text{been} & \text{downloaded}
\end{array}
\]

(2) di-imel ‘be emailed’

\[
\begin{array}{lll}
\text{makalahnya} & \text{di imel} & \text{ke} & \text{aku.} \\
\text{The paper} & \text{was emailed} & \text{to} & \text{me}
\end{array}
\]

(3) di-dilet ‘be deleted’

\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{pasti} & \text{tugas} & \text{tidak} & \text{di dilet} \\
\text{of course} & \text{the work} & \text{was not} & \text{deleted}
\end{array}
\]

(4) di-forwat ‘be forwarded’

\[
\begin{array}{llllll}
\text{apa} & \text{imel} & \text{saya} & \text{belum} & \text{diformat?} \\
\text{Was} & \text{email} & \text{my} & \text{not yet} & \text{forwarded?}
\end{array}
\]
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(5) *di-infait* ‘be invited’

Miss Lina has been invited to group our kita.

(6) *di-posting* ‘be posted’

The photos have many been posted.

(7) *di-publis* ‘is published’

Paper my has been published.

(8) *di-sef* ‘be saved’

Was this already saved?

(9) *di-sken* ‘be scanned’

Was ID Card your already scanned?

(10) *di-register* ‘be registered’

Has account your already been registered?

**Assimilation Proses of the Borrowing Lexicon**

Indonesian has a verb prefix *me-* as a bound morpheme with constituting some allomorphs, /me-/, /mem-/, /men-/, /meŋ-, and /meŋ-/. The function of prefix *me-* is to modify stems to transitive verbs. The allomorphs will appear in the assimilation process by inserting nasal sounds [m,n,ŋ] in the combination of the prefix *me-* with the stems, that depends on the influencing of stems’ initial sounds. The inserted nasal sounds adapt to the stems’ initial sounds by the phonological process of assimilation, which conform to the point of articulation of the two sounds, such as the stem *baca* ‘read’ > *membaca* ‘to read’, (adik membaca buku ‘brother read a book). The point of articulation of [b] is bilabial so the suitable nasal should be bilabial feature [m]. All of the stems which initiated by vowel will exhibit *meng-* to represent the transitive verb, for example, *ambil* ‘take’ > *meng-ambil* ‘to take’, *ingat* ‘remember’ > *mengingat* ‘to remember’, and *undang* ‘invite’ > *meng-undang* ‘to invite’.

The phonological process of assimilation also occurs in borrowing internet lexicons. As has been told before that the students prefer to use English internet lexicons to the Indonesian ones during conversation time in daily activities. The user, however, never try to maintain the
original pattern or construction of the lexicons. The construction of the lexicons would manifestly evolve following the patterns of Indonesian structure which are admitted conventionally by the internet user. The phonological assimilation process upon the stem will be employed in other, to capture a clear framing procedure to produce the new design of the borrowing lexicons,

(11) powat > mem-powat ‘to forward’
    Budi tidak mem-powat bahan itu
    Budi did not forward the material

(12) polo > mem-polo ‘to follow’
    saya sudah mem-polo dia
    I have followed him

(13) prin > memprin ‘to print’
    apa kamu memprin tugas kelompok kita?
    Did you print assignment group our

(14) publis > mem-publis ‘to publish’
    jurnal itu belum mem-publis makalah saya
    journal the has not published paper my

(15) donlot > men-donlot ‘to download’
    si Rini tidak men-donlot tulisan kamu
    Rini did not download writing our

(16) sken > men-sken ‘to scan’
    apa kamu sudah men-sken KTP mu
    did you already scan ID card you

(17) seif > men-seif ‘to save’
    sebelum mematikan laptop, saya menseifnya dulu.
    Before turn off laptop I save it first

(18) ser > men-ser ‘to share’
    bu Lina sudah mensernya di grup
    Miss Lina has shared it in group.
(19)  *imel > meng-imel* ‘to email’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>mereka</th>
<th>belum</th>
<th>meng-imel</th>
<th>aku</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>They</td>
<td>not yet</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>me</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(20)  *edit > mengedit* ‘to edit’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rina</th>
<th>sudah</th>
<th>men-edit</th>
<th>tugasnya</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rina</td>
<td>has</td>
<td>edited</td>
<td>her assignment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The assimilation process in (11), (12), (13), and (14) produced is in the terms sharing similar point of articulation between [p] as the initial sound in each stem (*powad, polo, prin* and *publis*) and the nasal sound [m]. Both of them are bilabial sounds. The assimilation process in (15), (16), (17), and (18) happened since [d] and [s] as the initial sounds of the stem (*donlot, sken, seif* and *ser*) and the nasal sound [n] share identical phonemic feature, all of them are alveolar sounds. While in *imel* and *edit*, the initial sounds of those stems are vowels; therefore, the suitable prefix allomorph is [η].

**Conclusion**

The English borrowing on internet lexicons done by university students as the internet users much depends on their need growing on the subject material. Even the Indonesian government has launched internet lexicon items, but generally, plenty of students prefer to use the English ones. The borrowed lexicons are not automatically imported and used without having any changing in the parts of the original sound and patterns. The pattern and sound change and fitted to Indonesian phonological and morphological procedures chosen by internet users. Generally, this process is dominated by the substitution process, which merely runs fitting to Indonesian substitution rules performs simple creation. The findings are as follows:

a. Every single borrowing lexicon mutually changes through the substitution process, and this changing influenced by identical features or environment of the sounds, such as the alveolar voiced sound [d] substituted to the alveolar voiceless sound [t] in the final position of the distribution. Both of the two sounds share identical manner and place of articulation (alveolar and plosive).

b. Indonesian word pattern acknowledges prefix *di-* as a bound morpheme to convey passive indicator which pinned directly to the stems, like in *di-makan, di-minum, di-pukul*, and so forth. Therefore, the borrowing internet lexicons of English face similar construction in passive structure, like *di-donlot, di-ser, di-edit, di-aplot*, and so forth.

Indonesian designate prefixes *me-* to account for transitive verb forms. It supports some allomorphs in which the appearance depends on the phonological process of assimilation. The assimilation process is applicable concerning the initial sounds of the stems, which pin down
to the morpheme indicator verb-transitive forms. The assimilation process emerges nasal sounds between the prefix *me-* and the stem. The nasal sound adjusts with the initial sound of the stem. The bilabial [p] will encounter with the bilabial nasal [m]. The alveolar [d] and [s] will match the alveolar nasal sound [n], the velar sound [k] and [g] will meet the velar nasal sound [ŋ], the velar nasal sound [ŋ] will also emerge in combination with the stem supported initial vowel sound. The phonological process of assimilation also occurs in borrowing internet lexicons, like in *men-donlot, mem-posting, meng-edit.*
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